

Shifty first person inclusive and *de re*-free domains in Marathi



Shweta Akolkar (UC Berkeley) · akolkar@berkeley.edu

SALT 34 @ U of R · May 28-30, 2024

1. Introduction

- In some languages, indexicals (e.g. *I, you, today*) embedded in attitude reports can shift to get their reference from the context of the attitude rather than the utterance^[1,2,5,6]

(1) Heseni_j va ke **ez_{j/k}** dēwletia. **Zazaki**^[2]
Hesen.OBL said that I rich.be-PRES
'Hesen said that {I am, Hesen is} rich.'

- This paper: Marathi (Indo-Aryan) has a type of indexical shift which differs from standard indexical shift in two respects

- Enables a 1.INCL indexical to be coreferent with the attitude holder
- Results in a clause that is opaque for *de re* construal

2. Shifty behavior of *āpan*

- In Marathi attitude reporting CPs, the morpheme *āpan* may be used instead of a third person pronoun to refer to the attitude holder (2)

(2) Aruṅ-lā wāṭ-ta [ki **āpan**] huśār āh-ot].
Arun-DAT feel-PRES.3SG.N C APAN intelligent be.PRES-1PL
'Arun_i thinks that he_i is intelligent.'

- At a first pass, this *āpan* behaves like a shifted 1SG indexical
 - Refers to the author of the attitude report (2)
 - Obeys Shift Together^[1,2,5]: all instances of *āpan* in the same minimal attitude CP must be coreferent (3)

(3) **Minā**-lā wāṭla [ki **Aruṅ**-lā māhit hota [ki **āplyā**] bahiṇi-ni
Mina-DAT felt C Arun-DAT know be.PST C APAN.GEN sister-ERG
āplyā-lā bolawla]].
APAN.OBL-DAT invited

- ✓: 'Mina_i thought that Arun_j knew that her_i sister invited her_i.'
- ✓: 'Mina_i thought that Arun_j knew that his_j sister invited him_j.'
- ✗: 'Mina_i thought that Arun_j knew that her_i sister invited him_j.'
- ✗: 'Mina_i thought that Arun_j knew that his_j sister invited her_i.'

- Cannot cooccur with an unshifted 1SG indexical in the same minimal attitude CP (4)

(4) #Minā-lā wāṭta [ki **āpan**] **ma-lā** pāhila].
Mina-DAT feels C APAN 1SG-DAT saw
Int: 'Mina_i thinks that she_i saw me.'

- Must be read *de se* (like shifty 1SG in Zazaki^[1], Uyghur^[8], a.o.) (5)

(5) *Context: Kishori is asked to judge three different singers' recordings of the same song. Unbeknownst to her, one of those recordings is actually of herself singing many years ago. Without recognizing her own voice, Kishori determines that she sang the song best.*

#Kiśori-lā wāṭta [ki **āpan**] sagly-at cāngle gāylo].
Kishori-DAT feels C APAN all-LOC good sang
'Kishori_i thinks that she_i sang the best.'

3. Complications

- Āpan* is form-identical with the 1.INCL pronoun, not the 1SG pronoun (4); both also trigger 1PL φ -agreement (cf. (2) & (6))

(6) **Āpan** huśār āh-ot.
1.INCL intelligent be.PRES-1PL
'We (inclusive) are intelligent.'

- The shifted reading of *āpan* is licensed under thought and knowledge verbs (2, 3), but highly restricted under speech verbs (7)

- Contra implicational hierarchies of indexical shift licensing verbs: speech > thought > knowledge^[5,9]

(7) #Minā **mhaṇāli** [ki **āplyā**] -lā yaś miḷel].
Mina said C APAN.OBL-DAT success get.FUT
Int: 'Mina_i said that she_i will succeed.'

- Shifted *āpan* is permitted in speech reports only if they are self-directed (8)

(8) Minā **swataha-lā mhaṇāli** [ki **āplyā**] -lā yaś miḷel].
Mina SELF-DAT said C APAN.OBL-DAT success get.FUT
'Mina_i said to herself that she_i will succeed.'

4. Core analysis

Assumptions:

- Expressions are evaluated relative to a context c , index i , and assignment g

(9) $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^{c,i,g} = \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^{\langle auth(c), addr(c), w(c) \rangle, \langle auth(i), addr(i), w(i) \rangle, g}$

- Attitude verbs quantify over indices, changing $auth(i)$ and $addr(i)$ to *de se* and *de te* individuals, respectively

(10) $\llbracket think \alpha \rrbracket^{c,i,g} = \lambda x. \forall i' \in DOX(x)(i). \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{c,i',g} = 1$
where $i' \in DOX(x)(i)$ iff

- $w(i')$ is compatible with what x believes at i
- $auth(i')$ is an individual in $w(i')$ that x identifies at i as herself
- $addr(i')$ is an individual in $w(i')$ that x identifies at i as her addressee

Proposal:

- A context-shifting operator OP_{EGO} optionally occurs in the left periphery of Marathi attitude reports and overwrites $auth(c)$ and $addr(c)$ for its complement with the corresponding index coordinates. Additionally, it presupposes that $auth(i) = addr(i)$

(11) $\llbracket OP_{EGO} \alpha \rrbracket^{c,i,g} = \begin{cases} \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{\langle auth(i), addr(i), w(c) \rangle, i, g} & \text{iff } auth(i) = addr(i) \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

- This presupposition is met only in mental attitude and self-directed speech reports

\Rightarrow Mental attitude verbs allow their sole nominal arguments to be both authors and addressees (cf. Sudo^[8], Deal^[5])

- In the scope of OP_{EGO} , 1.INCL *āpan* picks out the author-addressee (i.e. *ego*)

(12) $\llbracket \bar{a}pan \rrbracket^{c,i,g} = auth(c) \oplus addr(c)$

5. Unavailability of *de re* readings

Problem:

- Clauses that undergo context shift are opaque for *de re* construal in Marathi: names and descriptions alike must be read *de dicto* (13)

(13) *Context: Ravan comes to Sita disguised as an ascetic and asks for alms. Sita doesn't recognize him as Ravan.*

#Site-lā wāṭta [ki **Rāvan** **āplyā**] -lā bhikṣā māgtoy].
Sita-DAT feels C Ravan APAN.OBL-DAT alms request.PRES.PROG
'Sita_i thinks that Ravan is asking her_i for alms.'

- This property is characteristic of embedded quotations^[3] rather than indexical shift
- Yet shifted clauses in Marathi resist a quotational analysis: they are syntactically transparent, e.g. for *wh*-dependencies (14)

(14) Aruṅ-lā [**āplyā**] -lā **koṅ** madat karel asa] wāṭta?
Arun-DAT APAN.OBL-DAT who help do.FUT so feels
'Who does Arun_i think will help him_i?'

Proposal:

- OP_{EGO} is incompatible with the CP edge abstractors needed for *de re* LFs (e.g. for *res* movement or concept generator binding)
 - Deal^[4] argues that indexical shift in Nez Perce is incompatible with *res* movement for similar reasons (but in-situ *de re* is still available)

- Potential connection to Free Indirect Discourse (FID) \rightarrow future work
 - FID has also been analyzed in terms of context shifting^[7]
 - Similar profile: Incompatible with *de re* readings and reference to an addressee distinct from the author: no second person pronouns, subjectless imperatives, vocatives, or addressee-oriented adverbials^[3]
 - Perhaps OP_{EGO} is common to both phenomena

Acknowledgements & Selected References

I am grateful to Amy Rose Deal, Ashwini Deo, Peter Jenks, Line Mikkelsen, Seth Yalcin, and audiences at FASAL 14, CoM (Stanford), and S-Circle (Santa Cruz) for very helpful discussions and feedback on this work.

- Anand, Pranav. 2006. *De de se*. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Anand, Pranav, and Andrew Nevins. 2004. Shifty operators in changing contexts. In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, 20–37.
- Banfield, Ann. 1982. *Unspeakable sentences: Narration and representation in the language of fiction*. Routledge.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2018. Compositional paths to *de re*. In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, 622–648.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2020. *A theory of indexical shift: Meaning, grammar, and crosslinguistic variation*, volume 82. MIT Press.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 1999. Propositional attitudes and indexicality: A cross categorial approach. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Sharvit, Yael. 2008. The puzzle of free indirect discourse. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31:353–395.
- Sudo, Yasutada. 2010. Person indexicals in Uyghur indexical shifting. In *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 441–456.
- Sundaesan, Sandhya. 2021. Shifty attitudes: Indexical shift versus perspectival anaphora. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 7:235–259.