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I. What does it mean for an indexical to be shifted?

II. The data
   1. 1SG pronominals
   2. Contra “pseudo-shifting”
   3. 2SG pronominals and the explicit addressee constraint

III. Multiple indexical interaction
   1. Shift-Together
   2. Asymmetry in available readings

Goals:
- confirming Sener and Sener 2011,
- introducing novel data,
- calling for a revision of current theories about indexicals.
What’s an indexical?

- A referential expression:
  
  pronominal: \textit{I, you}
  
  temporal: \textit{now, today, tomorrow}
  
  locative: \textit{here}

- A context is a tuple containing the author, the place and the time of enunciation

- The standard theory (Kaplan 1977/1989) of indexicals claims that their reference is always computed according to the context of utterance:

  e.g. : My advisor said that \textit{I} was to come \textit{here today}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embedded context</th>
<th>Context of utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who?</td>
<td>My advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where?</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When?</td>
<td>Oct. 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s a *shifted* indexical?

The standard theory restricts indexical reference to the actual context. But data from several languages conflicts with this claim.

**Amharic** (Schlenker 1999)

John Jägna näNN yt-lall
John hero 1-am says-3 sg.m
*John* says that *he* is a hero

**Zazaki** (Anand 2006)

Hesen-i va kε εz meSte Rojda vinεna
Hesen.OBL said that I tomorrow Rojda see-PROG
*Hasan* said that *he* would see *Rojda* the next day

In these languages (and others) indexicals refer to the embedded context.

They shift
The data

Sener and Sener 2011

Embedded clauses under THINK

(1) Seda [pro sınıf-ta kal-dı-m] san-iyor.
Seda        class-LOC flunk-PST-1SG believe-PRS
Seda_i believes that she/I flunked.

> Null 1st person pronominals shift, their overt counterparts do not.

Our data

Embedded clauses under SAY

(2a) İnan [ben-i Viyana’ya ata- di-lar] de-di
İnan 1SG-ACC Vienna-DAT appoint-PST-3PL say-PST[3SG]
İnanı said that they appointed him/me to Vienna.

> Null pronominals shift, as well as their overt counterparts (?)

Finite embedded clauses with no complementizer: A problem?
Could it be quotation?

> No. Wh-extraction and NPI tests suggest genuine indirect speech environment.

**Wh- extraction**

(2b) İnan [**ben-i** nere-ye ata- dî-lar] de-di ?
İnan **1SG-ACC where-DAT appoint-PST-3PL say-PST[3SG]**
Where did İnan, say that they appointed **him/me __** ?

**NPI licensing**

(3a) *İnan kimse -yi gör-dü-m de-di
İnan anyone-ACC see-PST-**1SG** say-PST[3SG]
**İnan**, said that **he_i** saw anyone

(3b) İnan kimse -yi gör-dü-*m* de-me-di
İnan anyone-ACC see-PST-**1SG** say-NEG-PST[3SG]
İnan, didn't say that **he_i** saw anyone

**Indexicals do shift in these environments.**
Could it be *partial* quotation?

> **What is partial quotation?**

(2c) İnan ["**ben-i**" nere-ye ata- dı-lar] de-di ?
İnan 1SG-ACC where-DAT appoint-PST-3PL say-PST[3SG]
Where did İnanı say that they appointed **him**/me __ ?

> Claim: indexicals can be quoted locally. They do not shift, they behave normally.

> **Can it be partial quotation? No. Why?**

Scenario: I go to the post office to get a visa. The lady at the counter tells me:

(4a) Beyefendi, o işlem için konsolosluğ-a git-me**k** gerek
Sir-VOC that operation for consulate-DAT go-INF necessary
Sir, it is necessary to go to the consulate for that operation

(4b) Kadin bana nere-ye git- me-n gerek de-di ?
Lady 1SG-DAT where-DAT go-NMZ-2SG necessary say-PST[3SG]
Where did the lady tell me that I should go?

**There is no personal feature in (3a) to be quoted.**
Data for 2SG and the explicit addressee constraint

**Explicit addressee**

(5a) Tunç İnan’a ∙ ∙ ∙ [sen-i nere-ye atadılar] de-miş ?
Tunç İnan-DAT 2SG-ACC where-DAT appoint-PST-3PL say-EVID[3SG]

Where did Tunç tell İnan that they had appointed him __?
Where did Tunç tell İnan that they had appointed you __?

**No addressee**

(5b) Tunç ∅ [sen-i nere-ye atadılar] de-miş ?
Tunç 2SG-ACC where-DAT appoint-PST-3PL say-EVID[3SG]

Where did Tunç say that they had appointed you __?
# Where did Tunç say that they had appointed him??__?

The addressee must be explicit for 2SG pronouns to shift
Interim Conclusion

> Turkish shifting is not pseudo-shifting

> 1 indexical → 2 readings
    Turkish indexical shifting is an **optional phenomenon**

> Generalizations:
    Null and overt pronominal indexicals shift under *SAY*,
    2SG shifts if addressee is explicit.
Shift Together

> Shift Together constraint (Anand and Nevins 2004):

For more than one indexical in a clause, one shifts iff all others shift.

i.e.

Distinct indexicals cannot pick up their reference from distinct contexts.

What this would look like if English shifted:

Ex: *Bill told Sue that I like you.*

*Shift Together would rule out two of four possible readings:*

- **Bill** likes **Sue**
  (Both shift)
- I like my addressee
  (None shift)
- # **Bill** likes my addressee
  (Mismatch 1)
- # I like **Sue**
  (Mismatch 2)
Shift Together: some theory

- Anand (2006), Sudo (2010) claim that an indexical shifts because it falls under the scope of a modal operator that manipulates a context variable.

  => Predicts “Shift Together”

- Schlenker (1999) claims that indexicals are like bound variables.

  When bound by the embedding verb, indexicals shift.

  Each indexical’s reference is computed independently.

  => Does not predict “Shift Together”
Shift Together

When indexicals are coordinated, Shift Together holds:

- \( X \) said [that they Verb you and me]
  - Shift unavailable for 2SG

(6a) İnan [sen-in-le ben-i nere-ye ata-yacak-lar] de-mis ?
İnan 2SG-GEN-with 1SG-ACC where-DAT appoint-FUT-3PL say-EVID[3SG]

Where did İnan say that they would appoint you and me __?

> Shifting is unavailable for 2SG, neither 2SG nor 1SG shift.

- \( X \) told Y [that they Verb you and me]
  - Shift available for both indexicals

(6b) İnan Ayse’ye [sen-in-le ben-i nere-ye ata-yacak-lar] de-mis ?
İnan Ayse-DAT 2SG-GEN-with 1SG-ACC where-DAT appoint-3PL say-EVID[3SG]

Where did İnan tell Ayse that they would appoint you and me __?
Where did İnan_i tell Ayse_j that they would appoint him_i and her_j __ ?

> Either both indexicals shift, or none does.
Shift Together does not hold generally
Asymmetry when indexicals are coarguments of V.

\[ X \text{ told } Y \text{ [that I Verb you]} \]

(7) Tunç Ayse’ye (\textit{ben}) \textit{sen} -i nere-ye ata-yacag-im de-di?
Ali Ayse-DAT (1SG) 2SG-ACC where appoint-fut-1SG say-PST-[3SG]

Where did Ali tell Ayse that he would appoint you \_\_? (2SG unshifted)
\# Where did Ali tell Ayse\_\_ that I would appoint her\_\_\_? (2SG shifted)
De re blocking (Percus and Sauerland 2003)

Dream reports

(8a) I dreamed that I was Brigitte Bardot and I kissed me. (Lakoff 1972)

   I dreamed that Brigitte kissed me (= speaker)
   # I dreamed that I (= speaker) kissed Brigitte

> The dream-self is Brigitte: *me* is read *de se*
   *I* referring to the dreamer is read *de re*

> A pronoun cannot refer to the dream-self if it is c-commanded by a *de re* pronoun.
Shifted indexicals are obligatorily de se

2SG

Scenario:
Tunç notices that one of his waiters, Can, is being a nuisance. He stops one of the waiters, and without recognizing that it is Can, he tells him:

(9) “Can should go home”

(9a) Tunç Can'a nere -ye git -me -si gerek de-di?
Tunç Can-DAT where-DAT go-NMZ-3SG necessary[be] say-PST[3SG]

(9b) #Tunç Can'a nere -ye git -me -n gerek de-di?

Where did Tunç tell Can that {he/#you} should go?
De re blocking?

> “pro” and the overt nominative pronoun do c-command the complement (cf. Appendix):

(7) Tunç Ayse'ye ben sen-i nere -ye ata-yacag-im de-di?

Where did Tunç tell Ayse that he would appoint you?
   (OK) Shifted > Unshifted
   (OK) De se > De re

# Where did Tunç tell Ayse that I would appoint her?
   # Unshifted > Shifted
   # De re > De se
De re blocking?

> De re blocking no longer occurs if c-command relation is broken (Anand 2007)

(8a) I dreamed I was Brigitte Bardot and I kissed me. (Lakoff 1972)
   I = Brigitte, me = George
   # I = George, me = Brigitte

(8b) I dreamed I was Brigitte Bardot and my mother kissed me.
   my = Brigitte, me = George
   (OK) my = George, me = Brigitte

> The unaccepted reading does become acceptable if pro no longer c-commands the complement:

(7b) Tunç Ayşe'ye patron-um sen -i nere-ye ata -yacak de-di?
   Tunç Ayse-DAT boss-POSS-1SGyou-ACC where-DAT appoint-FUT-[3SG] say-PST-[3SG]
   Where did Tunç_i tell Ayşe that his_i boss would appoint you?
   Where did Tunç tell Ayşe_i that my boss would appoint her_i?
Conclusion

Turkish allows genuine indexical shifting in embedded clauses

Findings:

- 2SG shifting requires an explicit addressee;
- Turkish obeys Shift Together Locally for coordinated indexicals
- For indexicals coarguments of V, available readings show asymmetric pattern, similar to \textit{de re blocking}
- Full range of readings restored if \textit{de re blocking} bypassed → No Shift Together
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Appendix

> Does pro c-command verb complement?
Yes.

Condition C:
* Bakan_j Ali_i'yi nere-ye ata-di_i de-di?
Minister Ali-ACC where-DAT appoint-PST-[3SG] say-PST-[3SG]
Intended: Where did the minister say that pro_i appointed Ali_i.

Condition A:
Bakan_j kendisi-ni_i nere-ye ata-di_i de-di?
Minister anaph-ACC where-DAT appoint-PST-[3SG] say-PST-[3SG]
Where did the minister say that pro_i appointed himself_i.

> Does possessive subject c-command verb complement?
No.

Condition C:
Bakan_j patron-u_i Ali_i'yi nere-ye ata-di de-di?
Where did the minister say that his_i boss appointed Ali_i?