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This talk presents an integrated theory of tense, pronouns and mood under attitudes on the basis of the theory in (Schlenker, 1999), which will be elaborated and improved in certain details. The centre of the paper will be the analysis of certain temporal phenomena that have been worrying me for the last ten years. The coverage of the theory is more general, however.

A. Ideas. The central ideas of the approach are these.
1. Each finite verb has a world, a time and a person argument, whose semantic properties are checked by the person, tense and mood morphology of the verb. Call them the egocentric arguments of the verb.
2. With the possible exception of the third person, the said arguments of the verb are variables. Variables with features will always be interpreted with respect to the context of utterance. The result is that variables with these features are deictic expressions.
3. Features of semantically bound variables are deleted at LF and therefore not interpreted (Heim’s principle of feature transmission; see e.g. (Heim, 2001)).
4. Attitudes (modals and certain temporal auxiliaries) may bind the egocentric variables of their verbal complement under agreement and therefore may produce bound person/tense/mood readings. Under these circumstances the variables lose their referential character entirely.

That certain verbs (as opposed to noun phrases) can bind variables is crucial for understanding the functioning of de se pronouns (e.g. PRO, logophors, Engl. I under attitudes), sequence of tense rules, certain readings of temporal adverbs such as in two days, shiftable deictic modals such as ought or should.

The talk tries to clarify the following point: while (Kaplan, 1979) is wrong in his claim that pronouns such as I or you are always directly referential, Schlenker’s (1999) criticism of Kaplan’s Prohibition against Monsters is not warranted. Schlenker’s attitudes are arguably purely intensional operators. There is no expression of natural language that denotes a genuine monster such as Stalnaker’s diagonal operator.

B. Data. Here are some of the data that will be discussed in the talk:

(1) Amharic I under says (Schlenker, 2001)
Why can the English sentence John says that he is a hero be expressed as John says that I am a hero in Amharic?

(2) Russian Present under thought (folklore)
Why is Engl. John thought that Mary was sick pronounced as John thought that Mary is sick in Russian?

(3) in 10 minutes under promise: How do we explain the following contrast?
 a. #Ich traf Irene um 5. Sie rief mich in genau 10 Minuten an. (German)
   ‘I met Irene at 5. She called me in exactly 10 minutes’
 b. Irene versprach mir, mich in 10 genau Minuten anzurufen.
   ‘Irene promised me to call me up in exactly 10 minutes’

(4) ought under thought: What about this?
 a. *When John was a schoolboy, he ought to study more. (Abusch, 1993)
 b. When John was a schoolboy, he thought that he ought to study more.

(5) Germ. Konjunktiv under thought: Subjunctive in than-clause generates contradiction
a. Ich dachte, ihre Yacht sei/wäre (subj.) länger als sie ist/war (ind.).
(Russell, 1905) (Stechow, 1984)
I thought your yacht be-SUBJ longer than it be-IND.
c. Ich dachte, ihre Yacht sei/wäre (subj.) länger als sie sei/wäre (subj).
I thought your yacht be-SUBJ longer than it be-SUBJ.

C. LF-movement. The LF of the de se reading of (6a) will be (6b), where the features of the variables bound by thought are deleted at LF under agreement with the features of thought.

(6)  

a. I thought I was a hero.
b. w₁ind t¹past x¹st [VP thought λ<w₂ind t²past x²st> [CP w₂ind t²past x²st was a hero]]

The talk addresses the problem of how the relation between thought and the variables it binds can be conceived of as LF-movement. There are several possible theories. The lambdas at the left edge of CP are operators moved at LF. The relation between thought and the bound variables would then be a sort of generalised chain in the GB-style; cf. (Percus and Sauerland, 2002). Another possible option is to literally move the verbal quantifier out of an argument position of the subordinate verb; cf. (Heim, 2001). Both variants lead to an area of LF that has not been investigated much so far.
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