

**INTRODUCTION:** According to Forbes (1914), Russian indirect reports allow *temporal overlap* between the time of the embedded eventuality and the attitude holder's *now* only if the embedded tense is non-past. In contrast, it is generally held that English allows temporal overlap when the embedded tense is past. Many researchers have attempted to account for this putative difference between Russian and English (e.g. Comrie 1986; Kusumoto 1999; Schlenker 1999, 2003; von Stechow 2003; Kondrashova 2006). However, (Boeck 1957, Costello 1960/61) showed that in certain contexts, Russian indirect reports with an embedded past tense allow temporal overlap, just like their English counterparts.

In this talk I propose a new generalization about Russian indirect reports: temporal overlap is possible with the embedded past tense if (a) the reference time in the matrix and the embedded clause is the same, and (b) the eventuality located relative to that reference time is a state. I suggest that a satisfactory treatment of Russian indirect reports has been largely elusive because they have often been considered without a supporting context. As a result, only a small subset of the relevant cases that are considered in this talk have been accounted for. By investigating indirect reports—as they occur within a discourse—the empirical and theoretical gap can be bridged. The analysis put forth adopts the semantics of tense proposed in Kamp & Reyle (1993), along with the semantics of aspect that draws on previous research (Kamp 1979 *et seq.*). Given these semantic ingredients and some standard assumptions about the semantics of attitudes and reference time resolution, temporal overlap in Russian indirect reports is straightforwardly derived.

**DATA:** The discourses in (1)-(2) illustrate the role of reference time settings in the interpretation of Russian indirect reports. In (1a), the reference time is updated to the *consequent state* of Lev's arrival (Webber 1988). This is the reference time in both the matrix and the embedded clause of (1b). As a result, (1b) allows temporal overlap. In (2a), the reference time is first updated to the *consequent state* of the speaker's asking, and then to the *preparatory state* of Lev's giving. While the former state is understood to be the reference time in the matrix clause of (2b), the latter state is understood to be the reference time in the embedded clause. Consequently, temporal overlap is not possible.

**ANALYSIS:** I assume that the imperfective imposes a relation in which a reference time is contained in the time of a state, i.e.  $t_R \subseteq \tau(s)$  (Kamp 1979 *et seq.*). The tenseless imperfective predicate *Ja vygljadit' blednym* ('I look pale') in (1b)/(2b) is translated in (i), where the reference time variable  $t_R$  is co-indexed with the element that introduces it. Assuming that the reference time in the embedded clause of (1b) and (2b) is resolved to the *consequent state* of Lev's arrival and the *preparatory state* of Lev's giving respectively, (i) correctly predicts that the speaker was pale at the time of these events.

To account for the past tense interpretation of the embedded predicate in (1b)/(2b), I assume that it serves as an argument of the past tense operator in (ii). This operator differs from the one in (iii), which takes in an eventive predicate (Kamp & Reyle 1993). The past tense operators impose relations between the local evaluation time  $t_o$ , the time of the modified eventuality and a *perspective time*  $t_p$ ; while the *reference time* accounts for narrative progression, the distinct notion of *perspective time* is motivated by discourses involving, e.g. *extended flashbacks* (Kamp & Reyle 1993). For stative sentences, the perspective time refers to a previously mentioned eventuality in discourse that is located in the past (i.e. before  $t_o$ , which refers to the speech time when free, or the attitude holder's *now* when bound by the complementizer (Heim 1994)); the described state is located in the past by virtue of overlapping this perspective time, e.g. the state of looking pale in (1b) overlaps the past event of Lev's arrival, which serves as the perspective time.

Whether a state overlaps the attitude holder's *now* depends on the reference time settings in the matrix and the embedded clause. For example, consider the translation of (1b)/(2b) in (iv), which follows from (i)-(iii) and a standard definition of the indirect speech verb *skazat'* ('say'), which I assume to be a four-place predicate that takes in a proposition (a set of world-time pairs), an individual, an event and a world.

The reference time variables  $t_R^1$  and  $t_R^2$  in (iv) could refer to the same or different reference times depending on the surrounding discourse. Assuming that they get assigned the same value (viz. (1b)), the desired results are predicted: (iv) entails that the state of looking pale overlaps Lev's *now*. Assuming that  $t_R^2$  is assigned a value that precedes the value of  $t_R^1$  (viz. (2b)), (iv) does not entail temporal overlap.

**EXTENSION:** Assuming that an imperfective predicate with a progressive interpretation describes a state which contains the reference time (Kamp 1979 *et seq.*), the analysis presented in this talk correctly predicts that when such predicates are embedded, they allow temporal overlap if the reference time in the matrix and the embedded clause is the same. In contrast, when an imperfective predicate has a *statement of fact* interpretation (e.g. Grøn 2003), I propose that the consequent state of the described event contains the reference time. As a result, if the reference time in the matrix and the embedded clause is the same, the consequent state of the event—rather than the event itself—overlaps the attitude holder's *now*. Finally, assuming that perfective predicates describe an event whose time is contained in the reference time (Kamp 1979 *et seq.*), overlap is not possible with such predicates, regardless of the reference time settings.

- (1) a. *V prošloe voskresen'e, Lev priexa-l ko mne domoj.*  
 In last Sunday Lev<sup>PFV</sup> arrive-PST.3s to me house
- b. *On skaza-l, čto ja vygljade-l blednym.*  
 He<sup>PFV</sup> say-PST.3s that I look<sub>IPF</sub>-PST.1s pale  
 'Last Sunday, Lev arrived at my place. He said that I looked pale.'
- (2) a. *Včera ja sprosi-l L'va: "Počemu ty da-l mne lekarstvo?"*  
 Yesterday I<sup>PFV</sup> ask-PST.3s Lev Why you<sup>PFV</sup> give-PST.3s me medicine
- b. *On skaza-l, čto ja vygljade-l blednym.*  
 He<sup>PFV</sup> say-PST.3s that I look<sub>IPF</sub>-PST.1s-FEM pale  
 'Yesterday I asked Lev: 'Why did you did give me medicine?' He said that I looked pale.'

- (i)  $Ja\ vygljadet'\ blednym^1 \rightsquigarrow \lambda s_I \lambda w_I [look.pale(I)(s_I)(w_I) \wedge t_R^1 \subseteq \tau(s_I)]$
- (ii)  $PST_{State} \rightsquigarrow \lambda R_{\sigma_{\omega t}} \lambda w_I [\exists s_I [t_P^1 < t_0 \wedge t_P^1 \cap \tau(s_I) \neq \emptyset \wedge R(s_I)(w_I)]]$
- (iii)  $PST_{Event} \rightsquigarrow \lambda P_{\sigma_{\omega t}} \lambda w_I [\exists e_I [t_P^1 = t_0 \wedge \tau(e_I) < t_P^1 \wedge P(e_I)(w_I)]]$
- (iv)  $PST_{Event}\ Lev\ skazat'^1\ čto\ PST_{State}\ ja\ vygljadet'\ blednym^2 \rightsquigarrow$   
 $\lambda w_I [\exists e_I [t_P^1 = t_0 \wedge \tau(e_I) < t_P^1 \wedge say(\lambda t_0 \lambda w_2 [\exists s_I [t_P^2 < t_0 \wedge t_P^2 \cap \tau(s_I) \neq \emptyset$   
 $\wedge look.pale(I)(s_I)(w_2) \wedge t_R^2 \subseteq \tau(s_I)]])(lev)(e_I)(w_I) \wedge \tau(e_I) \subseteq t_R^1]]]$

## REFERENCES

- BOECK, W. 1957. "Zum Tempusgebrauch des Russischen in Objekt- und Subjektsätzen", *Zeitschrift für Slavistik* 2: 206–218.
- COMRIE, B. 1986. "Tense in indirect speech." *Folia Linguistica* 20: 265-296.
- COSTELLO, D.P. 1960/61. "Tenses in Indirect Speech in Russian." *Slavonic and East European Review* 39: 489-496.
- FORBES, N. 1914. *Russian Grammar*. Oxford University Press.
- GRØNN, A. 2003. "The Semantics and Pragmatics of the Russian Factual Imperfective", Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oslo.
- HEIM, I. 1994. "Comments on Abusch's theory of tense." In H. Kamp (ed.), *Ellipsis, tense and questions*. Univ. Amsterdam.
- KAMP, H. 1979. "Events, instants and temporal reference". In R. Bäuerle et al (eds.), *Semantics from Different Points of View*. De Gruyter, Berlin, 376–471.
- KAMP, H. & U. REYLE. 1993. *From Discourse to Logic: Introduction to Model theoretic Semantics of Natural Language, Formal Logic and Discourse Representation Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- KONDRASHOVA, N. 2006. "Is Russian a split SOT-language?" In J. Lavine, S. Franks, M. Tasseva-Kurkchieva and H. Filip (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Princeton Meeting 2005 (FASL 14)*. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Slavic Publications.
- KUSUMOTO, K. 1999. "Tense in Embedded Contexts." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- SCHLENKER, P. 1999. "Propositional Attitudes and Indexicality: A Cross-Categorical Approach". Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- SCHLENKER, P. 2003. "A Plea For Monsters", *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26: 29-120.
- VON STECHOW, A. 2003. "Feature deletion under semantic binding: tense, person, and mood under verbal quantifiers", text of the NELS 33 talk.