

Speech reports: Day 3

Context shifting

Pranav Anand ¹ & Natasha Korotkova ^{2,3}

¹ UC Santa Cruz

²University of Konstanz

³University of Tübingen

ESSLLI 31 @ University of Latvia, Riga



Today

- Shifty elements and environments
 - De se
 - FID (cont'd)
 - Indexical shift

De se I

- Awareness: the signature of attitudes *de se* (Lewis 1979; Perry 1979)
- English PRO: the obligatory *de se* construal (Morgan 1970; Chierchia 1989)

- (1) a. *Context: Winnie the Pooh and Piglet are going to hunt a Woozle. They find footprints that they think belong to one of those creatures. Unbeknownst to them, however, they have been walking in circles, and the footprints are Pooh's own.*
- ✓Pooh_i claimed that **he**_i was a Woozle.
#Pooh_i claimed **PRO**_i to be a Woozle.
- b. *Context: Pooh thinks he himself is a Woozle.*
- ✓Pooh_i claimed that **he**_i was a Woozle.
✓Pooh_i claimed **PRO**_i to be a Woozle.

(adapted from Pearson 2013:559-560)

De se II

- *De se*: self-ascription of a property (Lewis 1979; Chierchia 1989)

(2) $\llbracket \text{claim} \rrbracket = \lambda P. \lambda x. \lambda w. \forall \langle x', w' \rangle \in \text{CLAIM}_{x,w} : P(x')(w'),$
where $\text{CLAIM}_{x,w} = \{ \langle x', w' \rangle \mid \text{it is compatible with what } x \text{ claims in } w \text{ for } x \text{ to be } x' \text{ in } w' \}$

- PRO: obligatorily abstracted over (Chierchia 1989)

(3) a. $\lambda w_0 w_0 \text{ Pooh claimed } [\text{CP } \lambda x_1 \lambda w_1 w_1 \text{ PRO}_1 \text{ to be a Woozle }] .$
b. $\llbracket (3a) \rrbracket = 1 \text{ iff } \forall \langle x', w' \rangle \in \text{CLAIM}_{\text{Pooh}, w_0} : x' \text{ is a Woozle in } w' .$

De se III

- *De se* in the nominal domain: logophors, long-distance reflexives, and shifted indexicals (Anand 2006; Schlenker 2011; Pearson 2013; Zu 2018)
- *De se* in the verbal domain: subjective agreement, the jussive mood, experiencer predicates (Zu 2018:174–189), evidentiality (Korotkova 2016, 2019)
- ▶ Some readings: *de se* as *de re* (Lewis 1979; Maier 2010; Santorio 2014); special LFs for *de se* (Pearson 2018, Patel-Grosz forth.)

FID: summary

	INDIRECT DISCOURSE	DIRECT DISCOURSE
de re blocking		✓
temporal indexicals		✓
main clause syntax		✓
1st/2nd de re	✓	
tenses	✓	
no language switch	✓	
de se	✓	

Mixed quotation?

- FID: a case of mixed quotation (Maier 2015); see also (Recanati 2000; Schlenker 2004)

(4) **He**_{NARRATOR} **was**_{NARRATOR} sick “**today**_{HE}”, **he** thought.

- All elements that are typically speaker-oriented are quoted
- Objections
 - Mixed quotation has deferential pragmatics; FID does not
 - Mixed quotation is unconstrained; FID is not
 - ➡ An analysis along those lines: ad-hoc assumptions (see discussion in Sharvit 2008)

Basic solution: bicontextualism I

- Banfield (1982): two contexts
 - the speech context, u
 - the reported thought context, r
- Different elements can be sensitive to different contexts
- Root level: contexts coincide

- (5) If α is a root node, $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{u,r,g}$ is defined if and only if
- u is the utterance context;
 - $r = u$;
 - $g = \text{assignment}(r)$

Basic solution: bicontextualism II

- An idea embraced in various ways by Doron (1991); Schlenker (2004); Sharvit (2008); Eckardt (2014)
- **Personal indexicals: speech context**

(6) $\llbracket x_i^{1st} \rrbracket^{u,r,g}$ defined only if $g(i) = \text{SPEAKER}(u)$

- **Adverbial indexicals: reported context**

(7) $\llbracket \text{today}_i \rrbracket^{u,r,g}$ defined only if $g(i)$ is the day surrounding $\text{TIME}(r)$

- **Pronominal gender features: reported context**

(8) $\llbracket x_i^{1st} \rrbracket^{u,r,g}$ defined only if $g(i) = \text{SPEAKER}(u)$

- Locus of variation: the lexicon
- Parallel: contexts of assessment for predicates of personal taste and epistemic modals (MacFarlane 2014)

Tense in FID I

- Tense itself does not shift
- SOT: a feature of attitudinal complements (overview in Ogihara and Sharvit 2012; Sharvit 2017)
- Cross-linguistic variation: SOT vs. non-SOT contrast preserved in FID (Schlenker 1999; Sharvit 2008; Eckardt 2014)

	SOT	FID-SOT	QUOTES
English, German	✓	✓	no
Hebrew, Russian	no	no	no

Tense in FID II

- English: SOT language, present-under-past does not have a simultaneous reading

- (9) a. #Two years ago, John found out that Mary is pregnant.
b. ✓Two years ago, John found out that Mary was pregnant.

- FID in English: no simultaneous reading

- (10) Original thought: “Yes, I am definitely pregnant.”
- a. #Yes, she is definitely pregnant(, thought Mary).
 - b. Yes, she was definitely pregnant(, thought Mary).
- (Sharvit 2008:357)

Tense in FID III

- Hebrew: non-SOT language, present-under-past can have a simultaneous reading

(11) Hebrew

Yosef gila Se Miriam hara
Yosef find.out.PST COMP Miriam pregnant
'Yosef found out that Miriam was pregnant (at the time of
utterance).'

- FID in Hebrew: simultaneous reading

(12) Hebrew

Ken, hi le-lo safek hara (, xaSva Meri).
 Yes she definitely pregnant think.PST Meri
 'Yes, she was definitely pregnant(, thought Mary).'
 (Sharvit 2008:357)

Tense in FID IV

- Temporal *de se* in non-SOT languages: simultaneous present-under-past is the protagonist's "now" in FID

Context: Dan wakes up from a coma. It's February, but the calendar in his room still shows January, because the hospital staff forgot to turn the page. Dan says to himself (in Hebrew): "Mira is supposed to give birth on January 31st." Mira is his wife.

(13) STANDARD INDIRECT DISCOURSE

Dan xaSav Se Mira (hayta) amura laledet
Dan think.PST that Mira (be.PST) supposed give-birth
be-yanuar.
in-January

'Dan thought that Mira was supposed to give birth in January.'

Tense in FID V

(14) FID

Mira (#hayta) amura laledet be-yanuar(, xaSav Dan)
Mira be.PST supposed give-birth in-January think.PST dan
'Mira was supposed to give birth in January, thought Dan.'
(Sharvit 2008:378)

- FID: an attitude environment
- FID operator: a covert doxastic

- (15) a. $\llbracket \text{think} \rrbracket^{u,r,g}(w)(p)(t)(x) = 1$ iff $\forall \langle w', t', x' \rangle$ compatible with what x believes in w at t : $p(w')(t')(x') = 1$
- b. $\llbracket \text{FID} \rrbracket^{u,r,g}(w)(t)(x)(f) = 1$ iff $\forall \langle r', g' \rangle$ compatible with what x believes in w at t :
 $f(r')(g')(world(r'))(time(r'))(author(r'))$

Sharvit (2008) II

- The SOT facts and *de se* pronoun handled by same mechanism: feature deletion under binding (see Eckardt 2014 for disagreement)
- When a tense (or pronoun) is bound by one of the abstractors, the associate presupposition is deleted (leaving just the bound variable)

(16) a. She was pregnant, thought Mary.

b. FID-Mary- t_1^{past} - w_2 $\lambda w_3 \lambda t_4 \lambda x_5$ she₆ t_4^{past} was pregnant

- This is why SOT and *de se* pronominals have matrix world features: morphology that is not interpreted

Bottom line I

- Why an operator: elements with structural reference (tenses/pronouns)
 - ➡ Asymmetry between personal vs. non-personal indexicals
- Operators may not be enough/needed
 - cross-sentential FID
 - perspectival elements with flexible reference: epithets, appositives, expressives (Harris and Potts 2009; Harris 2012; Kaiser 2015)

(17) *Context: My aunt is extremely skeptical of doctors in general.*

- She** says that dentists, **who are only in it for the money anyway**_{AUNT}, are not to be trusted at all.
- Dentists, **who are only in it for the money anyway**_{AUNT}, are not to be trusted at all.

(Harris and Potts 2009:Appendix A, ex.3)

Bottom line II

- Psycholinguistic profile: direct or indirect?
- Cross-linguistic variation in indexicality (acknowledged by Sharvit)?

What FID reports I

- Standard view

(18) OVERT SPEECH:

He was arriving today, she **told** him.

(19) THOUGHT (hence the doxastic operator):

He was arriving today, she **thought**.

- Incorrect prediction: all doxastics license FID

(20) He was arriving today, she **{??believed, ??was certain}**.

(21) What would he say to her? she **{??was curious}**.

- Proposal: FID is always a speech report

What FID reports II

- Most doxastic predicates are not communicative

- (22)
- a. #“He is running late,” she believed/was certain.
 - b. #“He is running late,” she discovered/figured out/knew.
 - c. #“What are we doing?” she was curious (about).

- Some doxastic predicates license direct discourse and quotative inversion

- (23)
- a. “He is running late,” she thought (aloud/to herself).
 - b. “He is running late,” she realized.
 - c. “What are we doing?” she wondered (aloud/to herself).

- Proposal: such cases report internal speech and license FID

What FID reports III

- Commitments rather than words

- (24) a. • When he wanted to illustrate his theory of descriptions, Russell said: “The King of France is bald.”
b. #When Russell wanted to illustrate his theory of descriptions, he said that The King of France was bald.
c. #The King of France was bald(, said Russell when he wanted to illustrate his theory of descriptions).
(Sharvit 2008:392)
- (25) a. To illustrate inversion in English Zeljko said: “ Is John still here?”
b. # Was John still here, asked Zeljko to illustrate inversion in English.
(Sharvit 2008:392)

Indexical shift

The phenomenon I

The upshot

True indexicals may switch reference in attitudes

- Indexicals shift

(26) Korean

John-i [Mary-ka **na-lul** cohahanta-ko] malhayssta.
John-NOM [Mary-NOM **I-ACC** like-COMP] said

NON-SHIFTED: 'John said that Mary likes me'.

SHIFTED: 'John said that Mary likes her (Mary)'. (Park 2015)

The phenomenon II

- Such pronouns are indexicals

(27) Korean

- a. Definite description

Obama-ka malhal ttyay.mata hwaca-nun taythonglyeng-ita.
Obama-NOM speak whenever speaker-TOP president-be
'Whenever Obama speaks, the speaker is president.'

- b. I

Obama-ka malhal ttyay.mata na-nun taythonglyeng-ita.
Obama-NOM speak whenever I-TOP president-be
'Whenever Obama speaks, I am president.' (Park 2015)

The phenomenon III

- Such clauses are not quotations

(28) Korean

Mary-ka [nwuka na-lul coahanta-ko] malhayss-ni?

Mary-nom [who I-ACC like-COMP] say.PST-Q

NON-SHIFTED: 'Who did Mary say likes me?'

SHIFTED: 'Who did Mary say likes her (Mary)?' (Park 2015)

The phenomenon IV

(29) Uyghur: Indexical shift over negative concord

Tursun { men hichkim-ni kör-di-m } di-mi-di
Tursun.NOM { I.NOM nobody-ACC see-PST-1SG } say-NEG-PST.3

- (i) NON-SHIFTED: # 'Tursun said that I {the speaker} saw anybody'.
- (ii) SHIFTED: ✓ 'Tursun didn't say that he {Tursun} saw anybody.' (Sudo 2012:205, ex.610)//

Accounts

- ① Pragmatics (Maier 2007; Bittner 2007, 2012; Roberts 2015)
- ② Semantics/syntax (Schlenker 1999, 2003; von Stechow 2002; Anand and Nevins 2004; Shklovsky and Sudo 2014 a.o.)

Indexical shift as mixed quotation

- Maier (2007)

(30) Pseudo-Zazaki:
Meaghan thinks that “I” am a space alien.

- Problems (many shared by other pragmatic approaches)
 - Mixed quotation has a special pragmatics
 - Cross-linguistic variation
 - Syntactic restrictions
 - *De se*

Typology of indexical shift I

- (31) A. **No pronominal shift:** English; French; Russian; ...
- B. **Optional pronominal shift:** Aghem (Bantu), Amharic (Semitic) (Schlenker 1999, 2003, secondhand data from (Hyman 1979) and (Leslau 1995)); Japanese (Sudo 2012); Korean (Park 2014); Kurmanji (Iranian; Koev 2013); Mishar Tatar (Turkic; Podobryaev 2014), Navajo (Athabaskan; Speas 1999); Nez Perce (Sahaptian; Deal 2014); Slave (Northern Athapaskan; Rice 1986); Tamil (Dravidian; Sundaresan 2012); Tsez (Nakh-Daghestanian; Polinsky 2015); Turkish (Turkic; Şener and Şener 2011; Özyildiz 2012); Zazaki (Iranian; Anand and Nevins 2004; Anand 2006)
- C. **Obligatory pronominal shift:** Balkar (Turkic; Koval 2014); Matses (Panoan; Munro et al. 2012); Uyghur (Turkic; Shklovsky and Sudo 2014; Sudo 2012; Major 2019)

Typology of indexical shift II

(32) Pronouns that shift:

	Shifty 1st	Shifty 2nd	Shifty HERE
Zazaki	✓	✓	✓
Uyghur	✓	✓	—
Tamil	✓	—	—
English	—	—	—

(Deal 2017)

Role shift, again

- Schlenker (2017a,b): Role Shift as indexical shift

Indexical shift as binding

- Schlenker (1999, 2003); von Stechow (2002)
- Locus of variation: pronouns

- (33)
- A. **No pronominal shift:** $\llbracket I \rrbracket = \text{AUTHOR}(c^*)$
 - B. **Optional pronominal shift:** $\llbracket I \rrbracket = \text{AUTHOR}(k)$, k is a context variable that can be bound locally and non-locally
 - C. **Obligatory pronominal shift:** $\llbracket I \rrbracket = \text{AUTHOR}(k)$, k is a context variable that has to be bound locally

- Problems:
 - subtle restrictions, including cross-linguistic variation and dependencies between indexicals
 - differences between tense and pure indexicals

Shift together I

(34) Zazaki: Shift-Together:

Context: Hesen returns to Diyarbekir with his young son Ali.

waxto kε e Diyarbekir-de bime, Heseni Ali-ra va
 when that they D.-at were, Heseni.OBL Ali-at said {
 kε ti ita ame dina }
 that you here came world }
 'When they were in Diyarbekir, Heseni told Ali, you {HEARER, Ali}
 were born here {LOCATION, Diyarbekir}.'

- (i) NOTHING SHIFTS: ✓you=HEARER, here=LOCATION
 - (ii) BOTH SHIFT: ✓you=Ali, here=Diyarbakir
 - (iii) ONLY ADVERBIAL SHIFTS: #you=HEARER, here=Diyarbakir
 - (iv) ONLY PRONOUN SHIFTS: #you=Ali, here=LOCATION
- (Anand 2006:99, ex.294)

Shift together II

(35) Zazaki

	Speaker's here	Diyarbakir
you=HEARER	✓	☹
you=Ali	☹	✓

- Potential explanation: a pragmatic principle “Don’t mix perspectives” (cf. Harris 2012)
- Not all languages obey shift-together
- Some languages obey it partially
 - Korean: within personal indexicals, within adverbial indexicals
 - Uyghur: within DP

Conditional shift I

- (36) Nez Perce: personal and locative shift

Talmaks-pa *pro*_{subj} hi-pe-hi-n-e [*pro*_{subj} weet'u
Talmaks-LOC *pro* 3S-S.PL-say-PRF-REM.PST [*pro* not
kíne Ø-wisiinu' kii k'ay'x-pa]
here 1S-be.PROSP.PL this week-LOC
SHIFTED: 'They said at Talmaks they (lit. we) won't be at Talmaks
(lit. *here*) this week.'
(Deal 2014:ex.23)

Conditional shift II

- (37) Nez Perce: locative shift without personal shift

Context: Harold is in Clarkston. I and my consultant are in Lapwai.

#pay's	harold	hi-neki-se-∅	{	<i>pro</i> _{subj}	∅-wees	kine
maybe	Harold	3S-think-IPV-PRES		<i>pro</i>	1s -be.PRES	here
clarkston-pa]				
Clarkston-LOC]				

Intended: 'Maybe Harold thinks that I (the speaker) am there (lit. *here*) in Clarkson'.
(Deal 2014:ex.27)

Conditional shift III

- (38) Nez Perce: personal shift without locative shift

Context: my friend is calling me on his cellphone and describing his location. He is trying to make it to Lapwai, but he is lost.

pro_{subj} hi-hi-ce- \emptyset { pro_{subj} **kíne** \emptyset -paay-ca- \emptyset }
 pro 3S-say-IPV-PRES { pro **here** **1s**-arrive-IPV-PRES }
 shifted: 'He says he (lit. I) is arriving here (=actual location), but he is not arriving here (=actual location).' (Deal 2014:ex.25)

- (39) Summary

	Locative shift	No locative shift
Personal shift	✓	✓
No personal shift	☹	✓

No shift outside of clausal complements

(40) Japanese

Mary-niyoruto, John-ga watashi-o suki
Mary-according.to, John-NOM I-ACC like

- (i) NON-SHIFTED: ✓ 'According to Mary, John likes me (the speaker)'
- (ii) SHIFTED: # 'According to Mary, John likes her (Mary)'
(Yasutada Sudo, p.c.)

Clause types

- Finite clauses

(41) Uyghur

Ahmet [men ket-ti-m] di-di
Ahmet.NOM [I.NOM leave-PST-1SG] say-PST

- (i) NON-SHIFTED: #‘Ahmet said that I (the speaker) left’.
- (ii) SHIFTED: ✓‘Ahmet said that he (Ahmet) left’.
- (Sudo 2012:203, ex.603b)

- Nominalizations

(42) Uyghur

Ahmet	[mening	kit-ken-lik-im-ni]	di-di
Ahmet.NOM		I.GEN	leave-REL-NMLZ-1SG-ACC		say-PST

- (i) NON-SHIFTED: ✓‘Ahmet said that I (the speaker) left’.
- (ii) SHIFTED: #‘Ahmet said that he (Ahmet) left’.
- (Sudo 2012:203, ex.603a)

Summary of constraints

- Language-specific shift-together restrictions
- Dependencies between different indexicals
- Shift only in finite clausal complements
- ▶ Consensus (though see Sundaresan 2018): shift is handled by context-shifting operators (Anand and Nevins 2004; Anand 2006) in the syntax (Shklovsky and Sudo 2014; Deal 2017)

Shifted indexicals *de se* I

- First discovered by Schlenker (1999) for Amharic

(43) Zazaki

✓ Context 1: *Hesen says, "I am sick today."*

Context 2: Hesen, at the hospital for a checkup, happens to glance at the chart of a patient's blood work. Hesen, a doctor himself, sees that the patient is clearly sick, but the name is hard to read. He says to the nurse when she comes in, "This guy is really sick."

Heseni va { ke ez newesha }
Hesen.OBL said { that I sick.PRES }
'Hesen said that he was sick.'

(Anand 2006:79)

Shifted indexicals *de se* II

- Problem for the mixed quotation account: regular indexicals are not obligatorily *de se* (pace Roberts 2015)
- (44) Sam looks like his brother Ash in his baby photos and often doesn't recognize himself.
- a. ✓ I claimed that I was Ash.
 - b. # I claimed to be Ash.
- Analysis of indexical shift: context-shifting operators

Monsters I

- Index


$$(45) \quad i_k = c^* = \langle author, hearer, \dots, world \rangle$$

- Monster

$$(46) \quad \llbracket \text{👻} \phi \rrbracket^{c,i,g} = \llbracket \phi \rrbracket^{i,i,g}$$

Monsters II

(47) pseudo-Zazaki

- a. Meaghan thinks that I am a space alien.
SHIFTED: 'Meaghan thinks that she {Meaghan} is a space alien'.
- b. LF: [Meaghan thinks [ [I am a space alien]]]
- c. $\llbracket 47a \rrbracket^{c,i,g}$
 $= \llbracket \text{think} \rrbracket^{c,i,g}$
 $(\lambda i'. \llbracket \text{alien} [\text{I am an alien}] \rrbracket^{c,i',g})(\llbracket \text{Meaghan} \rrbracket^{c,i,g})$
 $= 1 \text{ iff } \forall i' \text{ compatible with what Meaghan think at } i,$
 $\llbracket \text{alien} [\text{I am an alien}] \rrbracket^{c,i',g}$
 $= 1 \text{ iff } \forall i' \text{ compatible with what Meaghan think at } i,$
 $\llbracket \text{I am an alien} \rrbracket^{i',i',g}$
 $= 1 \text{ iff } \forall i' \text{ compatible with what Meaghan think at } i,$
 $\text{AUTHOR}(i') \text{ is an alien at } i'$

Predicates I

- Tsez (Polinsky 2015:17)

- (48) a. 'see', and its derivative 'see in a dream'; 'explain'; 'believe';
'say'; 'tell', and its derivative 'lie'; 'request, ask'; 'hope';
'apologize'; 'be forgiven'; 'promise'; 'think'; 'brag, lie';
'worry'; 'be forgotten/forget'; 'hear'; 'read'; 'complain'.
- b. finite complements are headed by $=\lambda in$ (< 'say')

Predicates II

- Uyghur (Sudo 2012:229-233)

- (49) a. *de-* 'say'; *sözle-* 'speak, talk'; *maxtan-* 'brag'; *qayil qil-* 'persuade, convince'; *aghrin-* 'complain'; *wede qal-* 'promise'; *bil-* 'believe, know'; *oyla-* 'think'; *ansir-* 'worry'; *ümid qil-* 'hope'; *xejal qil-* 'dream'; *angla-* 'hear'; *oqu-* 'read'
- b. only 'say' takes bare complements; others are headed by *dep* (< 'say')
- Say-complementizers are active Özyildiz et al. (forth.), Major (2019) (the idea going back to Koopman and Sportiche 1989)
 - Can there be a pragmatic story?

Tomorrow

- Communicative predicates
- Hearsay evidentiality

References I

- Anand, P. (2006). *De de se*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Anand, P. and A. Nevins (2004). Shifty operators in changing contexts. In R. B. Young (Ed.), *Proceedings of SALT 14*, pp. 20–37.
- Banfield, A. (1982). *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. Routledge.
- Bittner, M. (2007). Online update: Temporal, modal, and *de se* anaphora in polysynthetic discourse. In C. Barker and P. Jacobson (Eds.), *Direct compositionality*, pp. 363–404. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bittner, M. (2012). Perspectival discourse referents for indexicals. In H. Greene (Ed.), *SULA 7: Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting on the Semantics of Under-represented Languages in the Americas*.
- Chierchia, G. (1989). Anaphora and attitudes *de se*. In R. Bartsch, J. van Benthem, and P. van Emde Boas (Eds.), *Language in Context*. Foris.
- Deal, A. R. (2014). Nez Perce embedded indexicals. In H. Greene (Ed.), *Proceedings of SULA 7*, Amherst, pp. 23–40. GLSA.
- Deal, A. R. (2017). Shifty asymmetries: universals and variation in shifty indexicality. Ms., UC Berkeley.

References II

- Doron, E. (1991). Point of view as a factor of content. In S. Moore and A. Wyner (Eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 1*, pp. 51–64. Cornell University.
- Eckardt, R. (2014). *The Semantics of Free Indirect Discourse: How Texts Allow Us to Mind-read and Eavesdrop*. Leiden: Brill.
- Harris, J. A. (2012). *Processing perspectives*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Harris, J. A. and C. Potts (2009). Perspective-shifting with appositives and expressives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 32(6), 523–552.
- Hyman, L. (Ed.) (1979). *Aghem grammatical Structure*. Number 7 in Southern California occasional papers in linguistics.
- Kaiser, E. (2015). Perspective-shifting and free indirect discourse: Experimental investigations. In *Proceedings of SALT 25*, pp. 346–372.
- Koev, T. (2013). *Apposition and the structure of discourse*. Ph. D. thesis, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.
- Koopman, H. and D. Sportiche (1989). Pronouns, logical variables, and logophoricity in Abe. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(4), 555–588.

References III

- Korotkova, N. (2016). *Heterogeneity and Universality in the Evidential Domain*. PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Korotkova, N. (2019). The subjective heart of evidentiality. Ms., University of Konstanz.
- Koval, P. (2014). Indexical shifting in Balkar. To be presented at the workshop *Pronouns in the embedded contexts at the syntax-semantics interface*, November 7–9, 2014, Tübingen.
- Leslau, W. (1995). *Reference grammar of Amharic*. Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Lewis, D. (1979). Attitudes *de dicto* and *de se*. *Philosophical Review* 88(4), 513–543.
- MacFarlane, J. (2014). *Assessment Sensitivity: Relative Truth and Its Applications*. Oxford University Press.
- Maier, E. (2007). Quotation marks as monsters or the other way round. In M. Aloni, P. Dekker, and F. Roelofsen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 16th Amsterdam Colloquium*, pp. 145–150.
- Maier, E. (2010). Presupposing acquaintance: a unified semantics for *de dicto*, *de re* and *de se* belief reports. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 32, 429–474.

References IV

- Maier, E. (2015). Quotation and unquotation in free indirect discourse. *Mind and language* 30(3), 345–373.
- Major, T. (2019). Revisiting the syntax of monsters in Uyghur. Ms., UCLA.
- Morgan, J. (1970). On the criterion of identity for noun phrase deletion. In *Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp. 380–389.
- Munro, R., R. Ludwig, U. Sauerland, and D. W. Fleck (2012). Reported speech in Matsigenka: Perspective persistence and evidential narratives. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 78(1), 41–75.
- Ogihara, T. and Y. Sharvit (2012). Embedded tenses. In R. I. Binnick (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of tense and aspect*, Chapter 22, pp. 638–668. OUP.
- Özyildiz, D. (2012). When *I* is not me: A preliminary case study of shifted indexicals in Turkish. Ms., École Normale Supérieure.
- Özyildiz, D., T. Major, and E. Maier (To appear). Communicative reception reports as hear-say: Evidence from indexical shift in Turkish. In *Proceedings of the 36th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*.
- Park, Y. (2014). Indexicals and the long-distance reflexive *caki* in Korean. Handout of the talk presented at *GLOW 37*, April 4, 2014, Brussels.

References V

- Park, Y. (2015). Indexical shift and the long-distance reflexive *caki* in Korean. Ms., UMass.
- Patel-Grosz, P. (Forth). Pronominal typology and the *de se/de re* distinction. *Linguistics and Philosophy*.
- Pearson, H. (2013). *The sense of self: topics in the semantics of de se expressions*. Ph. D. thesis, Harvard.
- Pearson, H. (2018). Counterfactual *de se*. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 11. Early access.
- Perry, J. (1979). The problem of the essential indexical. *Noûs* 1(13), 3–21.
- Podobryaev, A. (2014). *Persons, Imposters, and Monsters*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
- Polinsky, M. (2015). Embedded finite complements, indexical shift, and binding in Tsez. *Languages of the Caucasus* 1(1).
- Recanati, F. (2000). *Oratio Obliqua, Oratio Recta*. MIT Press.
- Rice, K. (1986). Some remarks on direct and indirect speech in Slave (Northern Athapaskan). In *Direct and indirect speech*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, C. (2015). Indexicality: *de se* semantics and pragmatics. Ms., The Ohio State University.
- Santorio, P. (2014). On the plurality of indices. Ms., University of Leeds.

References VI

- Schlenker, P. (1999). *Propositional attitudes and indexicality: a cross-categorical approach*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Schlenker, P. (2003). A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26(1), 29–120.
- Schlenker, P. (2004). Context of thought and context of utterance (a note on free indirect discourse and the historical present). *Mind and language* 19(3), 279–304.
- Schlenker, P. (2011). Indexicality and *De Se* reports. In K. V. Heusinger, C. Maienborn, and P. Portner (Eds.), *Semantics: an international handbook of natural language meaning*, Volume 2, Chapter 61, pp. 1561–1604. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schlenker, P. (2017a). Super monsters i: Attitude and action role shift in sign language. *Semantics and Pragmatics*.
- Schlenker, P. (2017b). Super monsters II: Role Shift, iconicity and quotation in Sign Language. *Semantics and Pragmatics*.
- Şener, N. and S. Şener (2011). Null subjects and indexicality in Turkish and Uyghur. In *Proceedings of WAFL 7*.
- Sharvit, Y. (2008). The puzzle of free indirect discourse. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31(3), 353–395.

References VII

- Sharvit, Y. (2017). Sot: Syntax, semantics, pragmatics. In P. Patel-Grosz, P. G. Grosz, and S. Zobel (Eds.), *Pronouns in Embedded Contexts at the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Springer.
- Shklovsky, K. and Y. Sudo (2014). The syntax of monsters. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(3), 381–402.
- Speas, M. (1999). Person and point of view in Navajo direct discourse complements. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- von Stechow, A. (2002). Feature deletion under semantic binding: tense, person, and mood under verbal quantifiers. In *Proceedings of NELS 33*.
- Sudo, Y. (2012). *On the semantics of phi-features on pronouns*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
- Sundaresan, S. (2012). *Context and (Co)reference in the syntax and its interfaces*. PhD dissertation, University of Stuttgart and University of Tromsø.
- Sundaresan, S. (2018). An alternative model of indexical shift: Variation and selection without context-overwriting. Ms., Leipzig University.
- Zu, V. (2018). *Discourse Participants and the Structural Representation of the Context*. Ph. D. thesis, New York University.