

Aspect in discourse and in attitude reports (Atlshuler 2008)

1. Aspect in discourse: temporal anaphora.

■ Data and intuitions:

- (1) John got up, went to the window, and raised the blind. It was light out. He pulled the blind down and went back to bed. He wasn't ready to face the day. He was too depressed (Partee 1984: 253).
- ↳ Eventive (= non-stative, dynamic) predicates give rise to narrative progression.
 - ↳ Stative predicates invoke a narrative halt.

■ To account for the narrative effects in discourses such as (1), the following has been proposed in the literature on temporal anaphora:

- (2) TEMPORAL LOCATION:
Whereas the truth conditions for an **eventive** sentence require that the described event occur **within** the *reference time*—i.e. the topical interval of time previously introduced in discourse—the truth conditions for a **stative** sentence require that the described state hold **throughout** the reference time (Kamp 1979, Hinrichs 1981; 1986, Kamp and Rohrer 1983, and Partee 1984).
- (3) Recall INST from Deo (2006):

$$\text{INST}(P, t) = \exists e [\tau(e) \subseteq t \wedge P(e)] \text{ when } P \text{ is eventive}$$

$$= \exists e [\tau(e) \supseteq t \wedge P(e)] \text{ when } P \text{ is stative}$$
- (4) UPDATE OF REFERENCE TIME:
An eventive predicate updates the reference time to the duration of the consequent state of the described event (Moens and Steedman 1988; Webber 1988); a stative predicate does not update the reference time (Hinrichs 1981; 1986, and Kamp and Rohrer 1983).
- (5) REFERENCE TIME RESOLUTION:
Unless there exists contextual justification to the contrary, a described eventuality is—by default—located in time relative to the most recent reference time that is made salient in discourse (after Kamp and Reyle 1993: 545; see also Dowty 1986).

QUESTION 1: Apply the notions above to discourse (1). Does this capture our intuitions?

2. Aspect in attitude reports.

■ Data and intuitions:

(6) Anna told_{e1} me that Dudkin ran away with an actress_{e2, eventive}.
 ↳ e2 precedes e1.

(7) Anna told_{e1} me that Dudkin was sick_{e2, stative}.
 ↳ e2 is simultaneous with (i.e., overlaps) or precedes e1.

■ More on Kamp and Reyle's analysis of (English) simple Past tense in discourse:

- K&R split the Reichenbach's reference time R into subtypes, including at least:
 - (i) reference time (for the narrative progression effect in §1), and
 - (ii) *perspective time* or temporal perspective point (for the original Reichenbachian classification, e.g. Past Perfect).
 Here we'll be concerned with the latter.

- Simple Past tense is ambiguous (R = perspective time):
 - when applied to an eventive predicate, its encodes E<R and R ◦ S: (8)
 - when applied to a stative predicate, it may encode E ◦ R and R<S: (9)

(8) Bill had come home at seven. Now he was writing a letter (Kamp and Reyle 1993:596).

(9) # Bill had come home at seven. Now he wrote a letter (Kamp and Reyle 1993:596).

- Formalization: t_0 in the formulas below is the speech time; t is the perspective time.¹

(8) $PAST(P_{eventive}, t) = \exists e [\tau(e) < t \wedge t \circ t_0 \wedge P(e)]$

(9) $PAST(P_{stative}, t) = \exists e [\tau(e) \circ t \wedge t < t_0 \wedge P(e)]$

■ Altshuler extends Kamp and Reyle's to attitude reports like (6)-(7):

Free t_0 refers to the speech time of the speaker (speaker's speech time); bound t_0' is used for the local evaluation time of the attitude's subject (subject's speech/thinking time).

(10) Anna told_{e1} me that Dudkin ran away with an actress_{e2, eventive}
 $\exists e [\tau(e) < t \wedge t \circ t_0 \wedge TELL(e) \wedge AG(e)=anna \wedge$
 $THEME(e) = \lambda t_0'. \exists e' [\tau(e') < t' \wedge t' \circ t_0' \wedge RUN(e') \wedge AG(e')=dudkin]]$

(11) Anna told_{e1} me that Dudkin was sick_{e2, stative}.

QUESTION 2: Apply the analysis to (11). Are the intuitions correctly derived?

¹ Altshuler gives "=" instead of "◦" in (8). For simplicity, the reference time in (8)-(9) is ignored.