The Case of the Mol Particle in Russian[1]

Mariia Esipova

January 2014

Abstract

This paper investigates the case of the Russian particle mol. After a brief overview of its general properties, I present a primary set of data on the behavior of indexicals, namely the first person pronoun 'I' and the locative indexical 'here', in the scope of mol. Next, I show how these data can be analyzed from the perspective of two different assumptions: (i.) mol is a context shift operator; (ii.) mol is a quotative particle. I refute the first assumption based on the data on wh-extraction from mol clauses. I proceed by arguing that any apparent 'shifts' of the locative indexical 'here' are not instances of perspectival shift and happen for independent reasons that are rooted in the flexible semantic nature of 'here' itself. I finish with a piece of data on uninterpretable plural features on indexical pronouns in the scope of mol that might pose a problem for the quotative analysis of the mol particle.

1. The mol particle in Russian: a general overview

Mol is one of the Russian particles[2] used in speech and thought reports. It derives from a verb of speech, *molvit'*, which is an obsolete Russian verb for 'say / utter'. The usage patterns for mol are often unclear and speaker-specific; its semantic and pragmatic contribution is also multi-faceted and not always distinct. In dictionaries, this particle is usually described as quotative and/or evidential. While there have been scanty attempts by Russian researchers at describing the meaning shades brought in by mol[3], there have been none, to my knowledge, at studying the apparent indexical shift happening in the scope of mol and, thus, clarifying this particle's semantic nature.

Mol is often embedded under non-factive attitude verbs (with or without an overt complementizer), but using mol without an embedding verb is also totally possible from the structural point of view (i.e. there is no syntactic requirement to necessarily have an embedding verb). However, mol requires an embedding context, i.e. there should be a salient speech act, or a thought act attributed to the agent of the reported context in respect to which the material in the scope of mol is interpreted, since mol itself does not create a context. Consider, for instance, the following examples from the Russian National Corpus:

[1] I thank Philippe Schlenker for productive discussions and many useful suggestions, some of the students at the New York-St. Petersburg Institute of Linguistics, Cognition and Culture (2013) for the initial debate, Deniz Özyildiz for some pertinent questions, and my very helpful and patient informants. None of the above is responsible for any erroneous claims made in this paper.

[2] There are two other particles similar to mol in Russian, *deskat'* and de (both are less frequent than mol and presumably obsolete; additionally, de regularly exhibits a clitic-like behavior). The latter derives from the Old Russian *děet'* ('say'), and the former derives from de and the Modern Russian *skazat'* ('say'). I do not consider their behavior within this paper, but most likely it is very similar to that of mol.

[3] See, for example, Perfilyeva & Halzova 1991, Grigorenko 2009.

(1)

a. Kakoj-to upitanno-rozovoŝëkij srednix let vozrazil mne,
some plump-pink-cheeked middle.GEN years.GEN retorted me.DAT
čto, mol, moi utverždenija nesostojatel'ny…
that mol my claims invalid
'Some plump and pink-cheeked [man] retorted to me that my claims were invalid.'
(I. Grekova. V vagone [In a car]. 1983.)

b. …oni mne otvetili, čto, mol, my eŝë podumaem
they me.DAT answered that mol we more think.FUT.1PL
'They answered me that they would think more [about it].'
(Olga Aleksandrova. Nevernyj obraz šaxmatista [Unfaithful image of a chess-player] // "64 — Chess review", 2004.)

c. …kakaja-to brjunetka vyšla iz desjatogo rjada partera
some brunette came-out from tenth row parterre.GEN
i, ulybajas' tak, čto ej, mol, rešitel'no vsë ravno
and smiling so that she.DAT mol decidedly all-the-same
i v obŝem naplevat', prošla i po bokovomu trapu podnjalas' na scenu.
and in general spit-upon walked and along side ladder went-up to stage
'Some brunette came out from the tenth row of the parterre and, smiling as if it decidedly made no difference to her and she in general didn't care, walked up a side ladder to the stage.' (M.A. Bulgakov. Master i Margarita [The Master and Margarita]. 1929—1940.)

d. I on odobritel'no mne kivnul, mol, slyšu.
and he approvingly me.DAT nodded mol hear.PRES.1SG
'And he nodded to me approvingly [as if saying], 'I [can] hear [you]'.' (Ljudmila Gurčenko. Aplodismenty [Applause]. 1994—2003.)

Both (1a) and (1b) contain explicit speech acts, and the difference between the two is that there is no shift in the interpretation of the indexical element in (1a) (the plural first person possessive 'my' is interpreted with respect to the actual context), and there is one in (1b) (the plural first person pronoun 'we' is interpreted with respect to the reported context). Neither (1c), nor (1d) contains explicit speech or thought acts, however, mol marks the thought material constructed by the actual speaker and attributed to the agent of the reported context (as if conveyed by this person's actions). Again, there is an indexical shift in (1d) (the interpretation of the first person morphology on the verb is shifted), and no indexical shift in (1c) (the third person pronoun ej ('she.DAT') is unshifted).

The position of mol in a sentence is not fixed; it is probably highly dependent on prosodic considerations, and is subject to individual preferences. According to my observations, many Russian speakers (including me) prefer having mol in the second position after the complementizer (if there is any), i.e. preceded by some other element, in which case mol is generally unstressed and rather clitic-like. However, it can appear immediately after the complementizer, or sometimes even somewhere else in the sentence.

Within this paper I will only focus on mol in clauses embedded under speech verbs. However, the actual usage of mol is much broader and might imply a more complicated

semantics. I will also ignore the variation in word order for now; however, in Appendix 2 one can see how judgments for Paradigm 1 vary depending on the respective order of mol and the indexicals.

2. Indexicals in the scope of mol in speech reports: initial empirical generalizations

2.1. First person pronoun in Subject position + locative indexical

Let us first look at the initial set of data[4] on how indexicals, in particular the first person pronoun ja ('I') in the Subject position and the locative indexical *zdes'* ('here'), tend to be interpreted in the scope of mol in speech reports. Consider the following example:

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg, and I am talking about my friend Ivan.

(2) Kogda Ivan byl v Pariže on skazal čto mol zdes' ja budu rabotat'.
when Ivan was in Paris he said that mol here I will.1SG work
'When Ivan was in Paris, he said that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha[5]) would work there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb).' [Table 1.2]

The main judgment generalizations for this sentence are as follows:

(i.) the 'shifted-shifted' reading is preferred; both the first person pronoun and the locative indexical are preferably interpreted within the reported perspective, i.e. 'I' refers to Ivan, and 'here' refers to Paris (depending on the respective word order of mol and the indexicals, the mean ratings vary from 6 to 6.75, with the lowest individual rating (LIR) at 4 and the highest individual rating (HIR) at 7);

(ii.) the 'unshifted-shifted' reading is available, i.e. it is possible to shift the reference of the locative indexical without shifting the reference of the first person pronoun, which means 'I' can refer to Masha while 'here' refers to Paris (mean: 5—6, LIR: 4, HIR: 7);

(iii.) the 'shifted-unshifted' interpretation is plain unacceptable; it is impossible to shift the first person pronoun without shifting the locative indexical, i.e. 'I' cannot refer to Ivan while 'here' refers to Saint Petersburg (mean: 1.25—2, LIR: 1, HIR: 3);

(iv.) the 'unshifted-unshifted' reading is degraded; it is hard to interpret both the first person pronoun and the locative indexical (i.e. 'I' refers to Masha, 'here' refers to Saint Petersburg) within the actual perspective (mean: 1.75—3.5, LIR: 1, HIR: 5).

2.2. First person pronoun in Object position + locative indexical

The same judgment pattern emerges when the first person pronoun is in the Object position[6]:

[4] The judgments in the form of acceptability ratings on a 7-point scale (1 = worst, 7 = best) were elicited from three native speakers of Russian (see Appendix 1 for sociolinguistic information on the speakers); additionally, as a native speaker of Russian, I myself provided the judgments for all the test sentences (this was systematically done before collecting the data from the other speakers).

[5] For the sake of simplicity I systematically use my own name to refer to the speaker of the actual context both when checking the sentences with the informants and when reporting the data.

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg, and I am talking about my friend Ivan.

(3) Kogda Ivan byl v Pariže on skazal čto mol kto-nibud' voz'mët menja
when Ivan was in Paris he said that mol someone take.FUT.1SG me.ACC
zdes' na rabotu.
here on work
'When Ivan was in Paris, he said that someone would hire him (= Ivan) / me (= Masha) there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb).' [Table 2.1]
'me' = Ivan, 'here' = Paris (mean: 6.25, LIR: 4, HIR: 7)
'me' = Masha, 'here' = Paris (mean: 5.75, LIR: 5, HIR: 6)
*'me' = Ivan, 'here' = SPb (mean: 1.75, LIR: 1, HIR: 3)
??'me' = Masha, 'here' = SPb (mean: 3.5, LIR: 2, HIR: 5)

2.3. Posing the questions

Using (2) and (3) as the departure point, I will try to address the following questions in the rest of the paper:

Q1. What is the nature of the indexical shift in the scope of mol, i.e. does mol function as a quotative particle or is it a 'monstrous' context shift operator?

Q2. Why is it possible to shift the locative indexical without shifting the first person pronoun (but not vice versa, i.e. why is it impossible to shift the first person pronoun without shifting the locative indexical)?

Q3. Why does the 'unshifted-unshifted' reading seem degraded?

3. Context shift vs. quotative analyses

3.1. Context shift analysis (to refute)

Let us first entertain the idea that mol is a 'monstrous' context shift operator.

3.1.1. Kaplanian monsters

A 'monster' in the Kaplanian sense (Kaplan 1977/1989) is an operator that shifts the reference of indexical elements. According to Kaplan, 'monsters' do not exist in natural language; he explicitly excludes direct discourse out of the picture, because in his view indexicals in direct discourse are not used referentially, but are only 'mentioned'. Thus, I in (4b) cannot refer to Otto:

(4)

[6] Initially, the idea of testing such examples arose in an attempt to find a syntactic explanation for the pronoun-locative asymmetry in shiftability. One could speculate, for example, that mol is a context shift operator, in the scope of which everything necessarily gets shifted, but mol can have two landing sites: higher than the Subject (then everything is shifted), or lower than the Subject (then the Subject escapes shifting). This would predict that the first person pronoun in the Object position shifts obligatorily. The judgments for (3) exclude this possibility.

a. Otto said “I am a fool.”
b. Otto said that I am a fool. (Kaplan, p. 511)

While this claim might be true for English, it has been empirically challenged with data from other languages, in particular, by Schlenker 1999, 2003 and Anand & Nevins 2004, Anand 2006. Thus, in Zazaki ‘I’ in (5a) is ambiguous between Hesen and the actual speaker:

(5) Hɛseni$_j$ (mi$_k$-ra) va kɛ ɛz$_{j/k}$ dɛletia
Hesen.OBL (I.OBL-to) said that I rich.be-PRES
‘Hesen said that {I am, Hesen is} rich.’ (Anand & Nevins, (4))

Thus, context shift is in principle possible; however, it can be dealt with differently.

3.1.2. Mix Perspectives vs. Shift Together

The above mentioned authors have proposed two different theoretical approaches to accounting for context shift. Schlenker has set forth an account dubbed ‘Mix Perspectives’, within which all attitude predicates are universally ‘monstrous’ operators that obligatorily shift the context, but which indexicals can be shifted depends on the lexical properties of the indexicals themselves; consequently, there can be both shifted and unshifted indexicals within one and the same clause. Anand & Nevins have advocated the ‘Shift Together’ theory, within which attitude predicates are operators that optionally shift (‘overwrite’) the context, but when they do, all the indexicals in a clause necessarily get shifted interpretation.

If we assume that mol is a context shift operator, it might seem, on the first glance, that the availability of the ‘unshifted-shifted’ reading in (2) and (3) should argue in favour of the ‘Mix Perspectives’ approach. However, the unacceptability of the ‘reverse’ mixed interpretation (in which the first person pronoun is shifted, but the locative indexical is not) will pose a problem under this analysis. Instead, one could assume the ‘Shift Together’ approach and find an alternative explanation as to why it is possible to shift the locative indexical without shifting the pronoun. The relevant alternative explanation is introduced in 3.2.2.; at this point let us first look at more data that would support the applicability of the ‘Shift Together’ constraint were the mol sentences analyzed as instances of context shift.

3.1.3. Two indexicals of the same type

In particular, let us see if multiple instances of the first person pronoun (namely, a personal pronoun and a possessive) in a mol clause have to be interpreted coreferentially or if there is a possibility for them to shift independently, resulting in mixed perspectives:

(6) Ivan skazal čto mol moj brat ljubit menja.
Ivan said that mol my brother loves me.ACC

‘Ivan said that his (= Ivan’s) / my (= Masha’s) brother loved him (= Ivan) / me (= Masha).’ [Table 3.2[7]]
‘me’ = Ivan’s, ‘my’ = Ivan’s (mean: 6.5, LIR: 6, HIR: 7)
*‘me’ = Masha’s, ‘my’ = Ivan’s (mean: 1.75, LIR: 1, HIR: 3)
*‘me’ = Ivan’s, ‘my’ = Masha’s (mean: 1.25, LIR: 1, HIR: 2)
‘me’ = Masha’s, ‘my’ = Masha’s (mean: 6.25, LIR: 5, HIR: 7)

Clearly, no mixed readings are available for (6), which, if the context shift analysis was to be applied, should be evidence that Russian obeys the ‘Shift Together’ constraint.

3.1.4. Refuting the context shift analysis: wh-extraction from clauses with mol

Let me now demonstrate that the context shift analysis of mol is problematic based on the results of the wh-extraction test. While the embedded material in indirect discourse is syntactically integrated into the sentence, i.e. the grammatical dependencies are preserved, and in particular it is possible to extract elements from the embedded material to form questions, the direct discourse is opaque to such operations. Consequently, wh-extraction from a quoted clause is normally impossible. Here is a relevant example with bona fide direct speech in Russian:

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg, Ivan is in Paris.
(7) *S kem Ivan skazal: «Ja budu zdes’ rabotat’ ___ »?
with who.INSTR Ivan said I will.1SG here work
‘With whom did Ivan say, ‘I will work here ___’?’ [Table 4.3[8]]

Sentence (7) is generally ungrammatical under any reading[9] (the mean values for all the readings vary from 1 to 1.25, LIR: 1, HIR: 2).

When it comes to wh-extraction, mol clauses under shifted interpretation pattern with direct discourse (although the judgments are less definitive):

(8) S kem Ivan skazal čto mol ja budu rabotat’ ___?
with who.INSTR Ivan said that mol I will.1SG work
‘With whom did Ivan say that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) would work ___?’ [Table 5.1]
??‘I’ = Ivan (mean: 3.25, LIR: 2, HIR: 4)
‘I’ = Masha (mean: 6.25, LIR: 5, HIR: 7)

[7] I only adduce here the example in which the personal pronoun is in the Object position. There is a general tendency for many Russian speakers to disprefer plain first and second person possessives when they are c-commanded by their antecedent and to use the reflexive possessive svoj (‘self’s’) instead (third person plain possessives are definitely unacceptable in such contexts). The data for a counterpart example with the personal pronoun in the Subject position can be found in Table 3.1 of Appendix 2.
[8] See Paradigm 4 in Appendix 2 for judgments on control examples with bona fide direct speech. The main generalizations are quite unsurprising: the indexicals in the quoted material are all shifted.
[9] Unless you aim for the high reading, of course, which is semantically weird in this case.

3.2. Quotative analysis

3.2.1. Positing quotative analysis

So, there is a good reason to believe that the material in the scope of mol is, in fact, quoted. However, at this point the quotative analysis might still seem problematic for two major reasons:

(i.) it is commonly assumed that ordinary quotations in Russian, much like in English, cannot be embedded under a complementizer, i.e. co-occurrence of shifted interpretations in mol clauses with the overt complementizer *čto* should be impossible; however, it is clearly possible in (2) and (3);

(ii.) we still have to explain the pronoun-locative asymmetry in (2) and (3); if the material in the scope of mol is quoted, no mixing of perspectives should be allowed.

I suggest the following solutions for these problems:

(i.) in fact, embedding quotations under a complementizer in Russian is marginally possible; mol facilitates this process by forcing quotative interpretation of the embedded material;

(ii.) there is no true perspectival shift in the 'unshifted-shifted' interpretations of (2) and (3), i.e. these are neither instances of quotation, nor of context shift; instead, the locative indexical 'here' picks up a salient location as its referent in a process that has no relation to the mol particle.

The data that support the second suggestion also provide some minor evidence for the first one.

3.2.2. Explaining the pronoun-locative asymmetry

I argue that the apparent 'shift' that occurs in the 'unshifted-shifted' reading of (2) and (3), i.e. the reading in which the first person pronoun remains unshifted (= Masha), but the location shifts (= Paris), is not a perspectival shift per se. The 'shift' that occurs in these cases is not a shift towards the reported perspective (Ivan's perspective), but a 'shift' towards a salient location different from the actual one.

This can be conceptualized differently. One could speculate that in sentences like (2) or (3), I, the speaker of the actual context, remain within my perspective, but I alter my perspective as if by shifting my own location to a different one.

Alternatively, one could posit a more flexible semantics for locative indexicals like 'here'. 'Here', in essence, is traditionally understood as the location in which the speaker of the actual context is located at the moment of speech, however, it can and does have other uses. The most robust example of such would probably be simply pointing to a place on a map and uttering something like, 'I will work here'. Another rather obvious example would be uttering the same sentence while, for example, watching a film and seeing an episode featuring the relevant location. In neither cases 'here' refers to the actual location of the actual speaker, but rather it is understood as the most salient location within the actual

context[10]. In (2) and (3) Paris is the location made salient by the context. In a way, while in the map and film examples 'here' is used demonstratively, in the Paris examples it is used more or less anaphorically, i.e. it picks up the most salient antecedent from the previous discourse. When the context is neutral, i.e. when it contains no salient locations, the most salient location is the actual location of the actual speaker at the moment of speech.

First person pronouns are, thus, inherently different from locative indexicals. The indexicality in the first person pronoun is the 'strongest', because it relates to identity. Accordingly, one cannot simply point to a different person and use the pronoun 'I' in order to refer to them (for instance, it is impossible to introduce John by pointing to him and uttering, 'I am John'), which is so obviously different from the map example. It is also very plausible that temporal indexicals can behave similarly to the locative ones, but this needs be checked.

3.2.3. Wh-extraction from clauses with shifted 'here'

Interestingly, wh-extraction is (marginally) possible from mol clauses under the shifted reading of 'here':

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg, Ivan is in Paris.

(9) S kem Ivan skazal čto mol ja budu zdes' rabotat' ___?
with who.INSTR Ivan said that mol I will.1SG here work
'With whom did Ivan say that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) would work there (= in Paris) / here (in SPb) ___?' [Table 5.2]
*'I' = Ivan, 'here' = Paris (mean: 2, LIR: 1, HIR: 3)
?'I' = Masha, 'here' = Paris (mean: 4.75, LIR: 4, HIR: 6)
*'I' = Ivan, 'here' = SPb (mean: 1.5, LIR: 1, HIR: 2)
'I' = Masha, 'here' = SPb (mean: 5.25, LIR: 5, HIR: 6)

Clearly, the 'unshifted-shifted' reading, although somewhat degraded, is much better than the 'shifted-shifted' one, which at the very least implies two different mechanisms for the shift in the 'shifted-shifted' reading and the 'shift' of the locative indexical only. Moreover, I think that the 'unshifted-shifted' reading in (9) is rated lower than in (2) or (3) mostly because Paris is much less salient in this context.

3.2.4. Shifted 'here' in indirect discourse

Crucially, the mol particle is absolutely irrelevant here, since a similar shift can and does occur without mol in ordinary indirect discourse[11, 12]:

(10) Context: I am in Saint Petersburg, and I am talking about my friend Ivan.

[10] Surely, the notion of salience might vary significantly across speakers.
[11] If anything, the judgments become sharper; I have something to say about it in 3.2.6.
[12] Interestingly, Speaker #2 provided an explicit comment for (10) supporting my analysis, saying that '…it is just that 'here' in a sentence in which a location is mentioned is not perceived as referring to another location'. This comment is also relevant to the issues discussed in 3.2.6.

a. Kogda Ivan byl v Pariže on skazal čto ja budu zdes' rabotat'.
when Ivan was in Paris he said that I will.1SG here work
'When Ivan was in Paris, he said that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) would work there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb).' [Table 6.1]
??'I' = Ivan, 'here' = Paris (mean: 3, LIR: 1, HIR: 5)
'I' = Masha, 'here' = Paris (mean: 6.75, LIR: 6, HIR: 7)
*'I' = Ivan, 'here' = SPb (mean: 1.25, LIR: 1, HIR: 2)
??'I' = Masha, 'here' = SPb (mean: 3.25, LIR: 2, HIR: 4)

b. Kogda Ivan byl v Pariže on skazal čto kto-nibud' voz'mët menja zdes' na rabotu.
when Ivan was in Paris he said that someone take.FUT.1SG me here on work
'When Ivan was in Paris, he said that someone would hire him (= Ivan) / me (= Masha) there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb).' [Table 6.2]
??'I' = Ivan, 'here' = Paris (mean: 2.75, LIR: 2, HIR: 4)
'I' = Masha, 'here' = Paris (mean: 6.75, LIR: 6, HIR: 7)
*'I' = Ivan, 'here' = SPb (mean: 1, LIR: 1, HIR: 1)
??'I' = Masha, 'here' = SPb (mean: 3, LIR: 1, HIR: 5)

Another important thing to note from the judgments for (10) is that while the 'shifted-shifted' reading is significantly degraded, it is not completely undoable at least for some of the speakers[13]. I conclude from this that embedding quotations under a complementizer is, in principle, possible, and it is greatly facilitated by the mol particle, which forces quotative readings.

3.2.5. Explaining the degradedness of the 'shifted-unshifted' reading under the quotative analysis

So, in our mol sentences a shifted first person pronoun can only indicate that we are dealing with quotation, and since it is quotation, it is impossible to 'mess' with locative

[13] This is intuitively true based on what happens in the actual speech production. According to my observations, embedding quotations under an overt complementizer in Russian is relatively common in colloquial speech. While this might be analyzed as a regular production error (for instance, one might speculate that speakers often start sentences as indirect discourse and 'change their mind' in the process), this phenomenon seems to be rather systematic to simply be waived as negligible. I will adduce here a curious example from a recent interview of a Russian public figure Mikhail Khodorkovsky (who seems to be producing such sentences on a regular basis):

Context: Answering the question why Vladimir Putin decided to pardon him.
(11) Èto, konečno, signal obŝestvu i, glavnoe, miru, čto ja zdes' čuvstvuju sebja dostatočno ustojčivo.
this surely signal society.DAT and mainly world.DAT that I here feel.PRES.1SG self.ACC enough stably
'This is, surely, a signal to the society and, above all, to the world that he [= Putin] is feeling quite stable here [≈ in power].' ('The New Times', 43-44 (310); cited from the video: http://youtu.be/zG64C79IWKk?t=3m33s)

Interestingly enough, in the text version of the interview (http://newtimes.ru/articles/detail/76393) the editors inserted the particle mol into the embedded clause, as if in an attempt to 'amend' the original sentence.

indexicals unless they were ‘messed’ with by the speaker of the reported context; hence the absolute degradedness of the ‘shifted-unshifted’ reading. In other words, one can interpret ‘here’ in (2) or (3) as referring to Saint Petersburg while ‘I’ refers to Ivan only if Ivan uttered a sentence ‘I will work here’ in which ‘here’ just happened to refer to Saint Petersburg, and there is no information in the contexts for (2) and (3) that would allow such a generous assumption. If the material in the scope of mol under a shifted pronoun reading was not a quotation then ‘here’ should also be possible to pick up salient antecedents from the actual context.

3.2.6. Degradedness of the ‘unshifted-unshifted’ reading

The final question to address is why the ‘unshifted-unshifted’ reading in sentences like (2) and (3) seems to be degraded. I think at least two factors might be relevant here:

(i.) the ‘anaphoric’ use of ‘here’ is preferred in the presence of a salient location in the context (this factor is mol-irrelevant and also applies in (10));

(ii.) the use of ‘mol’ has to be justified in some way.

The first idea seems to be corroborated by the lack of degradedness in (6) and (8), in which there is no locative indexical[14]. Also, as I have already pointed out in 3.2.3., the ‘unshifted-shifted’ reading is somewhat degraded in (9), presumably, due to the much lower salience of Paris in the context, which, unsurprisingly, also boosts the rating for the ‘unshifted-unshifted’ reading.

I have additionally tried making Paris slightly less salient by altering the context in (3), namely by removing Paris from the target sentence itself:

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg. I say something like this:
— Ivan is currently in Paris. Yesterday we talked on the phone about who would work where.

(12) Ivan skazal čto mol kto-nibud’ voz’mët menja zdes’ na rabotu.
Ivan said that mol someone take.FUT.1SG me.ACC here on work
‘Ivan said that someone would hire him (= Ivan) / me (= Masha) there (in Paris) / here (in SPb).’ [Table 2.2]
‘me’ = Ivan, ‘here’ = Paris (mean: 6.5, LIR: 6, HIR: 7)
?‘me’ = Masha, ‘here’ = Paris (mean: 4.5, LIR: 3, HIR: 6)
*‘me’ = Ivan, ‘here’ = SPb (mean: 2.5, LIR: 2, HIR: 3)
?‘me’ = Masha, ‘here’ = SPb (mean: 4.75, LIR: 2, HIR: 6)

[14] Note that the high rating of the unshifted reading in (8), and to a lesser extent in (6), can additionally be due to the contrastive nature of the judgments. While the aim of the tests was to assess grammaticality, it is virtually impossible for the speakers not to contrast the interpretations against each other and rate them accordingly. Consequently, the grammaticality judgments turn out to be more of interpretation rating judgments. Therefore, when there are fewer possible readings (like in (8)), and/or fewer factors potentially affecting the judgments (like in (6)), the judgments turn out to be more contrastive.

There is indeed a slight effect: the ratings for the ‘unshifted-unshifted’ reading increase while the ratings for the ‘unshifted-shifted’ reading drop accordingly. However, it is important to reiterate that the individual judgments vary significantly across the speakers.

The above described factor accounts for the difference in the ‘unshifted-shifted’ and ‘unshifted-unshifted’ readings both for mol and non-mol examples. However, the ratings for the non-quotative readings in the scope of mol are still not very high. In particular, the ratings for the ‘unshifted-shifted’ reading in (10) (without mol) are higher than in (2) and (3) (with mol). This might be due to some sort of an economy principle that tells us not to use mol unless it is for a reason. One could speculate that mol can be simply used to indicate that someone else’s words or thoughts are being conveyed; however, in the presence of an explicit speech verb using mol simply to express this idea might seem redundant.

Therefore, the quotative reading of the material in the scope of mol might be preferred. The question is whether there are ways to satisfy this hypothesized economy principle other than interpreting the whole clause as a quotation. Is it possible, for instance, that it will suffice to have just one quoted element, e.g. a stylistically marked one (an epithet or alike)? The following examples contain stylistically marked elements in various syntactic positions:

(13) Context: I am in Saint Petersburg. I say something like this:
— Ivan is currently in Paris. Yesterday we talked on the phone about who would work where.

a. Ivan skazal čto mol svoloči rabotodateli ne voz’mut menja zdes’
Ivan said that mol bastards employers NEG take.FUT.3PL me.ACC here
na rabotu bez diploma.
on work without certificate
‘Ivan said that the bastard employers wouldn’t hire him (= Ivan) / me (= Masha) there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb) without a certificate (of a degree).’ [Table 7.1]

b. Ivan skazal čto mol ja budu zdes’ vkalyvat’ kak lošad’.
Ivan said that mol I will.1SG here work-hard.derog like horse
‘Ivan said that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) would work there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb) like a mule.’ [Table 7.2]

c. Ivan skazal čto mol ja najdu sebe zdes’ kakuju-nibud’
Ivan said that mol I find.FUT.1SG oneself.DAT here some.ACC
rabotënku.
job-derogatory.ACC
‘Ivan said that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) would find some petty job there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb).’ [Table 7.3]
‘me/I’ = Ivan, ‘here’ = Paris (mean: 5.75—6, LIR: 4, HIR: 7)
‘me/I’ = Masha, ‘here’ = Paris (mean: 5.25—5.5, LIR: 4, HIR: 7)
??‘me/I’ = Ivan, ‘here’ = SPb (mean: 3—3.75, LIR: 2, HIR: 6)
‘me/I’ = Masha, ‘here’ = SPb (mean: 5.5—6, LIR: 5, HIR: 7)

In this test it is crucial that the marked element is indeed interpreted as quoted. I explicitly asked the speakers whether it was clear what words Ivan had used, in particular,

whether the marked element was Ivan's. Most speakers suggested that, indeed, the marked element had been most likely used by Ivan[15].

As for the judgments, there is indeed a boost in the ratings for 'unshifted-unshifted' readings. While the context for (13) is altered just like in (12), the increase in (13) is slightly higher than in (12). Thus, the overall increase could be attributed to a cumulative effect of the lower salience of Paris and the presence of a quoted element. However, in (13) there is also an unexpected increase in the ratings for the normally very degraded 'shifted-unshifted' reading. I think that this increase could be due to the fact that, while I explicitly encouraged the speakers to ignore whatever extralinguistic knowledge they might have had about Paris and Saint Petersburg in terms of employment, it is not clear whether they always did so. It is very possible that Saint Petersburg was simply perceived by some speakers[16] as more likely than Paris to be the location to which negative job-related contexts can apply, to the extent that this bias could have forced the interpretation under which Ivan used 'here' to refer to Saint Petersburg in his speech act (see 3.2.5.).

Therefore, the data on whether mol can successfully introduce a single quoted element instead of a whole clause are very inconclusive. Although I have a strong intuition that this should be possible, new contexts, more impervious to extralinguistic knowledge, should be constructed to check this supposition.

4. Open problem: uninterpretable plural features on pronouns in the scope of mol

The quotative analysis seems to have worked rather well for the mol particle so far. However, there is a potential problem for it that is yet to be accounted for. In indirect discourse it is possible to have uninterpretable plural features on pronouns while direct discourse trivially does not allow this. However, it seems that it is not entirely impossible to have uninterpretable plural features on indexical pronouns under shifted interpretation in the scope of mol.

Consider the following paradigm, for which there are two different subcontexts depending on the interpretation. The speakers were asked to assess the acceptability of each sentence from the paradigm for reporting the speech act from each of the subcontexts.

(14) Context 1: Before an individual competition, we asked each athlete who would win. Each of them said, 'I will win.'
Context 2: Before a team competition, we asked one representative of each team who would win. Each of them said, 'We will win' (i.e. 'our team').

[15] However, Speaker #2 suggested that for the readings in which the first person pronoun referred to the actual speaker (Masha), i.e. exactly the readings that are targeted in this paradigm, it was more likely that the marked element could have been introduced by the actual speaker (Masha). This observation probably trivially follows from the extralinguistic fact that one is probably more likely to use negatively or positively marked elements in a context concerning themselves. What it means for the current analysis is that if Speaker's #2 judgments for the readings in which the first person pronoun refers to the actual speaker were indeed made with the provision that the marked element was not quoted (which is unclear, since she never claimed that the marked elements could not have been used by Ivan), then her judgments for this paradigm should not be taken into account.

[16] Namely, by Speaker #1 and Speaker #3, as can be seen from the data tables 7.1—3 in Appendix 2.

For standard indirect discourse it is predicted that the third person plural pronoun should be compatible with both contexts, and the first person plural pronoun should be compatible with none:

(14)

a. Oni vse skazali čto oni vyigrajut.
they all said that they win.FUT.3PL
Context 1 (mean: 6.25, LIR: 4, HIR: 7)
Context 2 (mean: 6.75, LIR: 6, HIR: 7)
'They all said that they would win.' [Table 8.1]

b. Oni vse skazali čto my vyigraem.
they all said that we win.FUT.1PL
*Context 1 (mean: 1.5, LIR: 1, HIR: 2)
?Context 2 (mean: 4, LIR: 3, HIR: 5)
'They all said that they would win.' [Table 8.2]

The judgments correspond to the predictions, except that a shifted reading is marginally possible in (14b), which agrees with what has been previously said about marginal embeddability of quotations in Russian (see 3.2.1., 3.2.4.).

For standard direct discourse it is predicted that the first person plural pronoun should be only compatible with the second context, which is indeed so:

(14)

c. Oni vse skazali: «My vyigraem».
they all said we win.FUT.1PL
'They all said, 'We will win.'' [Table 8.3]
*Context 1 (mean: 1, LIR: 1, HIR: 1)
Context 2 (mean: 7, LIR: 7, HIR: 7)

For mol sentences it is predicted that the third person plural pronoun (non-quotative case) should be compatible with both contexts[17], the first person singular pronoun (quotative case) should only be compatible with the first context, and the first person plural pronoun (quotative case) should only be compatible with the second context:

d. Oni vse skazali čto oni mol vyigrajut.
they all said that they mol win.FUT.3PL
'They all said that they would win.' [Table 8.4]
Context 1 (mean: 6, LIR: 5, HIR: 7)
Context 2 (mean: 7, LIR: 7, HIR: 7)

e. Oni vse skazali čto ja mol vyigraju.
they all said that I mol win.FUT.1SG

[17] To be more precise, a slight degradedness should be predicted for both contexts, if we assume that using mol has to be justified somehow. However, this degradedness might not arise, since the lack of contrastive alternative (quotative) readings for this sentence might encourage higher ratings.

‘They all said that they would win.’ [Table 8.5]
Context 1 (mean: 6.25, LIR: 5, HIR: 7)
*Context 2 (mean: 1.25, LIR: 1, HIR: 2)

f. Oni vse skazali čto my mol vyigraem.
they all said that we mol win.FUT.1PL
‘They all said that they would win.’ [Table 8.6]
?Context 1 (mean: 4.25, LIR: 4, HIR: 5)
Context 2 (mean: 6.75, LIR: 6, HIR: 7)

Contrary to the predictions, having uninterpretable plural features on the indexical pronoun in (14f) might not be perfect, but it is not completely impossible, and, crucially, there is a palpable contrast with bona fide direct discourse. This puzzling piece of data has to be studied further and accounted for; for now I leave it as an open problem.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, let me revisit the questions posed in 2.3. and summarize the answers I have proposed.

Q1. What is the nature of the indexical shift in the scope of mol, i.e. does mol function as a quotative particle or is it a ‘monstrous’ context shift operator?

A1. Mol is a quotative particle and not a context shift operator; this is primarily evidenced by the impossibility of wh-extraction from mol clauses under ‘shifted-shifted’ readings.

Q2. Why is it possible to shift the locative indexical without shifting the first person pronoun (but not vice versa, i.e. why is it impossible to shift the first person pronoun without shifting the locative indexical)?

A2. This asymmetry is unrelated to the mol particle, but stems from the different ‘degree’ of indexicality in the first person pronoun and locative indexicals; in particular, the Russian locative indexical ‘here’ presumably has a more flexible semantics that allows for demonstrative and anaphoric(-like) uses. A shifted first person pronoun in mol sentences indicates that the material in the scope of mol is quoted and, therefore, in this case the locative indexical can only refer to the actual location of the actual speaker by coincidence.

Q3. Why does the ‘unshifted-unshifted’ reading seem degraded?

A3. (i.) When there is a super-salient location in the discourse other than the actual location of the actual speaker, ‘here’ is preferably interpreted as referring to this salient location.
(ii.) At least when used in the presence of an explicit speech verb, mol forces a quotative reading, thus, non-quotative readings are (slightly) dispreferred; however, it is unclear whether it is obligatory to interpret the entire clause as quoted, or a single quoted element (e.g. an epithet) can suffice.
The cumulative effect of the two factors lowers the availability of the ‘unshifted-unshifted’ reading.

Additionally, there is an open problem of marginal acceptability of uninterpretable plural features on indexical pronouns under shifted interpretation in the scope of mol.

References

Anand P. 2006. De de se. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Anand P., Nevins A. 2004. Shifty Operators in Changing Contexts. In: Young, R. (ed.), Proceedings of SALT 14. Ithaca NY: CLC Publications, pp. 20—37.

Grigorenko M.Y. 2009. Jazykovoj, kommunikativnyj i pragmatičeskij status èvidencial'no-predpoložitel'nyx častic mol, *deskat'*, jakoby, de [The language, communicative and pragmatic status of evidential-hypothetical particles mol, *deskat'*, jakoby, de]. In: MOVA: Naukovo-teoritičnij časopis z movoznavstva [Scientific-theoretical journal of linguistics], 14. Odessa, Ukraine, pp. 52—56.

Kaplan D. 1977/1989. Demonstratives. In: Almog, J., Perry, J., Wettstein, H. (eds.), Themes from Kaplan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 481—563.

Perfilyeva N.P., Halzova Y.B. 1991. Semantika vyskazyvanij s časticami mol, de, *deskat'* [Semantics of utterances with particles mol, de, *deskat'*]. In: Semantičeskie i pragmatičeskie aspekty vyskazyvanij [Semantic and pragmatic aspects of utterances]. Novosibirsk, pp. 86—95.

Schlenker P. 1999. Propositional Attitudes and Indexicality: A Cross-Categorial Approach. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Schlenker P. 2003. A Plea for Monsters. In: Linguistics & Philosophy, 26, pp. 29—120.

Appendix 1: sociolinguistic information about the speakers

All the informants are native speakers of Russian. Speaker #1 and Speaker #3 have had virtually no exposure to theoretical linguistics; Speaker #2 has had some introductory exposure to formal linguistic frameworks and cognitive psychology.

Speaker	**Age**	**Gender**	**Education**	**City/cities of residence**
Sp#0 (me)	24	female	BA (equivalent)	Kursk, Moscow
Sp#1	24	female	BA (equivalent)	Yoshkar-Ola, Moscow
Sp#2	23	female	BA (equivalent)	Ufa, Moscow, Saint Petersburg
Sp#3	25	male	BA (equivalent)	Samara, Moscow

Appendix 2: data tables

Paradigm 1

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg, and I am talking about my friend Ivan.

1.1. Kogda Ivan byl v Pariže on skazal čto ja mol budu zdes' rabotat'.
when Ivan was in Paris he said that I mol will.1SG here work

Table 1.1	ja-sh/zd*es'*-sh	ja-un/zd*es'*-sh	ja-sh/zd*es'*-un	ja-un/zd*es'*-un
Sp#0	7	6	2	4
Sp#1	6	7	3	5
Sp#2	7	4	2	3
Sp#3	4	7	1	2
Mean	**6**	**6**	**2**	**3.5**

1.2. Kogda Ivan byl v Pariže on skazal čto mol zdes' ja budu rabotat'.

when Ivan was in Paris he said that mol here I will.1SG work

Table 1.2 // (2)	ja-*sh/zdes'*-sh	ja-*un/zdes'*-sh	ja-sh/zd*es'*-un	ja-un/zd*es'*-un
Sp#0	7	5	1	3
Sp#1	7	5	2	1
Sp#2	7	5	1	1
Sp#3	5	5	1	2
Mean	**6.5**	**5**	**1.25**	**1.75**

1.3. Kogda Ivan byl v Pariže on skazal čto zdes' mol ja budu rabotat'.
when Ivan was in Paris he said that here mol I will.1SG work

Table 1.3	ja-*sh/zdes'*-sh	ja-*un/zdes'*-sh	ja-*sh/zdes'*-un	ja-*un/zdes'*-un
Sp#0	7	5	2	4
Sp#1	7	6	2	2
Sp#2	7	6	1	2
Sp#3	6	4	1	2
Mean	**6.75**	**5.25**	**1.5**	**2.5**

'When Ivan was in Paris, he said that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) would work there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb).'

Paradigm 2

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg, and I am talking about my friend Ivan.

2.1. Kogda Ivan byl v Pariže on skazal čto mol kto-nibud' voz'mët menja
when Ivan was in Paris he said that mol someone take.FUT.1SG me.ACC
zdes' na rabotu.
here on work
'When Ivan was in Paris, he said that someone would hire him (= Ivan) / me (= Masha) there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb).'

Table 2.1 // (3)	menja-*sh/zdes'*-sh	menja-*un/zdes'*-sh	menja-*sh/zdes'*-un	menja-*un/zdes'*-un
Sp#0	7	6	2	5
Sp#1	7	5	1	2
Sp#2	7	6	3	2
Sp#3	4	6	1	5
Mean	**6.25**	**5.75**	**1.75**	**3.5**

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg. I say something like this:
— Ivan is currently in Paris. Yesterday we talked on the phone about who would work where.

2.2. Ivan skazal čto mol kto-nibud' voz'mët menja zdes' na rabotu.
Ivan said that mol someone take.FUT.1SG me.ACC here on work
'Ivan said that someone would hire him (= Ivan) / me (= Masha) there (in Paris) / here (in SPb).'

Table 2.2 // (12)	menja-*sh/zdes'*-sh	menja-*un/zdes'*-sh	menja-*sh/zdes'*-un	menja-*un/zdes'*-un
Sp#0	7	5	2	6
Sp#1	6	4	2	6
Sp#2	6	6	3	2
Sp#3	7	3	3	5
Mean	**6.5**	**4.5**	**2.5**	**4.75**

Paradigm 3

3.1. Ivan skazal čto mol ja ljublju moego brata.
Ivan said that mol I love my.ACC brother.ACC
'Ivan said that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) loved his (= Ivan's) / my (= Masha's) brother.'

Table 3.1	ja-sh/moego-sh	ja-un/moego-sh	ja-sh/moego-un	ja-un/moego-un
Sp#0	6	1	1	4
Sp#1	6	1	1	7
Sp#2	3	1	1	5
Sp#3	6	1	1	6
Mean	**5.25**	**1**	**1**	**5.5**

3.2. Ivan skazal čto mol moj brat ljubit menja.
Ivan said that mol my brother loves me.ACC
'Ivan said that his (= Ivan's) / my (= Masha's) brother loved him (= Ivan) / me (= Masha).'

Table 3.2 // (6)	menja-sh/moj-sh	menja-un/moj-sh	menja-sh/moj-un	menja-un/moj-un
Sp#0	7	1	1	6
Sp#1	6	1	1	7
Sp#2	6	3	1	5
Sp#3	7	2	2	7
Mean	**6.5**	**1.75**	**1.25**	**6.25**

Paradigm 4

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg, and I am talking about my friend Ivan.

4.1. Kogda Ivan byl v Pariže, on skazal: «Ja budu zdes' rabotat'».
when Ivan was in Paris he said I wil.1SG here work
'When Ivan was in Paris, he said, 'I will work here.''

Table 4.1	ja-*sh/zdes'*-sh	ja-*un/zdes'*-sh	ja-*sh/zdes'*-un	ja-*un/zdes'*-un
Sp#0	7	1	1	1
Sp#1	7	1	1	1
Sp#2	7	1	1	1
Sp#3	7	1	1	1
Mean	**7**	**1**	**1**	**1**

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg. I say something like this:
Ivan is currently in Paris. Yesterday we talked on the phone about who would work where.

4.2. Ivan skazal: «Kto-nibud' voz'mët menja zdes' na rabotu».
Ivan said someone take.FUT.1SG me.ACC here on work
'Ivan said, 'Someone will hire me here.''

Table 4.2	menja-*sh/zdes'*-sh	menja-*un/zdes'*-sh	menja-*sh/zdes'*-un	menja-*un/zdes'*-un
Sp#0	7	1	1	1
Sp#1	7	1	1	1
Sp#2	7	1	1	1
Sp#3	7	1	1	1

Mean	**7**	**1**	**1**	**1**

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg, Ivan is in Paris.

4.3. S kem Ivan skazal: «Ja budu zdes' rabotat' ___»?
with who.INSTR Ivan said I will.1SG here work
'With whom did Ivan say, 'I will work here ___'.'

Table 4.3 // (7)	ja-*sh/zdes'*-sh	ja-*un/zdes'*-sh	ja-*sh/zdes'*-un	ja-*un/zdes'*-un
Sp#0	1	1	1	1
Sp#1	1	1	1	1
Sp#2	2	1	1	1
Sp#3	1	1	1	1
Mean	**1.25**	**1**	**1**	**1**

Paradigm 5

5.1. S kem Ivan skazal čto mol ja budu rabotat' ___?
with who.INSTR Ivan said that mol I will.1SG work
'With whom did Ivan say that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) would work ___?'

Table 5.1 // (8)	ja-shifted	ja-unshifted
Sp#0	3	6
Sp#1	4	7
Sp#2	4	5
Sp#3	2	7
Mean	**3.25**	**6.25**

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg, Ivan is in Paris.

5.2. S kem Ivan skazal čto mol ja budu zdes' rabotat' ___?
with who.INSTR Ivan said that mol I will.1SG here work
'With whom did Ivan say that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) would work there (= in Paris) / here (in SPb) ___?'

Table 5.2 // (9)	ja-*sh/zdes'*-sh	ja-*un/zdes'*-sh	ja-*sh/zdes'*-un	ja-un*/zdes'*-un
Sp#0	2	5	1	6
Sp#1	1	6	1	5
Sp#2	3	4	2	5
Sp#3	2	4	2	5
Mean	**2**	**4.75**	**1.5**	**5.25**

Paradigm 6

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg, and I am talking about my friend Ivan.

6.1. Kogda Ivan byl v Pariže on skazal čto ja budu zdes' rabotat'.
when Ivan was in Paris he said that I will.1SG here work
'When Ivan was in Paris, he said that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) would work there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb).'

Table 6.1 // (10a)	ja-sh/*zdes'*-sh	ja-*un/zdes'*-sh	ja-*sh/zdes'*-un	ja-*un/zdes'*-un
Sp#0	3	7	1	4
Sp#1	1	7	1	2
Sp#2	5	7	2	3
Sp#3	3	6	1	4

Mean	**3**	**6.75**	**1.25**	**3.25**

6.2. Kogda Ivan byl v Pariže on skazal čto kto-nibud' voz'mët menja zdes' na rabotu.
when Ivan was in Paris he said that someone take.FUT.1SG me here on work
'When Ivan was in Paris, he said that someone would hire him (= Ivan) / me (= Masha) there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb).'

Table 6.2 // (10b)	menja-*sh/zdes'*-sh	menja-*un/zdes'*-sh	menja-sh/zdes'-un	menja-*un/zdes'*-un
Sp#0	2	7	1	4
Sp#1	2	7	1	1
Sp#2	4	7	1	2
Sp#3	3	6	1	5
Mean	**2.75**	**6.75**	**1**	**3**

Paradigm 7

Context: I am in Saint Petersburg. I say something like this:
— Ivan is currently in Paris. Yesterday we talked on the phone about who would work where.

7.1. Ivan skazal čto mol svoloči rabotodateli ne voz'mut menja zdes' na rabotu bez diploma.
Ivan said that mol bastards employers NEG take.FUT.3PL me.ACC here on work without certificate
'Ivan said that the bastard employers wouldn't hire him (= Ivan) / me (= Masha) there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb) without a certificate (of a degree).'

Table 7.1 // (13a)	menja-*sh/zdes'*-sh	menja-*un/zdes'*-sh	menja-*sh/zdes'*-un	menja-*un/zdes'*-un
Sp#0	7	5	2	6
Sp#1	7	6	5	7
Sp#2	5	6	3	5
Sp#3	4	5	5	6
Mean	**5.75**	**5.5**	**3.75**	**6**

7.2. Ivan skazal čto mol ja budu zdes' vkalyvat' kak lošad'.
Ivan said that mol I will.1SG here work-hard.derog like horse
'Ivan said that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) would work there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb) like a mule.'

Table 7.2 // (13b)	ja-sh/zdes'-sh	ja-un/zdes'-sh	ja-sh/zdes'-un	ja-un/zdes'-un
Sp#0	7	6	3	5
Sp#1	7	4	2	6
Sp#2	6	7	2	5
Sp#3	4	4	5	6
Mean	**6**	**5.25**	**3**	**5.5**

7.3. Ivan skazal čto mol ja najdu sebe zdes' kakuju-nibud' rabotënku.
Ivan said that mol I find.FUT.1SG oneself.DAT here some.ACC job-derogatory.ACC

‘Ivan said that he (= Ivan) / I (= Masha) would find some petty job there (= in Paris) / here (= in SPb).’

Table 7.3 // (13c)	ja-sh/zdes’-sh	ja-un/zdes’-sh	ja-sh/zdes’-un	ja-un/zdes’-un
Sp#0	7	5	2	5
Sp#1	7	4	4	5
Sp#2	5	6	3	5
Sp#3	4	6	6	7
Mean	**5.75**	**5.25**	**3.75**	**5.5**

Paradigm 8

Context 1: Before an individual competition, we asked each athlete who would win. Each of them said, ‘I will win.’

Context 2: Before a team competition, we asked one representative of each team who would win. Each of them said, ‘We will win’ (i.e. ‘our team’).

8.1. Oni vse skazali čto oni vyigrajut.
they all said that they win.FUT.3PL
‘They all said that they would win.’

Table 8.1 // (14a)	context 1	context 2
Sp#0	7	7
Sp#1	7	7
Sp#2	4	6
Sp#3	7	7
Mean	**6.25**	**6.75**

8.2. Oni vse skazali čto my vyigraem.
they all said that we win.FUT.1PL
‘They all said that they would win.’

Table 8.2 // (14b)	context 1	context 2
Sp#0	1	3
Sp#1	1	3
Sp#2	2	5
Sp#3	2	5
Mean	**1.5**	**4**

8.3. Oni vse skazali: «My vyigraem».
they all said we win.FUT.1PL
‘They all said, ‘We will win.’’

Table 8.3 // (14c)	context 1	context 2
Sp#0	1	7
Sp#1	1	7
Sp#2	1	7
Sp#3	1	7
Mean	**1**	**7**

8.4. Oni vse skazali čto oni mol vyigrajut.
they all said that they mol win.FUT.3PL
‘They all said that they would win.’

Table 8.4 // (14d)	context 1	context 2
Sp#0	5	7

Sp#1	7	7
Sp#2	5	7
Sp#3	7	7
Mean	**6**	**7**

8.5. Oni vse skazali čto ja mol vyigraju.
they all said that I mol win.FUT.1SG
'They all said that they would win.'

Table 8.5 // (14e)	context 1	context 2
Sp#0	6	1
Sp#1	7	1
Sp#2	5	2
Sp#3	7	1
Mean	**6.25**	**1.25**

8.6. Oni vse skazali čto my mol vyigraem.
they all said that we mol win.FUT.1PL
'They all said that they would win.'

Table 8.6 // (14f)	context 1	context 2
Sp#0	5	7
Sp#1	4	6
Sp#2	4	7
Sp#3	4	7
Mean	**4.25**	**6.75**