

Indexical shift and monstrous agreement in Balkar

Daniar Kasenov

Laboratory of Formal Models in Linguistics
NRU HSE, Moscow

26/11/21

18th Conference on Typology and Grammar
for Young Scholars

Outline of this talk

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Indexical shift
- 3 Monstrous agreement
- 4 Interaction between IS and MA
- 5 Conclusions

Introduction

Pre-introduction

- This is a rather descriptive talk without a proper analysis
- I have tried to avoid technicalities of research about indexical shift and monstrous agreement
- Data was gathered via elicitation during MSU Altaic expedition in village Verkhnyaya Balkaria in August 2021.
- This research is supported by the grant 19-012-00627a provided by RFBR.

Introduction

- Indexical shift (also known as semi-direct speech) is a phenomenon of indexicals referring to the coordinates of the original speech act/attitude in reported speech/attitude reports

- (1) Hɛseni va kɛ ɛz dɛwletia
Hesen.OBL said COMP I rich.be.PRES
'Hesen_i said that he_i is rich' (Anand & Nevins 2004,
ex.4, p.21)

Introduction

- Indexical shift (also known as semi-direct speech) is a phenomenon of indexicals referring to the coordinates of the original speech act
- Monstrous agreement (also known as agreement shift) is a similar phenomenon but in the domain of person agreement. Despite the subject being 3rd person, the 1st person agreement marker is present on the verb

(2) Raju [t̪anu pariget̪t̪-ææ-nu ani] cepp-ææ-Du
 Raju [3SG run-PST-1SG COMP] say-PST-M.SG
 ‘Raju said that he ran.’ (Messick 2016, ex.1, p.2)

Goal of this talk

- Indexical shift (IS) and monstrous agreement (MA) are similar phenomena of 1st/2nd person morphology being used to refer to participants of the original speech act
- Goal of this talk is to overview these phenomena in Balkar (<Turkic) and see how Balkar data corresponds to existing generalizations in the literature

Indexical shift

Balkar has IS

- (3) Kerim [men xicin aša-ɸan-ma] de-geŋ-di
Kerim.NOM [I.NOM hychin.NOM eat-PF-1SG] say-PF-3SG
'Kerim_i said that he_i ate a hychin.'
- (4) Kerim Roza-dan [sen tüken-ŋe bar-liq-mi-sa
Kerim.NOM Roza-ABL [you.NOM store-DAT go-FUT2-Q-2SG
dep] sor-du
COMP] ask-PST.3SG
'Kerim asked Rosa_i, whether she is going to go to the store.'

Quotation?

- Is indexical shift in Balkar a true grammatical phenomenon?

Quotation?

- Is indexical shift in Balkar a true grammatical phenomenon?
- A possibility: it's just quotation, full or partial

Balkar IS is not quotation

- Quotation is opaque for wh-phenomena (both movement and interpretation)
- Contrast these three:
 - (5) Peter said: “I ate an apple”.
 - (6) *What_i Peter said “I ate ___i”?
 - (7) *Peter said: “I ate **what**”?
(I=Peter interpretation unavailable)

Balkar IS is not quotation

- Quotation is opaque for wh-phenomena
- Balkar IS:

(8) Kerim [Fatima bla men kim-ni
Kerim.NOM [Fatima.NOM and I.NOM who-ACC
ur-ruq-buz] de-gen-di
hit-FUT2-1PL] say-PF-3SG
'Whom_i Kerim said that he and Fatima hit ___i?'

Balkar IS is not quotation

- Quotation is opaque for wh-phenomena
- Balkar IS:

(9) Kerim [men kim-ni tübe-di-m dep]
Kerim.NOM [I.NOM who-ACC meet-PST-1SG COMP]
ajt-di
say-PST.3SG
'Whom_i Kerim said that he met ___i?'

Balkar IS is not quotation

- Quotation is opaque for wh-phenomena
- Balkar IS:

(10) Kerim Fatima-dan [kim-ni ana-si
Kerim Fatima-ABL [who-GEN mother-POSS.3SG
saŋa uruš-xan-mi-di dep] sor-ɸan-di
you.DAT scold-PF-Q-3SG COMP] ask-PF-3SG
'About whose mom_i did Kerim ask Fatima_j whether
she_i scolded her_j?'

Balkar IS is not quotation

- Not quotation proper: evidence from wh-elements

Balkar IS is not quotation

- Not quotation proper: evidence from wh-elements
- Partial quotation?

Balkar IS is not quotation

- Not quotation proper: evidence from wh-elements
- Partial quotation?
- Unlikely in light of two generalizations that hold for Balkar: SHIFT TOGETHER (Anand & Nevins 2004) and the hierarchy of shifts (Deal 2020)

Two generalizations about IS

- Anand & Nevins (2004): either all indexicals of certain type are shifted in a domain, or none (SHIFT TOGETHER)

(11) [Sehlégé segha goníhkie rárule]
[1SG.friend 1SG.for slippers 3SG.will.sew]
yudeli
3SG.want.4SG

'She_i wants her_i friend to sew slippers for her_i.'

*'She_i wants her_i friend to sew slippers for me_j.'

*'She_i wants my_j friend to sew slippers for her_i.'

'She_i wants my_j friend to sew slippers for me_j.'

(Anand 2006, ex.291, p.99)

Balkar shifts together

- (12) Kerim [men-i ana-m maŋa
 Kerim.NOM [I-GEN mother-POSS.1SG.NOM I.DAT
 uruŝ-xan-di dep] ajt-xan-di
 scold-PF-3SG COMP] say-PF-3SG
 ‘Kerim_i said that his_i mom scolded him_i.’
 *‘Kerim_i said that his_i mom scolded me_j.’
 *‘Kerim_i said that my_j mom scolded him_i.’
 ‘Kerim_i said that my_j mom scolded me_j.’

Balkar shifts together

- (13) Kerim Fatima-dan [sen-i ana-ŋ saŋa
Kerim Fatima-ABL [you-GEN mother-POSS.2SG you.DAT
uruš-xan-mi-di dep] sor-ɣan-di
scold-PF-Q-3SG COMP] ask-PF-3SG
'Kerim asked Fatima_i, whether her_i mom had scolded
her_i.'
*'Kerim asked Fatima_i, whether your_j mom had scolded
her_i.'
*'Kerim asked Fatima_i, whether her_i mom had scolded
you_j.'
'Kerim asked Fatima_i, whether your_j mom had scolded
you_j.'

Two generalizations about IS

- SHIFT TOGETHER
- Anand & Nevins (2004), Deal (2020) *a.m.o.*: types of indexical shift obey the hierarchy in (14). 2nd person elements cannot shift without 1st person elements shifting too

(14) Loc>2nd>1st>Time

Balkar obeys the hierarchy of shifts

- (15) Kerim Fatima-dan [sen meni ur- van-mi-sa dep]
Kerim Fatima-ABL [you me.ACC hit-PF-Q-2SG COMP]
sor- van-di
ask-PF-3SG
'Kerim_i asked Fatima_j, whether she_j hit him_i.'
*'Kerim_i asked Fatima_j, whether she_j hit me_k.'
'Kerim_i asked Fatima_j, whether you_k hit him_i.'
'Kerim_i asked Fatima_j, whether you_k hit me_m.'

Balkar IS is not quotation

- Not quotation proper: evidence from wh-elements
- Partial quotation?
- Unlikely in light of two generalizations that hold for Balkar: SHIFT TOGETHER (Anand & Nevins 2004) and the hierarchy of shifts (Deal 2020)

Semantics of IS: self-ascription

- Anand (2006) *a.m.o.*: indexical shift is interpreted *de se* (there are exceptions, Deal 2020). What is *de se*?

Semantics of IS: self-ascription

- Anand (2006) *a.m.o.*: indexical shift is interpreted *de se* (there are exceptions, Deal 2020). What is *de se*?
- Lewis (1979): conscious self-ascription of property may be called *de se*

Balkar IS involves *de se*

- (16) Kerim [men aurup tur-a-ma] de-gen-di
Kerim.NOM [I.NOM sick AUX-IPFV-1SG] say-PF-3SG
'Kerim_i said that he_i was sick.'
#Context: Kerim is a doctor. He looks at anonymous exam results and concludes that this person is sick. Unbeknownst to him, these are his own results.

Balkar IS involves *de te*

- (17) Kerim Fatima-*wa* [*sen aurwan ete-se dep*]
Kerim.NOM Fatima-DAT [you sick AUX-2SG COMP]
ayt-xan-di
say-PF-3SG

'Kerim told Fatima_i that she_j were sick.'

#Context: Kerim and Fatima are doctors. During a break, Kerim looks at anonymous exam results, concludes that this person is sick, and says that to Fatima.

Unbeknownst to him and her, these are her own results.

Takeaways about IS

- Balkar has indexical shift

Takeaways about IS

- Balkar has indexical shift
- Balkar IS obeys major generalizations

Takeaways about IS

- Balkar has indexical shift
- Balkar IS obeys major generalizations
- Balkar IS get interpreted as conveying self-ascription

Monstrous agreement

Intro

- Another way to convey self-ascription. Monstrous agreement in Telugu (Messick 2016) and Tamil (Sundaresan 2011) conveys *de se* meaning

Intro

- Another way to convey self-ascription. Monstrous agreement in Telugu (Messick 2016) and Tamil (Sundaresan 2011) conveys *de se* meaning
- DEF: a person feature mismatch between the subject DP and the agreeing verb in attitude reports

MA in Balkar

- Balkar MA: a long-distance reflexive controls 1st/2nd person agreement
- First person monstrous agreement:

(18) Kerim [kesi aurup tur-a-**ma**] de-gen-di
Kerim.NOM [SELF sick AUX-IPFV-1SG] say-PF-3SG
'Kerim_i said that he_i is sick.'

MA in Balkar

- Balkar MA: a long-distance reflexive controls 1st/2nd person agreement
- Second person monstrous agreement:

(19) Kerim Fatima-dan [kesi Alim-ni
Kerim.NOM Fatima-ABL [SELF Alim-ACC
sü-e-mi-**se** dep] sor-*van*-di
love-IPFV-Q-2SG COMP] ask-PF-3SG
'Kerim asked Fatima_i, whether she_j loves Alim.'

Reflexive is the subject

- Is the reflexive the true subject?

Reflexive is the subject

- Is the reflexive the true subject?
- Sundaresan (2020): 3rd person nominals in monstrous agreement are not subjects – the verb agrees with a null indexical

Reflexive is the subject

- Is the reflexive the true subject?
- Sundaresan (2020): 3rd person nominals in monstrous agreement are not subjects – the verb agrees with a null indexical
- Possible test: conjunction

Reflexive is the subject

- Is the reflexive the true subject?
- Possible test: conjunction. Balkar MA passes
- (20) Kerim [kesi bla Fatima xicɨn
Kerim.NOM [SELF and Fatima.NOM hychin
aša-ʁan-biz] de-j-di
eat-PF-1PL] say-IPFV-3SG
'Kerim_i said that [he and Fatima]_{i+j} ate a hychin.'

Properties of Balkar MA

- Monstrous agreement in Balkar gets interpreted *de se*

(21) Kerim [kesi aurup tur-a-ma] de-gen-di
Kerim.NOM [SELF sick AUX-IPFV-1SG] say-PF-3SG

‘Kerim_i said that he_i was sick.’

#Context: Kerim is a doctor. He looks at anonymous exam results and concludes that this person is sick. Unbeknownst to him, these are his own results.

Properties of Balkar MA

- Monstrous agreement in Balkar gets interpreted *de se*

(22) Kerim Fatima-*wa* [kesi aur \bar{w} an ete-se
Kerim.NOM Fatima-DAT [SELF sick AUX-COND
dep] ayt-xan-di
COMP] say-PF-3SG

‘Kerim told Fatima_i that she_i were sick.’

#Context: Kerim and Fatima are doctors. During a break, Kerim looks at anonymous exam results, concludes that this person is sick, and says that to Fatima. Unbeknownst to him and her, these are her own results.

Properties of Balkar MA

- Monstrous agreement in Balkar is interpreted *de se*
- Like other documented instances of MA (Messick 2016), MA obligatorily tracks participants of the ‘closest’ speech act/attitude, when embedded.

Locality of MA

- (23) Alim de-gen-di [Kerim ajt-xan-di [kesi
Alim.NOM say-PF-3SG [Kerim.NOM say-PF-3SG [SELF
xicin-ni aša-kan-ma dep]]
hychin-ACC eat-PF-1SG COMP]]
'Alim_i said that Kerim_j said that he_{*i/j} ate the hychin.'

Locality of MA

- (24) Madina Rosa-*ba* ajt-xan-d \dot{i} [Kerim
Madina.NOM Rosa-DAT say-PF-3SG [Kerim.NOM
Fatima-*ba* [kesi xicin-n \dot{i} aša-*ban*-sa dep]
Fatima-DAT [SELF quesadilla-ACC eat-PF-2SG COMP]
ajt-xan-d \dot{i} dep]
say-PF-3SG COMP]
'Madina told Rosa $_i$ that Kerim told Fatima $_j$ that she $_{*i/j}$
ate the hychin.'

Locality of MA

Contrast with indexical shift:

- (25) Alim de-gen-di [Kerim ajt-xan-di [men
Alim.NOM say-PF-3SG [Kerim.NOM say-PF-3SG [I.NOM
xičin-ni aša-kan-ma dep]]
hychin-ACC eat-PF-1SG COMP]]
'Alim_i said that Kerim_j said that he_{i/j} ate the hychin.'

Locality of MA

Contrast with indexical shift:

- (26) Madina Rosa-*ва* ajt-xan-di [Kerim
 Madina.NOM Rosa-DAT say-PF-3SG [Kerim.NOM
 Fatima-*ва* [sen xicin-ni aša-*ван-са* dep]
 Fatima-DAT [you quesadilla-ACC eat-PF-2SG COMP]
 ajt-xan-di dep]
 say-PF-3SG COMP]
 ‘Madina told Rosa_i; that Kerim told Fatima_j; that she_{i/j} ate
 the hychin.’

Summarizing

- Balkar has monstrous agreement

Summarizing

- Balkar has monstrous agreement
- It is interpreted *de se*

Summarizing

- Balkar has monstrous agreement
- It is interpreted *de se*
- It tracks participants of the ‘closest’ speech act/attitude

Interaction between IS and MA

Interaction between IS and MA

- Since Balkar has both IS and MA, it allows to examine how these phenomena interact with each other

Interaction between IS and MA

- Since Balkar has both IS and MA, it allows to examine how these phenomena interact with each other
- In Balkar, MA **blocks** IS

(28) Kerim [kesi meni anam-mi sü-e-me]
Kerim [SELF I.GEN mom-POSS.1SG love-IPFV-1SG]
de-gen-di
say-PF-3SG
'Kerim said that he_i loves my_j mom.'
*'Kerim said that he_i loves his_j mom.'

Putting blocking in perspective

- What else is able to block participant pronouns?

Putting blocking in perspective

- What else is able to block participant pronouns?
 - Imposters: DPs whose person specification does not coincide with their reference
- (30) Yours faithfully (=speaker) is/*am really sorry for the incident

Putting blocking in perspective

- What else is able to block participant pronouns?
- Imposters: DPs whose person specification does not coincide with their reference
- Imposters **block** coreferent participant pronouns in their c-command domain (Podobryaev 2014)

(31) *Yours faithfully did my job.

Imposters and monstrous agreement

- We have two phenomena with a similar blocking property: imposters and monstrous agreement

Imposters and monstrous agreement

- We have two phenomena with a similar blocking property: imposters and monstrous agreement
- Suppose they come from the same source

Imposters and monstrous agreement

- We have two phenomena with a similar blocking property: imposters and monstrous agreement
- Suppose they come from the same source
- Hypothesis: if language has monstrous agreement, it has agreement with imposters.

Imposters in Balkar

- Balkar has monstrous agreement. Does it have agreement with imposters?

Imposters in Balkar

- Balkar has monstrous agreement. Does it have agreement with imposters?
- Imposters do trigger 1st/2nd person agreement on the verb

(33) teli qart zanʁil-dɨ-m
dumb old.NOM make.mistake-PST-1SG

‘The old fool (=the speaker) has made another mistake!’

Imposters in Balkar

- Balkar has monstrous agreement. Does it have agreement with imposters?
- Imposters do trigger 1st/2nd person agreement on the verb

(34) teli qart azaš-xan-sa
dumb old.NOM make.mistake-PST-2SG

‘The old fool (=the hearer) has made another mistake!

Towards explanation of blocking

- Monstrous agreement: blocks coreferent indexicals
- Imposters: block coreferent indexicals
- A possible way of research: unifying imposters and monstrous agreement

Conclusions

Self-ascription in Balkar

- Balkar has two strategies to mark self-ascription: indexical shift and monstrous agreement

Self-ascription in Balkar

- Balkar has two strategies to mark self-ascription: indexical shift and monstrous agreement
- Indexical shift behaves as one would expect: it obeys SHIFT TOGETHER and hierarchy of shifts

Self-ascription in Balkar

- Balkar has two strategies to mark self-ascription: indexical shift and monstrous agreement
- Indexical shift behaves as one would expect: it obeys SHIFT TOGETHER and hierarchy of shifts
- Monstrous agreement also appears to behave as expected: triggered by a logophorically bound nominal and tracks the closest attitude holder

Self-ascription in Balkar

- Balkar has two strategies to mark self-ascription: indexical shift and monstrous agreement
- Indexical shift behaves as one would expect: it obeys SHIFT TOGETHER and hierarchy of shifts
- Monstrous agreement also appears to behave as expected: triggered by a logophorically bound nominal and tracks the closest attitude holder
- Coexistence of both indexical shift and monstrous agreement allows to test the interaction between these two phenomena

Monstrous agreement as an imposter phenomenon?

- Monstrous agreement appears to block indexical shift

Monstrous agreement as an imposter phenomenon?

- Monstrous agreement appears to block indexical shift
- Imposters are known to block person pronouns in their domain

Monstrous agreement as an imposter phenomenon?

- Monstrous agreement appears to block indexical shift
- Imposters are known to block person pronouns in their domain
- Analysis of monstrous agreement may be based on semantic analysis of imposters (Podobryaev 2014)

References I

- Anand, Pranav. 2006. *De de se*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Anand, Pranav & Andrew Nevins. 2004. Shifty operators in changing contexts. In *Semantics and linguistic theory*, vol. 14, 20–37.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2020. *A theory of indexical shift: meaning, grammar, and crosslinguistic variation*. Vol. 82. MIT Press.
- Lewis, David. 1979. Attitudes de dicto and de se. *The philosophical review* 88(4). 513–543.
- Messick, Troy. 2016. Pronouns and agreement in Telugu embedded contexts. In *Proceedings of the 33rd west coast conference on formal linguistics*, 309–319.
- Podobryaev, Alexander. 2014. *Persons, imposters, and monsters*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

References II

- Sundaesan, Sandhya. 2011. A plea for syntax and a return to first principles: monstrous agreement in Tamil. In *Semantics and linguistic theory*, vol. 21, 674–693.
- Sundaesan, Sandhya. 2020. A new theory of indexical shift. *Manuscript, University of Leipzig*.