

## An adjacency requirement on indexical shift in Poshkart Chuvash: a markedness-based account

**Introduction** The goal of this paper is to discuss a novel syntactic restriction on indexical shift on the basis of the data from the dialect of Chuvash (< Turkic) spoken in the Poshkart village of the Chuvash Republic (in the Volga region in Russia), henceforth Poshkart Chuvash, or PC. This restriction suggests that indexical shift (of the 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement) in PC is sensitive to an adjacency requirement and only occurs in the immediate vicinity of a SAY-complementizer. To capture this restriction, an extension of a markedness-based account in Messick 2017 is proposed.

**Indexical shift in PC** Indexical shift in PC has several properties (cf. a typology of indexical shift in Deal 2017). First, it is restricted to finite embedded clauses introduced by complementizers morphologically related to the verb *te-* ‘say’, most commonly *teze* (*te-ze* ‘say.CV’), as well as the verb *te* ‘say’ itself. Second, PC only allows shift of the 1<sup>st</sup> person subject agreement on the verb. Thus, neither 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement nor overt 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronouns can shift (as in Mishar Tatar, see Podobryaev 2014); PC also lacks 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> possessive agreement. Third, shift of the 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement is in principle optional as it does not (and cannot) occur when there is an overt 1<sup>st</sup> person subject pronoun. However, in the absence of an overt 1<sup>st</sup> person subject, shift of the 1<sup>st</sup> person is strongly preferred, leading to a complementary distribution of the shifted vs. non-shifted interpretation. Fourth, the shifted 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement can co-occur with the 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject pronoun *vəl* (optional and conditioned by poorly understood pragmatic factors), a pattern documented in several languages, see Messick 2017.

An illustration of the indexical shift in PC is shown in (1a), where the 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement marker *-p* refers (=shifts) to the reported speaker (Masha) rather than to the actual speaker. Note that the complement clause contains a 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun *sernbe*, which refers to the actual addressee (Teacher), suggesting that the complement clause cannot be analyzed as a quotation (more standard diagnostics such as long distance wh-movement give the same result). As can be seen in (1a), the indexical shift pattern requires the subject to be either left unrealized or realized as the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun *vəl*, but not as the 1<sup>st</sup> person subject *ep*. In contrast, a “no shift” pattern in (1b), where *-p* refers to the actual speaker, disallows a non-overt subject and requires *ep*. A further property of indexical shift in PC is that if the subject of the embedded clause is co-indexed with the reported speaker (=matrix subject), one of the indexical shift patterns in (1a) becomes obligatory, i.e. the 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement on the embedded verb is disallowed, as shown in (2).

(1) (*Context*: Speaker to Teacher:)

a. INDEXICAL SHIFT

**maša**<sub>1</sub> man-a [∅/vəl/\*ep sern-be<sub>Addressee</sub> pilk il-e-**p**<sub>1</sub>] teze kala-r-ë.  
 masha 1SG-OBJ ∅/3SG/1SG 2PL-INS five take-NPST-**1SG** TEZE say-PST-3SG  
 ‘Masha<sub>1</sub> told me<sub>Speaker</sub> that she<sub>1</sub> (“I”) will get an A (“Five”) for your class (= for yours).’

b. NO SHIFT

**maša** man-a [ep/\*∅ sern-be<sub>Addressee</sub> pilk il-e-**p**<sub>Speaker</sub>] teze kala-r-ë.  
 masha 1SG-OBJ 1SG/∅ 2PL-INS five take-NPST-**1SG** TEZE say-PST-3SG  
 ‘Masha told me that I will get an A (“Five”) for your class.’

(2) \***maša**<sub>1</sub> man-a [∅ sern-be<sub>Addressee</sub> pilk il-e-**t**<sub>1</sub>] teze kala-r-ë.  
 masha 1SG-OBJ 2PL-INS five take-PRS-**3SG** TEZE say-PST-3SG  
*Intended*: ‘Masha<sub>1</sub> told me that she<sub>1</sub> will get an A (“Five”) for your class.’

**A markedness-based account** The pattern in (1)–(2) can be captured in a system proposed in Messick 2017, which offers a unified account of languages with indexical shift and with logophors within the framework of Distributed Morphology. The main insight (from Schlenker 2003) is that the actual and reported contexts correspond to different sets of participant features such as [ $\pm$  author\*] (for the actual context) and [ $\pm$  author], which are combined in the case of particular subject pronouns/agreement markers in the embedded clause. The other ingredient is (language-

specific) impoverishment rules which respect various (typologically-motivated) markedness constraints and delete “offending” features from the marked combinations, see (3)–(4) below.

To account for the indexical shift pattern in PC, one can assume, following Messick 2017, that the feature combination of *author of the reported context & non-author of the actual context* is not licit in PC (as there are no logophors, which are the designated realization of this feature combination), cf. (3a), leading to deletion of either of the two features, depending on their syntactic context. In the case of agreement (on T), the feature corresponding to *non-author of the actual context* will be deleted, as in (3b), leading to the realization of the 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement (given the right vocabulary insertion rules), cf. (1a)–(2). In the case of pronouns, the feature corresponding to *author of the reported context* will be deleted, precluding the realization of the 1<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun, cf. (1a). As for the combination of *non-author of the reported context & author of the actual context*, corresponding to (1b), we can assume a reverse markedness constraint in (4a), which will lead to the deletion of the [–author] feature on both pronouns and agreement (cf. a different pattern in Mishar Tatar, see Messick 2017:66–68). The rules in (3)–(4) are, obviously, simplified and have to be further fleshed out to include the features for the addressee.

- (3) a. \*[+author, –author\*]  
 b. –author\* → ∅ / [ \_\_\_ +author] \_\_\_ T  
 c. +author → ∅ / [ \_\_\_ –author\*] \_\_\_ *pro*
- (4) a. \*[-author, +author\*]  
 b. –author → ∅ / [ \_\_\_ +author\*] \_\_\_ T/*pro*

**An adjacency requirement on indexical shift** The system in (3)–(4) could receive some support from a peculiar restriction on indexical shift in PC. When an embedded clause whose subject is co-indexed with the reported speaker (matrix subject) is conjoined with another clause, the embedded verb in this clause must have the 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement, whereas the expected 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement is disallowed, as shown in (5a)–(5b) (witness the use of the reflexive pronoun in (5b), presumably an attempt by the consultant to mark coreference by pragmatic means, circumventing a grammatical restriction). This pattern was fairly robust across my consultants.

- (5) a. \***maşa**<sub>1</sub> vaea-na [[∅ sern-be<sub>Addressee</sub> pilk il-e-**p**<sub>1</sub>], a [vaea il-mez]]  
 masha vasya -OBJ 2PL-INS five take-NPST-1SG CONJ vasya take-  
 teze kala-za.  
 TEZE say-CV.SIM
- b. **maşa**<sub>1</sub> vaea-na [[xəj sern-be<sub>Addressee</sub> pilk il-e-**t**<sub>1</sub>], a [vaea  
 masha vasya -OBJ SELF 2PL-INS five take-NPST-1SG CONJ vasya  
 il-mez]] teze kala-za.  
 take-NPST.NEG TEZE say-CV.SIM  
 ‘Masha<sub>1</sub> told Vasya that she<sub>1</sub> will get an A (“Five”) for your class but Vasya won’t.’

**(A sketch of) an account** The pattern in (5) can be accounted for by the rules in (3) if we further restrict the application of the rule in (3b), which deletes the [–author\*] feature and leads to the 1<sup>st</sup> person agreement, to those Ts that are **adjacent to a SAY-complementizer**, as in (6a), cf. (1a). Consequently, whenever the adjacency requirement is not met, we correctly predict the application of the rule in (3c) (=6b), which deletes the [+author] feature and leads to the 3<sup>rd</sup> person agreement. Again, the rules should be fleshed out to include the 2<sup>nd</sup> person agreement.

- (6) a. –author\* → ∅ / [ \_\_\_ +author] \_\_\_ T (adjacent to a SAY-complementizer)  
 b. +author → ∅ / [ \_\_\_ –author\*] \_\_\_ *pro*/T (non-adjacent to a SAY-complementizer)

This account makes a number of predictions regarding possible positions of *-p* with respect to the associated complementizer *teze*, which will be tested in the upcoming fieldwork.