INDEXICAL SHIFTING AS PRONOMINAL BINDING
Faruk Akkuş, University of Pennsylvania

Aim: On the basis of *Shift-Together Constraint*, whereby all indexicals within a speech-context domain must pick up reference from the same context, indexical shifting has been argued to arise by overwriting of a parameter of the semantic evaluation sequence (Anand & Nevins, 2004; Anand, 2006). Investigating the indexical shifting patterns in three different languages, namely (a variety of) Turkish, Zazaki and Kurmanji, where certain Shift Together violations as grammatical, this study argues that Shift Together is not a universal fact about indexical shift. Crucially, the impossible Shift Together violations in these languages are always the ones where an unshifted pronoun intervenes between the shifted pronoun and its antecedent. In this way, they resemble the cases of pronoun binding that are ruled out by the *De Re* Blocking Effect, itself a reflex of a rule of binding locality. As such, the current study proposes that the *De Se* LF of indexical shifting may also arise via binding in the syntax.

Data: It has been previously discussed that indexical shifting is an indirect discourse phenomena rather than being simply a matter of quotation in Turkish (Şener & Şener 2011, Özyıldız 2013) and in Zazaki (Anand & Nevins 2004). This study investigates the same phenomena in a variety of Turkish, a different dialect of Zazaki (Mutki Zazaki-MZ) and in Kurmanji Kurdish (specifically Muş Kurmanji-MK) arguing that indexicals shift in these three languages unless an unshifted pronoun intervenes between the shifted pronoun and its antecedent. First, the following examples indicate that indexical shifting is not quotation in these languages because negation in the matrix clause can license the NPI in the embedded clause (1), a *wh-element* in the embedded clause can scope into the matrix clause and receive matrix question interpretation (2) and A'-extraction is possible out of complements of matrix verb with shifted indexicals although it is not licit in cases of direct quotation (3).

(1) a. *İnan*   [*kimse-yi*   *gör-dü-m*]   *de-me-di.*   (Turkish)
     İnan   anyone-ACC   see-PST-1SG   say-NEG-PST-3SG
     'İnan$_i$ didn't say that he$_i$ saw anyone.'

   b. *Kemal*   *ni-va*   [*mi*   *dükes*   *dî.*]   (MZ)
     Kemal   NEG-say.PST.3SG   1SG.OBL   anyone   see.PST.3SG
     'Kemal$_i$ didn't say that he$_i$ saw anyone.'

   c. *Rojbîn-ê*   *ne-got*   [*ku*   *min*   *kes-î*   *dît.*] (MK)
     Rojbîn-OBL   NEG-say.PST.3SG   that   1SG.OBL   anyone-OBL   see.PST.3SG
     'Rojbîn$_i$ didn't say that she$_i$ saw anyone.'

(2) a. *İnan*   *Ayşe'ye*   [*ben-i*   *nereye ata-dı-lar*]   *de-di?*   (Turkish)
     İnan   Ayşe-DAT   1SG-ACC   where   appoint-PST-3PL   say-PST-3SG
     'Where did İnan$_i$ say to Ayşe that they appointed me/him$_i$?'

   b. *Kemal*   *Leyla-ra*   *va*   [*(e)*   *to*   *ber-a*   *kudıe?*] (MZ)
     Kemal   Leyla-to   say.PST.3SG   1SG.DIR   2SG.OBL   take-1SG   where
     'Where did Kemal$_i$ say to Leyla$_j$ that he$_i$ would take her$_j$?'

(3) *Jinika$_i$*   [*ku* Rojbîn *got*   *min*   *t$_i$ dîtîye*] *pir ecêb*   *e*   (MK)
     woman-EZ.F   that   Rojbîn   say.PST.3SG   1SG.OBL   t   saw   very   strange   COP.3SG
     'The woman that Rojbin$_i$ said she$_i$ saw was strange/scary.'

Anand & Nevins (2004) propose the Shift Together Constraint (STC) based on the behavior of indexical shift in Slave and Standard Zazaki. According to the STC, all indexicals within a speech context domain must pick up their referents from the same context, thus all indexicals either get their reference from the utterance context or they all have their referents from the reported speech context. However, the data from (a variety of) Turkish, MZ and MK (4) demonstrate that indexical shifting in these languages are three-way ambiguous whereby the first two readings ((i) and (ii)) obey STC hence acceptable as predicted while the third reading is an apparent violation of STC but it is acceptable. On the other hand, the fourth reading (iv) violates STC and is, unsurprisingly, disallowed.

(4) a. Tunç Ayşe'ye   [ben   sen-i   nereye götür-eceğ-im   demiş? (Turkish)
      Tunç Ayşe-DAT 1SG.NOM 2SG-ACC where take-FUT-1SG   say-PST.3SG
      Where did Tunç$_i$ say to Ayşe$_j$ that …   (i) I would take you?
                                                   (ii) he$_i$ would take her$_j$?
                                                   (iii) he$_i$ would take you?
                                                   (iv) *I would take her$_j$?

   b. *Kemal   Leyla-ra   va*   [*to   mi   kudıe   dî?*] (MZ)
      Kemal   Leyla-to   say.PST.3SG 2SG.OBL 1SG.OBL where see.PST.3SG
      'Where did Kemal$_i$ say to Leyla$_j$ that …   (i) you would saw me?
                                                     (ii) she$_j$ would saw him$_j$?
                                                     (iii) she$_j$ would saw me?
                                                     (iv) *I would saw him$_i$?

   c. Rojbîn-ê   ji Sidar ra   got (ku)   **ez**   ji **te**   hez di-k-im
      Rojbîn-OBL P Sidar Part. said (that) 1SG.DIR P 2SG.OBL love do.PRS-1SG
      'Rojbin$_i$ said to Sidar$_j$ that …   (i) I love you
                                             (ii) she$_i$ loves him$_j$?
                                             (iii) she$_i$ loves me?
                                             (iv) *I love him$_j$?

Discussion and Analysis: The patterns in (4) bear strong resemblance to *De Re* Blocking Effect (Anand 2006), which states that no obligatory *de se* anaphor can be c-commanded by a *de re* counterpart. This accounts for the asymmetry between the 1st person pronouns in (5), from Lakoff (1972). The only possible interpretation is the one in which the object pronoun is interpreted *de re* (as George), and the subject *de se* (as Brigitte). The opposite interpretation is ruled out.

(5)   [George:] I dreamt I was Brigitte Bardot and I kissed me.
        a. In the dream Brigitte kisses George.
        b. #In the dream, George kisses Brigitte.

Crucial to Anand's explanation is the notion of binding locality. Anand proposes that the underlying motivation for binding locality is the same as the underlying cause of the *De Re* Blocking Effect – obligatory *de se* pronouns (e.g. *me* in (5)) are marked for binding by an operator, and it is this binding operation that cannot be intervened.

    Clauses with indexical shift can only express *de se* attitudes (Schlenker 1999, Messick 2016). As seen in (4), they also exhibit the same constraint observed for *De Re* Blocking Effect, in that obligatory *de se* pronouns (i.e. shifted pronouns) are bound by operators in syntax, and this operator-variable relationship is subject to intervention, as other binding relations. The binding relation is schematized in (6), using English words.

(6) Hasan λ_x [I$_x$ saw] said.

(7) * Hasan λ_x [you   [me$_x$ where take]] said.

In (7), an unbound (and so unshifted) indexical pronoun intervenes between the bound (shifted) indexical and its antecedent, and the result is ungrammaticality. This is the configuration found in the unavailable reading (iv) of (4). We further discuss the predictions of this analysis, its advantages over Deal (2012, 2016), which fails to capture the role of the hierarchy among pronominal arguments since Deal contends that shifting patterns are the result of hierarchy among operators in CP.

Selected References
Anand, Pranav, & Andrew Nevins. 2004. Shifty operators in changing contexts. In Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory XIV, ed. Robert B. Young, 20—37. CLC Publications. **Özyıldız, Deniz. 2013.** When I is not me: A preliminary case study of shifted indexicals in Turkish. Manuscript. **Şener, Nilüfer Gültekin, & Serkan Şener. 2011**. Null subjects and Indexicality in Turkish and Uyghur. In Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL7), 269–284.