

A syntactic feature-calculus and double-access analysis for indexical-shift in Tamil
Sandhya Sundaresan, CASTL (Tromsø)/Stuttgart

Here I present new evidence of a “partial” indexical shift, as in the (1) from Tamil:

- (1) raman_i [_{CP} taan_i poo.v.een(*aan)-nnu] so.nn.aan
 raman SE_i go.FUT.1SG(*3SG)-that say.PST.3MSG
 “Raman said [_{CP} that he_i would go]”

The matrix subject in (1) is 3MSG; the matrix verb denotes a speech-report and agrees in ϕ -features with the matrix subject. The embedded clausal complement contains a subject which has traditionally been described as a 3SG SE-anaphor (Annamalai, 1999): it is obligatorily coreferent with the matrix subject and interpreted obligatorily *de se*. But the embedded verb which should agree with its clausemate subject surfaces not as 3MSG but with 1SG agreement. Crucially and tellingly, such mismatched verbal agreement only seems to appear under matrix speech-event denoting verbs like SAY; with all other clausal-complement taking verbs, we get the expected 3MSG on the embedded verb (2):

- (2) raman_i [_{CP} taan_i poo.v.aan/(*een)-nnu] kaanḍupidi.tt.aan
 raman_i SE_i go.FUT.3SG(*1SG)-that find-out.PST.3MSG
 “Raman_i found out [_{CP} that he_i would go]”

Why is subject-verb agreement obligatorily absent in (1) but obligatorily present in (2)? Consider the Zazaki structure (3) below (Anand and Nevins, 2004):

- (3) Hesen_j (mi_k-ra) va ke εz_{j/k} dēwletia
 Hesen.OBL (I.OBL-TO said that I rich.be-PRES
 “Hesen said that {I am, Hesen is} rich.”

The indexical pronoun εz in (3) can refer to the speaker as is standard. But, just like the 1SG embedded-verbal agreement in (1), it can also refer to the attitude-holder *Hesen*). Also, the indexical shift in Zazaki (3), is induced only under the scope of a (language-specific) proper subset of intensional predicates (Schlenker, To appear) – just as with (1) vs. (2) above – suggesting that the embedded CP in (1) involves indexical shift. (4) confirms further that genuine indexical shift and not e.g. a quotative is involved. An NPI inside a quotative may not be licensed by an operator outside the quote – however, (4) is fully licit:

- (4) raman taan_i yenda tappu.m senjeen-nnu ottukka.le
 raman SE which mistake.even made-that admit.NEG
 “Raman_i didn’t admit that he_{i,*j} made any mistake.”

Nevertheless, there is one important difference between (1) and (3). The subject-verb person-feature mismatch in (1) obtains within the same embedded clause and not cross-clausally, as in (3). Problematically, the non-agreeing feature in (1) is on verbal agreement which, under standard assumptions for subject-verb agreement (Chomsky, 2001), is inherited from the subject and is not inherent. But the clausemate subject *taan* itself shows different person-features (3rd) from that on the verb (1st)! A promising solution to this dilemma is initially suggested by Anand (2006)’s proposal that Malayalam *taan* (featurally identical to Tamil *taan*) is itself underlyingly a 1st-person indexical because it yields obligatory *de se* readings. Tamil *taan* behaves exactly like its Malayalam counterpart with respect to this diagnostic, suggesting that it is also a 1st-person indexical (albeit, crucially, a shifted one). If this is correct, we could claim that the 1st-person agreement on the embedded verb in (1) is merely be due to standard Agree between embedded T and 1SG DP in [Spec, TP]. We could try to extend Anand’s context-overwriting approach for the Tamil data using a parametrized context-shifting operator: $[[OP_{auth}\alpha]]^{c,i,g} = [[\alpha]]^{j,i,g}$, where $j = \langle Auth(i), Addr(c), Time(c), World(c) \rangle$. But there are

Table 1: SPELL-OUT RULES IN A LATE INSERTION MODEL

	[1,sg]	\longleftrightarrow	<i>-een</i>
AGR	[3, masc, sg]	\longleftrightarrow	<i>-aan</i>
	[1, sg]	\longleftrightarrow	<i>naan</i>
	[1, sg, -R]	\longleftrightarrow	<i>taan</i>
PRONOUN	[2, sg]	\longleftrightarrow	<i>nii</i>
	[3, masc, sg, +R]	\longleftrightarrow	<i>avan</i>
	[3, fem, sg, +R]	\longleftrightarrow	<i>ava]</i>

two serious problems: 1. *taan* can only take 3rd-person antecedents. Such a restriction could be handled by claiming that context-shifting operators may only appear on embedding predicates marked 3rd person but, as Anand concedes, this is stipulative. 2. to account for “regular” subject-verb agreement in (2), Anand’s analysis would have to claim that *taan* is not an indexical but a logophor in such cases (inheriting its antecedent’s ϕ -features and transmitting these to the embedded verb (Kratzer, 2009)). However, *taan* in (2) is also interpreted obligatorily *de se* which, under Anand’s analysis, automatically means that it is also a 1st-person indexical – bringing us back to the original problem. **Solution:** The embedded CP in (1)/(2) represents an eventuality that is simultaneously 1st-person relative to the matrix subject, but 3rd-person relative to the utterance-context speaker. Thus, I propose that indexical shift on *taan* is not due to context-overwriting but due to simultaneous access to embedding and utterance contexts in the embedded cartographic C-layer (an idea used for deriving Double Access Readings for tense (Giorgi, 2010)). Specifically, in (2), both utterance and embedding contexts are present in the embedded C-layer, but in (1), only the latter is. Support for the idea that the embedded C-layer in (1) is smaller than that in (2) comes from the fact that the embedded CP in (1) can be replaced by a gerundival whereas that in (2) cannot (as easily). **Result:** the $DP_{embedded}$ in (2) can be syntactically specified as both 1st (against $Context_{embedding}: \lambda c. Author(c)$) and 3rd person (relative to $Context_{utterance}$). But the $DP_{embedded}$ in (1) can only be specified 1st-person because a 3rd-person feature would not be evaluable against $Context_{utterance}$ as this is absent and would crash. Spell-Out rules in Table 1 (including a -R syntactic feature encoding referential anaphoricity (Reinhart and Reuland, 1993) to distinguish indexicals like *taan* from purely deictic ones like *naan* (‘I’)) use different underspecification patterns for $DP_{embedded}$ and $Agr/T_{embedded}$: thus, in (2) with [1,3], “3rd person” is inserted for $Agr_{embedded}$ but *taan* is inserted for $DP_{embedded}$.

References

- Anand, Pranav. 2006. *De de se*. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Anand, Pranav, and Andrew Nevins. 2004. Shifty operators in changing contexts. In *SALT*.
- Annamalai, E. 1999. Lexical anaphors and pronouns in Tamil. In *Lexical and anaphors and pronouns in selected South Asian languages: a principled typology*, ed. Barbara C. Lust, Kashi Wali, James W. Gair, and K.V. Subbarao, 169–216. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Giorgi, Alessandra. 2010. *Towards a syntax of indexicality*. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2009. Making a pronoun: fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40.
- Reinhart, Tanya, and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:657–720.
- Schlenker, Philippe. To appear. Indexicality and *de se* reports. In *Handbook of Semantics*, ed. von Heusinger, Maienborn, and Portner. Mouton de Gruyter.