

[REVIEW]

About the Speaker: Towards a Syntax of Indexicality

By Alessandra Giorgi, Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 28, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010, vii+230pp.

KOJI KAWAHARA

*Nagoya University of Foreign Studies**

Keywords: *Double Access Reading, long distance anaphora, speaker projection, tense*

1. Introduction

Tense has risen to some prominence under current linguistic studies as various theories have tackled verbs and their argument structures, and the inflectional systems associated with them have been treated as the central component of the clause. Tense has manifested itself obviously in syntax and morphology, whereby the effort to understand the meaning of expressions that are related in time has played a significant role in the development of semantic theories. This book discusses important and longstanding issues in the analysis of temporal phenomena mainly in English and Italian. By hypothesizing that the speaker's temporal location is specified in the syntactic structure, Giorgi provides an elegant analysis of these phenomena by sophisticated theoretical and empirical arguments. The organization of this review is as follows. In section 2, I give a brief overview of this book, focusing on a core set of facts that support the central claim of this book. In section 3, I explore the theoretical and empirical consequences of the book, concluding the review. My overall evaluation of the book is that, while it nicely captures the temporal phenomena in Italian, Giorgi's proposal suffers from several undesirable consequences when applied to other languages, leading me to conclude that further refinement will be required in

* I would like to thank Thomas Jacques for proofreading. I am also grateful to Yukio Oba for his valuable comments. I am particularly indebted to two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions. Of course, any errors or inconsistencies that have persisted are my responsibility.

this area in order to contribute to the theory of UG.

2. Overview

Giorgi begins her discussion by focusing on the embedded verbal form in Chinese, English, Italian and Romanian. As shown in (1) below, in reference to Mary's pregnancy, English and Italian have a peculiar interpretation called the *Double Access Reading* (DAR), whereby the pregnancy of Mary must hold both at the time John talked about it and at the time the speaker utters the sentence. Giorgi claims that DARs are attributable to the characteristics of complementizers and the embedded present tense receives an interpretation twice: once with respect to the matrix subject's temporal location and once with respect to the speaker's temporal location that corresponds to *now* (p. 13).¹

- (1) Gianni ha detto che Maria è incinta.²

John said that Mary is (IND PRES) pregnant.

DARs are required in English and Italian and thus the following examples are anomalous in the present world, because pregnancy in human beings lasts nine months (p. 14).

- (2) #Due anni fa, Gianni ha detto che Maria è incinta.

#Two years ago, John said that Mary is (IND PRES) pregnant.

By contrast, DARs are not required in Chinese and Romanian. The following example from Romanian indicates that DARs are not obligatory, although it is possible (p. 5).

- (3) (Acum 2 ani) Gianni a spus ca Maria e insarcinata.

Two years ago John said that Maria is (IND PRES) pregnant.

Giorgi argues that English and Italian are not different in allowing DARs. Analogously, the embedded past and future forms do not exhibit significant differences between these two languages and the same kinds of

¹ An anonymous reviewer pointed out that it is logically possible for the embedded tense to be interpreted once with respect to speech time with the subject's temporal location derived pragmatically. The point here is that DARs are obligatory in Italian and English. In fact, the same kinds of readings are available in non-DAR languages such as Chinese and Romanian as shown in (3) but they are not required.

² The verbal form *ha detto* is translated in English as the simple past. The form is literally a present perfect form. The simple past form *disse* 'said' is only rarely used in central and northern Italy. This book basically uses the present perfect for the simple past. The simple past is used if necessary. For a detailed discussion, see Giorgi and Pianesi (1997).

Sequence of Tense (SOT) properties are observed. The embedded event in (4) below is interpreted as preceding both Gianni's/John's time of saying and the utterance time. The embedded event in (5) must be understood to follow both Gianni's/John's time of saying and the utterance time. The future-in-the-past usage in (6) locates the event after Gianni's/John's saying, but not necessarily after the utterance time (p. 19).

- (4) Gianni ha detto che Maria è partita.
John said that Mary left (IND PAST).
- (5) Gianni ha detto che Maria partirà.
John said that Mary will leave (IND FUTURE).
- (6) Gianni ha detto che Maria sarebbe partita.
John said that Mary would leave (IND FUTURE-IN-THE-PAST).

Like many languages—Catalan, German, Icelandic, Modern Greek, Romanian, and Spanish—Italian has so-called *subjunctive* forms. Giorgi points out that SOT properties are observed in this form as well. The following examples indicate that the tense forms of the superordinate clauses and the embedded clauses must correspond to each other (p. 35).

- (7) a. Gianni crede che Maria sia felice.
Gianni believes that Maria is (SUBJ PRES) happy.
- b. Gianni credeva che Maria fosse felice.
Gianni believed that Maria was (SUBJ PAST) happy.

Giorgi argues that the tense of the embedded verbal form is not necessarily translated into a tense relation with respect to the utterance time. Subjunctive morphology in Italian manifests itself as an agreement relation between the morphological tense of the main verb and the embedded one. The verbal form in the following example (8) shows temporal agreement with the main verbal form and the temporal interpretation of the leaving event is not constrained by any indexical adverb. Hence, the leaving can be located either in the past, in the present, or in the future with respect to the utterance event (p. 34).

- (8) Gianni sperava che Maria partisse ieri/oggi/domain.
Gianni hoped that Maria left (SUBJ PAST) yesterday/today/tomorrow.

According to Giorgi, the subjunctive in most cases does not have an independent temporal interpretation of its own and the location in time of the speaker is not relevant for the subjunctive verbal morphology, but DAR effects occur in (9b). Although the superordinate predicate is in a past form in both cases, the past and the present subjunctive forms are both possible. The present subjunctive in (9b) forces the DAR interpretation as well

as the indicative counterpart. The present subjunctive in (9b) implies that the pregnancy of Maria holds both at the time Gianni hypothesized about it, and *now* (pp. 41–42).

- (9) a. Gianni ha ipotizzato che Maria fosse incinta.
Gianni hypothesized that Maria was (SUBJ PAST) pregnant.
b. (#Due anni fa,) Gianni ha ipotizzato che Maria sia incinta.
(#Two years ago,) Gianni hypothesized that Maria is (SUBJ PRES) pregnant.

The hypothesis concerning DARs is summarized as follows (p. 24).

- (10) The eventuality embedded inside a complement clause must be evaluated twice. Once with respect to the subject's—attitude bearer's—temporal coordinate and once with respect to the speaker's temporal coordinate.

Assuming that the event of an attitude predicate's complement is anchored to the superordinate event, Giorgi argues that the embedded event can be treated as a variable, the value of which is recursively assigned by the superordinate event and by the utterance event by analogy with theta identification. (e.g., in *John left angry*, both *angry* and the argument of *leave* are theta-identified with *John*.) She proposes that the head of the tense projection is a bi-argumental predicate of the following form (p. 24):

- (11) $e_1 R e_2$

R stands for *Relation* and it can be interpreted as *precedes*, *follows*, or *overlaps with*, depending on the tense of a verb. The first term e_1 is identified with the embedded event by means of theta-identification and the second term e_2 is treated as a variable whose reference is locally determined. A point here is that the variable is identified twice: first in a lower position in the T-layer and second in a higher position in the C-layer. Giorgi argues that the anchoring to the superordinate event is implemented through the representation in the T-layer of the feature Φ of the event corresponding to the main attitude in both DAR and non-DAR languages. In DAR languages, the second argument of the tense predicate is further identified with the speaker's coordinate, *U* (*utterance*) in the C-projection. Under the proposed analysis, the embedded T agrees with both C and the main V in DAR languages.

According to Giorgi, the difference between the indicative and the subjunctive in Italian lies in the structure of complementizers. She claims that the C-layer is the locus for the realization in the syntax of the speaker's temporal coordinate. Since the left-most position of the C-layer contains the speaker's temporal coordinate, the complementizer introducing the indicative has different properties from that of the subjunctive. The different

structural properties of complementizers are reflected in the possibility of complementizer deletion. The complementizer in Italian can be omitted when introducing subjunctive clauses, while it can never be deleted when introducing indicative ones. According to Giorgi's analysis, complementizer deletion is possible in subjunctive clauses, because it does not bear any reference to the speaker. Hence, in Italian, DARs and complementizer deletion never co-occur. Her proposal accounts for the contrast in (12). *Che* cannot be deleted when it introduces the indicative, while it can when it introduces the subjunctive (p. 43).

- (12) a. Mario ha detto *(che) ha telefonato Gianni.
 Mario said that has (IND) called Gianni
 'Mario said that Gianni called.'
 b. Mario credeva (che) avesse telefonato Gianni.
 Mario believed (that) had (SUBJ) called Gianni
 'Mario believed that Gianni called.'

Since DARs are not compatible with complementizer deletion, *che* in (13b) cannot be omitted even if it introduces the subjunctive (p. 49).

- (13) a. Gianni ha ipotizzato (che) fosse incinta.
 Gianni hypothesized (that) (she) was (SUBJ PAST) pregnant
 (non-DAR).
 b. Gianni ha ipotizzato *(che) sia incinta.
 Gianni hypothesized (that) she is (SUBJ PRES) pregnant
 (DAR).

Giorgi provides a straightforward explanation for the different properties exhibited by the indicative and the subjunctive. According to her, the indicative always enforces a DAR that is introduced by the speaker's temporal coordinate in the C-layer. The subjunctive basically does not enforce a DAR, because the subjunctive complementizer does not make any reference to the speaker's temporal coordinate unless it co-occurs with *ipotizzare*.

Another verbal form that is discussed in detail is the imperfect. The imperfect has been dubbed an 'anaphoric' past form. This is because the imperfect is felicitous if some temporal topic locates the event. Hence, (14a) is not accessible out of context, while the existence of the temporal topic in (14b) circumvents the unnaturalness (p. 98).

- (14) a. #Gianni mangiava un panino.
 Gianni was eating (IMPF) a sandwich.
 b. Ieri alle tre Gianni mangiava un panino.
 Yesterday at three Gianni was eating (IMPF) a sandwich.

The imperfect behaves in the same way as the indicative, not as the sub-

junctive, in that it is grammatical in the main clause as shown in (15a) and (15c), while the subjunctive in (15b) is not possible in the matrix clause (p. 99).

- (15) a. Ieri alle tre Gianni ha mangiato un panino.
Yesterday at three Gianni ate (IND PAST) a sandwich.
- b. *Ieri alle tre Gianni mangiasse un panino.
Yesterday at three Gianni ate (SUBJ PAST) a sandwich.
- c. Ieri alle tre Gianni mangiava un panino.
Yesterday at three Gianni ate (IMPF) a sandwich.

The following examples also show that the imperfect can be treated in the same manner as the indicative, not as the subjunctive. The indicative and the imperfect are not possible under a verb like *desiderare* (wish) (p. 100).

- (16) a. *Gianni desiderava che Maria è partita.
Gianni wished that Maria left (lit: has (IND PRES) left).
- b. Gianni desiderava che Maria partisse.
Gianni wished that Maria left (SUBJ PAST).
- c. *Gianni desiderava che Maria partiva.
Gianni wished that Maria left (IMPF).

In addition, the imperfect disallows complementizer deletion as well as the indicative. Note that the subjunctive allows complementizer deletion (p. 102).

- (17) a. Gianni credeva (che) fosse partita.
Gianni believed that she had (SUBJ) left.
- b. Gianni ha detto *(che) era partita.
Gianni said (that) she had (IMPF) left.

However, the imperfect does not give rise to a DAR. The embedded past verbal form in (18a) is interpreted with respect to the superordinate event and with respect to the utterance event, while the counterpart of the imperfect receives a different interpretation. The eating event is simultaneous with the superordinate event in (18b), but the eating event precedes both the saying and *now* in (18a) (p. 103).

- (18) a. Gianni ha detto che Maria ha mangiato/mangiò un panino.
Gianni said that Maria ate (PRES PERF/SIMPLE PAST) a sandwich.
- b. Gianni ha detto che Maria mangiava un panino.
Gianni said that Maria ate (IMPF) a sandwich
'Gianni said that Maria was eating a sandwich.'

To sum up, the imperfect behaves in the same way as the indicative except that it does not give rise to a DAR. One way of capturing this property,

according to Giorgi, is to posit that the imperfect cannot be anchored to the utterance event, because it bears a [–speaker] feature. By virtue of this feature, the imperfect does not locate the event with respect to the speaker's temporal coordinate. It locates the event only with respect to the superordinate event.

I have summarized the main discussion in this book, in which the DAR in Italian can be explained by hypothesizing the speaker's temporal coordinate in the C-layer. The existence of the speaker's temporal coordinate is closely related to the unavailability of complementizer deletion. Hence, the complementizer introducing the indicative does not allow complementizer deletion, because this position must be held for the speaker's temporal coordinate. By contrast, complementizer deletion is possible in the subjunctive, because the speaker projection is not relevant to this verbal form. By taking the risk of adding the 'extra' [–speaker] feature, the properties of the imperfect are also captured.

3. Discussion

It is true that this book provides an elegant analysis of temporal phenomena by specifying the speaker's temporal location in the syntactic structure in Italian. Giorgi argues that the speaker projection is an option made available by UG. If so, then it should be expected that her analysis could be applied to other languages and in fact she discusses several temporal phenomena in English and anaphora in Chinese. On close scrutiny, however, there appear several theoretical and empirical problems to be overcome.

According to Giorgi, the speaker's temporal location is a source of DARs and the existence of the speaker's projection is indirectly supported by the impossibility of complementizer deletion. Under the analysis, it is predicted that English, which is categorized as a DAR language, cannot delete the complementizer *that* in DAR constructions, contrary to fact. The non-existence of the complementizer in (19) does not influence the DAR effect.

(19) John said (that) Mary is pregnant.

It is possible to hypothesize that English has a null complementizer that is semantically equivalent to the overt complementizer *that*, but such a hypothesis clearly weakens her argument. The hypothesis would be no more than a theoretical justification that cannot be supported empirically, because a deleted complementizer cannot be distinguished from a morphologically null complementizer. Furthermore, an anonymous reviewer points out that *that* cannot be deleted in subjunctive clauses for many speakers while it can be

in indicative clauses (Haegeman and Guéron (1999: 107)):

- (20) a. I demand *(that) he see the president now.
- b. I think (that) he works in a hospital.

This is clearly contrary to Giorgi's claim. I thank a reviewer for this comment.

It is also necessary to provide an explanation for how and why Italian is a DAR language, while Romanian is not. This is because these two languages adopt the same kinds of tense systems, at least morphologically. Giorgi admits this in the book (p. 11) and in her later work (Giorgi (2011)), she points out that the complementizer *ca* in Romanian cannot be deleted with the indicative, but it is generally omitted with the subjunctive. The examples are listed below (Giorgi (2011: 408)).

- (21) a. Jon a spus *(ca) Maria e insarcinata.
Jon said *(that) Maria is (IND PRES) pregnant.
- b. Maria vrea (*ca) sa-i raspunda.
Maria wants (*that) *sa*-him answer (SUBJ)
'Maria wants to answer him.'

If the distinction between the subjunctive and the indicative is a trigger to derive a DAR, why doesn't Romanian adopt an obligatory DAR? The distribution of the complementizer in (21) should indicate the existence of the speaker's temporal coordinate. In fact, the Romanian examples show that the relationship between DARs and the availability of complementizer deletion in Italian is no more than a coincidence and the morphological paradigm in tense systems should be addressed from a different perspective.³

This book claims that the speaker's coordinate in the C-layer is a universal one and thus it is reflected not only in tense phenomena but also in long distance anaphors. Italian has long distance anaphors that can refer to an antecedent beyond clause boundaries. However, the clause containing the speaker's coordinate blocks this reference. Hence, the indicative in (22) prevents the anaphor from taking *quel dittatore* as its antecedent (pp. 129–130).

³ I do not refute the possibility that DARs are explained by some tense systems. For example, how DARs are concerned with SOT phenomena is discussed in Sharvit (2003). According to her classification, Hebrew is not a SOT language without an obligatory DAR and Greek is like Romanian in that it has a SOT rule but is not categorized as a DAR language.

- (22) a. Quel dittatore_i spera che i notiziari televisivi parlino a lungo delle proprie_i gesta.
That dictator hopes that TV news programmes will talk (SUBJ) for a long time about self's deeds.
- b. Quel dittatore_i ha detto che il primo ministro_j era convinto che i notiziari televisive avessero parlato a lungo delle proprie_{j/*i} gesta.
That dictator said that the prime minister was (IND) convinced that the TV news programme had (SUBJ) talked a lot about self's deeds.
- c. *Quel dittatore_i ha detto che i notiziari televisivi hanno parlato a lungo delle proprie_i gesta.
That dictator said that the TV news programmes talked (IND) for a long time about self's deeds.
- d. *Quel dittatore_i ha detto che i notiziari televisivi parleranno a lungo delle proprie_i gesta.
That dictator said that the TV news programmes will (IND) talk a lot about self's deeds.

Since the speaker's coordinate blocks long distance binding, the subjunctive that derives a DAR blocks the anaphor from taking the antecedent in the superordinate clause (p. 134).

- (23) a. Quel dittatore_i ha ipotizzato che il primo ministro venda illegalmente i propri_{?/*i} tesori.
That dictator hypothesized that the prime minister illegally sells (SUBJ PRES) self's treasures.
- b. Quel dittatore_i ha ipotizzato che il primo ministro vendesse illegalmente i propri_i tesori.
That dictator hypothesized that the prime minister illegally sold (SUBJ PAST) self's treasures.

Although the imperfect does not give rise to an obligatory DAR, the C-layer of the imperfect corresponds to that of the indicative with respect to the speaker's coordinate and thus it blocks long distance binding (p. 135).

- (24) a. Quel dittatore_i ha detto che i libri di storia parlavano spesso delle proprie_{*i} gesta.
That dictator said that the books of history often spoke (IMPF) about self's deeds.
- b. Quel dittatore_i ha detto che i libri di storia hanno parlato spesso delle proprie_{*i} gesta.
That dictator said that the books of history often spoke (IND)

PAST) about self's deeds.

- c. Quel dittatore_i sperava che i libri di storia parlassero spesso delle proprie_i gesta.

That dictator hoped that the books of history often spoke (SUBJ) about self's deeds.

According to Giorgi, the blocking effect is caused by the speaker's coordinate. Hence, even if Chinese does not have any indicative/subjunctive distinction in verbal forms, the blocking effect appears if a first or a second person pronoun intervenes between the intended antecedent and the long distance anaphor *ziji* (p. 130).

- (25) Zhangsan_i danxin wo/ni_j hui piping ziji_{*i/j}.

Zhangsan is worried that I/you might criticize myself/yourself/*him.

The intervening third person pronoun does not cause a blocking effect (p. 131).

- (26) Wo_i danxin Zhangsan_j hui piping ziji_{i/j}.

I am worried that Zhangsan will criticize me/himself.

Giorgi claims that the embedded clause containing the first or second person pronoun is accompanied by the speaker's coordinate, causing the blocking effect. However, this analysis cannot be applied to the Japanese counterpart as shown in (27). Since the properties of *ziji* and *zibun* are basically the same, the absence of the blocking effect in Japanese needs further explanation.

- (27) a. John-wa_i watasi/anata-ga_j zibun-o_{i/j} hihansuru
 John-Top I/you-Nom self-Acc criticize
 nodewanaikato omotteiru.
 Comp worry
 'John is worried that I/you might criticize myself/yourself/him.'
- b. Watasi-wa_i John-ga_j zibun-o_{i/j} hihansuru nodewanaikato
 I-Top John-Nom self-Acc criticize Comp
 omotteiru.
 worry
 'I am worried that John will criticize me/himself.'

In addition, Iida (1996: 162) points out that the interpretation of *zibun* is linked to the point of view. When *zibun* is used in (28b), the interpretation is only from Taroo's perspective. Since such a requirement is not relevant for the pronoun *kare*, (28a) is ambiguous.

- (28) a. Taroo-wa_i kare-no_i migigawa-ni hon-o oita.
 Taroo-Top his-Gen right-on book-Acc put
 'Taroo_i put the book on his_i right.'

‘Taroo_i put the book on the right of him_i (from the speaker’s perspective)’

- b. Taroo-wa_i zibun-no_i migigawa-ni hon-o oita.

Taroo-Top self-Gen right-on book-Acc put

‘Taroo_i put the book on his_i right.’

‘*Taroo_i put the book on the right of him_i (from the speaker’s perspective).’

One way of capturing the distribution of *zibun* is to posit the speech act or evidentiality projection at the C-layer (Tenny (2006)).⁴ I will not discuss Tenny’s (2006) analysis here, but at the very least the examples above indicate that the speaker’s location must be somehow introduced in Japanese, a non-DAR language. A natural question to be asked is why an infant in the process of acquiring Japanese does not learn an obligatory DAR and exhibit a blocking effect with *zibun* in spite of the fact that he or she somehow has introduced the speaker’s location in his or her grammar. To provide a comprehensive analysis that leads to the illumination of UG, what triggers DARs and the blocking effect must be seriously reviewed. This book has established that complementizer deletion is closely related to the distinction between the indicative (and probably the imperfect) and the subjunctive in Italian, but the analysis *ipso facto* cannot rate explanatory adequacy. To apply the analysis to other languages, the theory must be restrictive enough to predict grammatical phenomena accompanied by a common parameter (e.g. the speaker’s temporal coordinate). Otherwise, the application will be no more than an indication of common properties and cannot lead to a refined parametric theory in generative grammar.

⁴ To show some examples, the predicate of direct experience requires a first person subject.

- (i) Watasi/*Anata/*Kare-wa samui desu.
I/you/he-Top cold Cop
‘I am/You are/He is cold.’

Since the speaker and addressee are related in the speech act projection, the interrogative counterparts are grammatical.

- (ii) Anata/Kare-wa samui desu ka?
you/he-Top cold Cop Q
‘Are you/Is he cold?’

REFERENCES

- Giorgi, Alessandra and Fabio Pianesi (1997) *Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Giorgi, Alessandra (2011) "Reflections on the Optimal Solution: On the Syntactic Representation of Indexicality," *The Biolinguistic Enterprise: New Perspectives on the Evolution and Nature of the Human Language Faculty*, ed. by Anna Maria Di Sciullo and Cedric Boeckx, 392–416, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Haegeman, Liliane and Jacqueline Guéron (1999) *English Grammar: A Generative Perspective*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Iida, Masayo (1996) *Context and Binding in Japanese*, CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Sharvit, Yael (2003) "Embedded Tense and Universal Grammar," *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 669–681.
- Tenny, Carol L. (2006) "Evidentiality, Experiencers, and the Syntax of Sentience in Japanese," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15, 245–288.

[received July 20 2012, revised and accepted December 4 2012]

Department of British and American Studies
 Nagoya University of Foreign Studies
 57 Takenoyama, Iwasaki-cho, Nissin-shi
 Aichi 470-0197
 e-mail: kkoji@nufs.ac.jp