

INTER-SPEAKER VARIATION AND CONSTRUCTION SPECIFIC RESTRICTIONS ON INDEXICAL SHIFT IN POSHKART CHUVASH

MIKHAIL KNYAZEV

Institute for Linguistic Studies RAS; National Research University Higher School of Economics, Saint-Petersburg

1 Introduction

Indexical shift is a phenomenon observed in reported speech/thought constructions in various languages and is roughly characterized as a situation whereby indexical elements (e.g., 1st/2nd person pronouns, etc.) within the complement clause are interpreted relative to the reported context, i.e., ‘shifted’ (see Deal 2017 and Sundaresan 2018 for overviews). Crucially, indexical shift is distinguished from quotation (i.e., traditional ‘direct speech’) in that it is transparent to various grammatical phenomena such as long-distance scope of *wh*-words, NPI licensing, etc. which do not occur in quotation. Furthermore, clauses containing shifted indexicals need not be faithful to the original quote and can, e.g., contain elements that take the perspective of the *actual* speaker (see, e.g., Anand & Nevins 2004).

To illustrate, in example (1a) from the Poshkart dialect of Chuvash (PC), the 1st person agreement marker *-p* can refer not only to the current speaker, as in (i), but also to the matrix subject (= reported speaker), as in (ii), instantiating a shifted interpretation (which is, in fact, more natural in a neutral context).¹¹ Note that for the shifted interpretation to be possible the embedded subject must be non-overt, represented here as *pro*, cf. (2). The fact that (ii) is not a quotation is shown by an overt 2nd person pronoun *sanba* in the complement clause referring to the *actual* addressee; similarly, (1b) contains the *wh*-word *kamba* in the complement clause taking scope over the whole sentence (cf. ‘for which *x*, Boris said that he is going to work with *x*’), which would be impossible in quotation. In what follows, I will only use the first

¹¹ All PC data come from my own fieldwork elicited in the Poshkart village (Chuvash Republic, Russia), as part of student expeditions organized by Masha Kholodilova and the HSE in Saint Petersburg in 2017–2019.

diagnostic for indexical shift, as in (1a).

- (1) DEFAULT PATTERN (NULL SUBJECT + 1ST PERSON AGREEMENT)
- a (son^ja,) boris man-a [*pro* san-ba **ëçl-e-p**] te-ze kala-r^j-e.
 Sonya Boris 1SG-OBJ 2SG-INS work-NPST-1SG say-CVB say-PST-3SG
 i. ‘(Sonya,) Boris₁ told me that I_{speaker} will work with you_{addressee}.’
 ii. ‘(Sonya,) Boris₁ told me that he₁ will work with you_{addressee}.’
- b. boris [*pro* kam-ba **ëçl-e-p**] te-ze kala-r^j-e?
 e? Boris who-INS work-NPST-1SG say-CVB say-PST-3SG
 ‘Who did Boris₁ say he₁ will work with?’

As was shown in previous work (Knyazev 2019), indexical shift in PC is optional (cf. (1a)) and is restricted to 1st person subject agreement in finite clauses (typically introduced by the complementizer *teze*, morphologically a converb of the quotative verb *te* ‘say’). Thus, only null but not overt pronouns can shift (cf. Podobryaev 2014 for a similar observation for Mishar Tatar), as shown in (2), cf. (1a). In addition, 2nd person does not shift at all (see Knyazev 2019).

- (2) boris man-a [**ep** san-ba **ëçl-e-p**] te-ze kala-r^j-e.
 Boris 1SG-OBJ 1SG.NOM 2SG-INS work-NPST-1SG say-CVB say-PST-3SG
 i. #‘Boris₁ told me that he₁ will work with you_{addressee}.’
 ii. ‘Boris₁ told me that I_{speaker} will work with you_{addressee}.’

Whereas (1a) instantiates the standard (‘default’) pattern of realizing the relevant meaning, which is accepted by all speakers of PC, there are two other patterns, namely, so-called ‘monstrous agreement’ (3rd person subject + 1st person agreement) and the ‘English-style’ pattern (3rd person subject + 3rd person agreement), which are accepted by different subsets of PC speakers.

The goal of this paper is twofold. First, to provide a systematic account of inter-speaker variation in the domain of indexical shift. Second, to discuss two distributional asymmetries exhibited by the default pattern and the English-style pattern with respect to their occurrence in a specific syntactic configuration, namely the first conjunct in a construction involving coordination of embedded clauses (and contrastive topics), as opposed to the ‘unmarked’ construction (ordinary complements of speech/thought predicates).

I will propose an account of these asymmetries in terms of markedness constraints on the realization of Person features on the embedded subject and T(ense), as developed in Messick 2017. I will also suggest a modification, namely relativizing the constraint favoring the realization of the [+author] feature on the embedded T to ‘most prototypical’ constructions with reported speech. My account will heavily rely on the idea of competition between null and overt pronouns. Specifically, I will propose two different variants of the *Minimize DP!* constraint (Patel-Grosz & Grosz 2017), which are operative for different subsets of PC speakers. I will also discuss some evidence from related constructions in Russian and from the construction with verbs of hearing in PC (see Knyazev 2019).

I believe that the two asymmetries discussed in this paper will highlight the fact that interpretative properties of indexical shift may to some extent be sensitive to its occurrence in

a specific construction, a point which, to my mind, is not often discussed in the relevant literature.

2 Two asymmetries

2.1 Monstrous agreement

As I mentioned above, the pattern in (1a), with a null subject and 1st person agreement, is the default way of expressing a speech report in which the embedded subject is co-indexed with the matrix subject (i.e., reported speaker). The same meaning can also be expressed by another pattern illustrated in (3). This pattern is identical to (1a) except that the embedded subject is (optionally) realized as a 3rd person pronoun *vəl*, illustrated in (4). The pattern in (3) seemingly instantiates an agreement mismatch as the 1st person agreement is controlled by a 3rd person pronoun.

One may wonder whether *vəl* in (3) is indeed the embedded subject as opposed to the matrix subject, with the apparent matrix subject *Boris* in the topic position. One argument against the latter alternative is the presence of the matrix goal argument *mana* in (3a) before *vəl*, which, if the analysis were correct, would require both *Boris* and *mana* to be in some left-peripheral topic/focus position (assuming that subjects normally precede goals in PC), which appears unlikely. Another argument is that the complement clause may optionally follow that matrix verb and still contain *vəl*, as in (3b). In this configuration, the analysis of *vəl* as a matrix subject is even more unlikely.

- (3) MONSTROUS AGREEMENT (3RD PERSON PRONOUN + 1ST PERSON AGREEMENT) — *dialect A*
- a. boris man-a [vəl san-ba ëɛl-e-p] te-ze kala-r^j-e.
 Boris 1SG-OBJ 3SG.NOM 2SG-INS work-NPST-1SG say-CVB say-PST-
 3SG ‘Boris₁ told me that he₁ will work with you_{addressee}.’
- b. boris kala-r^j-e [{vəl / pro} san-ba ëɛl-e-p] te-ze. .Boris say-PST-3SG
- (4) {boris kam-ba ëɛl-e-t?} vəl son¹a-ba ëɛl-e-t.
 Boris who-INS work-NPST-3SG 3SG.NOM Sonya-INS work-NPST-
 3SG ‘Who will Boris₁ work with? He₁ will work with Sonya.’

Although the assumption that *vəl* is indeed the embedded subject in (3) requires further scrutiny, it is not a priori implausible, as similar patterns have been observed for other languages such as the Dravidian language Telugu, as was shown by Messick (2017), who calls it ‘monstrous agreement’ (henceforth I adopt this usage), cf. also ‘1st person logophoricity’ (Curnow 2002).

Interestingly, not all speakers accept the monstrous agreement pattern. There are speakers for whom examples like (3a) sound very unnatural (while not totally ungrammatical). Given that these speakers consistently reject such examples, it is unlikely to be a matter of stylistic preference. Thus, I will assume that there is inter-speaker variation and will refer to those speakers who reject monstrous agreement as dialect B speakers, as opposed to dialect A speakers, who accept it. Judgments of dialect B speakers are illustrated in (5a)–(5b).

(5) *Dialect B*

- a. boris man-a [{"*vəl / *pro*} san-ba ěl-e-p] te-ze kala-r^j-e.
 Boris 1SG-OBJ 3SG.NOM 2SG-INS work-NPST-1SG say-CVB say-PST-
 3SG ‘Boris₁ told me that he₁ will work with you_{addressee}.’
- b. *vas^ja man-a kala-r^j-e [vəl sern predmet-pa pilək
 Vas^ja 1SG-OBJ say-PST-3SG 3SG.NOM 2PL.GEN subject-INS five
 il-e-p] te-ze.
 get-NPST-1SG say-CVB
 Vas^ja₁ told me he₁ will get “Excellent” for your_{addressee} class.’

2.2 Asymmetry #1: no default pattern in the first conjunct

We are now ready to introduce the first asymmetry mentioned in the Introduction. It concerns the use of the default pattern, which was illustrated in (1a). The main observation is that while this pattern is generally accepted by all speakers, it is sometimes rejected or strongly dispreferred in configurations like (6a)–(6b), where the complement clause, whose subject is co-indexed with the matrix subject (= reported speaker), is conjoined with another clause to the right of it. In addition, the subject of the first clause is contrasted with the subject of the second clause and thus may be viewed as a contrastive topic. In such configurations, the subject of the clause in the first conjunct must be realized overtly (as *vəl*) if the clause has a 1st person subject agreement. In other words, the default pattern must be replaced by the monstrous agreement pattern (although this is not the only available pattern, as I show in the next section). I will rather simplistically refer to configurations like (6a)–(6b) as the ‘first conjunct (construction)’, to contrast them with a general case instantiated in examples like (1a), (3) and (5), referred to as the ‘unmarked’ construction.

(6) *Dialect A*

- a. boris [{"vəl / **pro*} son^ja-ba ěl-e-p] a [lionila
 Boris 3SG.NOM Sonya-INS work-NPST-1SG CONJ Lionila
 serial poy-a-t]] te-ze kala-r^j-e.
 TV.show watch-PRS-3SG say-CVB say-PST-3SG
 ‘Boris₁ said that he₁ will work with Sonya and Lionila will watch a TV show.’
- b. vas^ja man-a kala-r^j-e [{"vəl / ??*pro*} sern-den
 enë Vas^ja 1SG-OBJ say-PST-3SG 3SG.NOM
 2PL-ABL cow
 il-e-p] a [ser on-dan mašina il-e-ter]] te-ze.
 get-NPST-1SG CONJ 2PL.NOM 3SG-ABL car get-NPST-2PL say-
 CVB.
 ‘Vas^ja₁ told me that he₁ will buy a cow from you_{addressee} and you_{addressee} will buy a car from him.’

Interestingly, not all speakers reject the default pattern in (6). In particular, dialect B speakers, who disallow monstrous agreement (cf. (5)), allow *pro* in the first conjunct but still disallow monstrous agreement, cf. (7).

This set of judgments, referred to as *Asymmetry #1*, is formulated in (8).

(7) *Dialect B*

a. vas^j_a man-a kala-r^j-e [[{*vəl / *pro*} sern predmet-pa
 pilək Vasja 1SG-OBJ say-PST-3SG 3SG.NOM
 2PL.GEN subject-INS five il-e-p] a [maša dvojka il-e-t]]
 te-ze.
 get-NPST-1SG CONJ Masha two get-NPST-3SG say-CVB.
 ‘Vasja₁ told me that he₁ will get “Excellent” for your addressee class and Masha will get
 “Unsatisfactory.”’

b. vas^j_a man-a [[{*vəl / *pro*} son^ja-ba ěl-e-p] a
 Vasja 1SG-OBJ 3SG.NOM Sonya-INS work-NPST-1SG
 CONJ [Lionila tan^ja-ba ěl-e-t]] te-ze
 kala-r^j-e.
 Lionila Tanya-INS work-NPST-3SG say-CVB say-PST-3SG
 ‘Boris₁ told me that he₁ will work with Sonya and Lionila will work with Tanya.’

(8) *Asymmetry #1*

The default pattern is disallowed in the first conjunct construction in dialects that have monstrous agreement but is allowed in dialects that do not have monstrous agreement.

2.3 Asymmetry #2: English-style pattern in the first conjunct

Whereas the first asymmetry introduced above consists in the *disappearance* of a pattern in the first conjunct construction, the second asymmetry consists in the *appearance* of a new pattern in the same construction.

As we saw above, dialect B speakers reject monstrous agreement, i.e., the realization of the embedded subject as an overt 3rd person pronoun (*vəl*) controlling 1st person agreement (see (5)). For these speakers an overt 3rd person subject in the embedded clause requires 3rd person agreement, as shown in (9), cf. (5a), just as we would expect in SAE languages like English, Russian, etc. in the same construction.² I will refer to the pattern in (9) as the English-style pattern.

(9) ENGLISH-STYLE PATTERN (3RD PERSON SUBJECT + 3RD PERSON AGREEMENT)
 boris man-a [vəl san-ba ěl-e-t] te-ze kala-r^j-e.
 Boris 1SG-OBJ 3SG.NOM 2SG-INS work-NPST-3SG say-CVB say-PST-
 3SG
 ‘Boris₁ told me that he₁ will work with you_{addressee}.’

² In section 3.5, I suggest that the pattern in (9) is a Russian influence, something to be expected given the fact that most if not all PC speakers are bilingual. Note that the default pattern in the corresponding Russian construction would probably involve a null subject (see (20) below and also Shushurin 2018 for some discussion). The latter pattern, however (null subject + 3rd person agreement), is generally rejected by PC speakers in the unmarked construction.

Interestingly, the English-style pattern (as a way of expressing the co-indexation of the embedded subject with the reported speaker) is accepted not only by dialect B speakers but also by a subset of dialect A speakers (henceforth, A2 speakers). The other subset, however, which I will refer to as A1 speakers, rejects this pattern. Thus, while dialect B speakers allow only 3rd but not 1st person agreement with a 3rd person subject (in construction with the embedded subject co-indexed with the reported speaker), dialect A1 speakers have the opposite patterns. At the same time, dialect A2 speakers allow both types of patterns. This is shown in (10a)–(10c).

(10) a. *Dialect B*

boris man-a [vəl san-ba {*ëçl-e-p / -t}] te-ze kala-r^j-e.
 Boris 1SG-OBJ 3SG.NOM 2SG-INS work-NPST-1SG -3SG say-CVB say-PST-3SG

b. *Dialect A1*

boris man-a [vəl san-ba {ëçl-e-p / *-t}] te-ze kala-r^j-e.
 Boris 1SG-OBJ 3SG.NOM 2SG-INS work-NPST-1SG -3SG say-CVB say-PST-3SG

c. *Dialect A2*

boris man-a [vəl san-ba {ëçl-e-p / -t}] te-ze kala-r^j-e.
 Boris 1SG-OBJ 3SG.NOM 2SG-INS work-NPST-1SG -3SG say-CVB say-PST-3SG

‘Boris₁ told me that he₁ is going to work with you_{addressee}.’

We are now ready to formulate the second asymmetry. Whereas dialect A1 speakers generally reject the English-style pattern (cf. (10b)), they allow it in the first conjunct construction, as shown in (11). As for dialect B and dialect A2 speakers, there is no asymmetry between the unmarked construction (cf. (9)) and the first conjunct construction as the English-style pattern is allowed in both for these speakers, cf. (12).³This is referred to as *Asymmetry #2*, formulated in (13). The whole set of judgments, including both the unmarked and first conjunct construction, is given in Table 1. The two asymmetries are marked by shading.

(11) *Dialect A1*

boris [[vəl man-ba ëçl-e-t] a [lionila serial
 Boris 3SG.NOM 1SG-INS work-NPST-3SG CONJ Lionila
 TV.show poy-a-t]] te-ze kala-r^j-e.
 watch-PRS-3SG say-CVB say-PST-3SG

‘Boris₁ said that he₁ will work with me_{speaker} and Lionila will watch a TV show.’

(12) *Dialects A2 and B*

boris man-a [[vəl son^ja-ba ëçl-e-t] a lionila tan^ja-
 ba Boris 1sg-OBJ 3SG.NOM Sonya-INS work-NPST-3SG CONJ Lionila Tanya-

³Two other patterns that were sometimes attested in the first conjunct involved 3rd person agreement with a reflexive subject *xəj* and with a null subject (cf. footnote 2). Unfortunately, these patterns were not systematically investigated.

INS $\ddot{e}\epsilon\text{[e-t]}$ te-ze kala-r^j-e.
 work-NPST-3SG say-CVB say-PST-3SG
 ‘Boris₁ told me that he₁ will work with Sonya and Lionila will work with Tanya.’

(13) *Asymmetry #2*

The English style pattern is disallowed in some dialects in the unmarked construction but allowed in all dialects (including those that disallow it) in the first conjunct construction.

pattern type	pronoun	agreement	construction	dialect		
				A1	A2	B
default (= (1a))	∅	-p (1SG)	unmarked	+	+	+
			first conjunct	–	–	+
monstrous agreement (= (3))	vəl (3SG)	-p (1SG)	unmarked	+	+	–
			first conjunct	+	+	–
English-style (= (9))	vəl (3SG)	-t (3SG)	unmarked	–	+	+
			first conjunct	+	+	+

Table 1. Realization of the embedded subject co-indexed with the reported speaker in the unmarked and in the first conjunct construction in different PC dialects

3 Account

3.1 The framework

My account of the asymmetries in (8) and (13) is roughly based on the ideas developed in Messick 2017. Following Messick, I assume that in reported discourse constructions, the person value of both the embedded subject and the embedded agreement is determined by two sets of morphological features, namely: (i) [\pm author]/[\pm addressee], for the participants of the reported context; and (ii) [\pm author*]/[\pm addressee*], for the participants of the current context (below I will disregard the [\pm addressee/ \pm addressee*] features, as addressees do not shift in PC). Thus, in examples like (1a), where the embedded subject corresponds to the reported speaker (= author of the reported context) and a non-participant (non-author) of the current context, both the embedded subject and the embedded T(ense)/agreement are specified as [+author –author*].

Messick suggests that the feature combination [+author –author*] has a special morphological realization in some languages, namely, logophoric pronouns/agreement. He further argues that logophoric morphology and the feature combination [+author –author*] itself is marked and cannot be realized unless one of the features (or perhaps both) is deleted by way of impoverishment rules. Languages differ as to which feature on the embedded subject and on the embedded T they delete. For example, languages with indexical shift delete the feature [–author*] on both the subject and T, giving 1st person morphology on both, as shown in (14). In SAE languages like English and Russian, it is, conversely, the [+author] feature that is deleted, giving 3rd person morphology on both the subject and T, as in (15). A more interesting case is instantiated by monstrous agreement in languages like Telugu (and PC, if

my analysis of examples like (3) is correct). In this case, the $[-\text{author}^*]$ feature is deleted on T, giving 1st person agreement, whereas the $[\text{+author}]$ feature is deleted on the subject, giving a 3rd person pronoun, as shown in (16).

- (14) a. $-\text{author}^* \rightarrow \emptyset / [_ \text{+author}]_T$ indexical shift
 b. $-\text{author}^* \rightarrow \emptyset [\text{+author}]_{\text{subj}}$
- (15) a. $+\text{author} \rightarrow \emptyset / [_ -\text{author}^*]_T$ English-style pattern
 b. $+\text{author} \rightarrow \emptyset [-\text{author}^*]_{\text{subj}}$
- (16) a. $-\text{author}^* \rightarrow \emptyset / [_ \text{+author}]_T$ monstrous agreement
 b. $+\text{author} \rightarrow \emptyset [-\text{author}^*]_{\text{subj}}$

Messick also observes that there is no attested language which is the mirror image of Telugu, i.e., with a 1st person subject controlling 3rd person agreement.⁴ To account for this fact, he assumes that impoverishment rules like (14)–(16) are subject to markedness constraints, which favor realization of *reported* participant (Person) features on the embedded T and, conversely, that of *current* participant (Person*) features on the embedded subject, as schematized in (17). The constraints in (17) can be overridden, e.g., if a language cannot realize the relevant features for independent reasons. For example, in SAE languages like English the $[\text{+author}]$ feature is deleted on T (cf. (15a)) in violation of (17b) because, as Messick argues, realization of $[\text{+author}]$ on T is only licensed in languages with complementizers related to the verb ‘say’ (which roughly coincide with the class of languages with indexical shift or monstrous agreement).⁵

- (17) a. *Pronouns*: Person* > Person
 b. *Agreement*: Person > Person*

Now I will show how the observations summarized in Table 1 can be accounted for in Messick’s system. I will first discuss monstrous agreement in the unmarked construction and its alternation with the default pattern. Then I will propose an account of *Asymmetry #1*. After that I will turn to the English-style pattern and propose an account of *Asymmetry #2*.

3.2 Account of monstrous agreement

First of all, I will adopt Messick’s analysis in (16) for the monstrous agreement pattern in (3). The next question is how the default pattern in (1a) should be analyzed. Since the subject is not realized and given that agreement is not a reliable guide to the person value of the subject in Messick’s system, the default pattern can in principle be analyzed either as an instance of indexical shift with 1st person *pro* (cf. Messick’s analysis of Mishar Tatar), as in (14), or as an instance of monstrous agreement, with 3rd person *pro*, as in (16). I will adopt the latter

⁴ This pattern is attested in Mishar Tatar (see Podobryaev 2014) but the subject pronoun there must refer to the current rather than reported subject, the fact that Messick (2017) derives in his system.

⁵ See Messick 2017 for a technical implementation of this assumption.

alternative as it provides a uniform analysis of both the default and the monstrous agreement patterns and thus seems preferable on conceptual grounds. Now the question is how we can account for the fact that some dialects (i.e., B) disallow monstrous agreement, while all dialects allow (and prefer) the default pattern.

Given that the default and the monstrous agreement patterns differ only in the overtness of the subject, the question is what regulates the choice of an overt vs. non-overt pronoun. This question has been addressed by Messick in connection with the non-overt requirement for indexical shift in Mishar Tatar (see Podobryaev 2014 and also Introduction) and I will largely follow Messick's insight.⁶ To account for this requirement (and a number of other observations regarding the choice of pronouns), Messick adopts Patel-Grosz & Grosz's (2017) *Minimize DP!* constraint.⁷ The basic idea behind this constraint is that whenever there is a competition between a less and a more minimal pronoun, the more minimal pronoun blocks the less minimal one unless latter serves a specific pragmatic function (e.g., disambiguation and a few others). In other words, under *Minimize DP!*, less minimal pronouns are ruled out by default and can only occur if they are licensed by making a pragmatic contribution. Given that *pro* is more minimal than *vəl*, the availability of *pro* will block *vəl* under *Minimize DP!*. Thus, to account for why dialect B speakers disallow monstrous agreement (*vəl* + 1st person agreement) but allow the default pattern (*pro* + 1st person agreement), we can simply assume that their grammar incorporates *Minimize DP!*.

Now, how can we account for dialects A1 and A2, which *do* allow monstrous agreement? The idea is as follows. In their characterization of the *Minimize DP!* constraint, Patel-Grosz & Grosz (2017) explicitly leave open the question as to whether this constraint is part of grammar proper or is subsumed under some (Gricean) pragmatic principle (see their footnote 17). One variant of a pragmatic account Patel-Grosz & Grosz discuss is Mayol and Clark's (2010) account of the choice of null vs. overt pronouns in Romance languages. The basic idea of Mayol and Clark 2010 is that speakers generally tend to choose less costly expressions (i.e., null pronouns) for more prominent (i.e., more likely) antecedents and, conversely, more costly expressions (i.e., overt pronouns) for less prominent (i.e., less likely) antecedents as part of a general economy strategy.

Now, in order to account for dialects A1 and A2, I wish to propose the following version of this general pragmatic account. Suppose that null pronouns *require* prominent antecedents (and perhaps have some further licensing conditions), whereas overt pronouns are in general compatible with either prominent or nonprominent antecedents (and, in general, do not have special licensing conditions). Then, given Gricean reasoning, we can derive the fact that overt pronouns will generally be dispreferred (but perhaps not disallowed) for prominent antecedents as hearers will tend to infer that the speaker would have chosen a null pronoun (assuming it is not independently blocked) if she had intended the more prominent antecedent. I will refer to this account as (*Pragmatic*) *Restricted Minimize DP!* to underscore the fact that under this account, the preference for minimal pronouns is restricted to particular environments so that it is null rather than overt pronouns that are marked, in contradistinction to Grosz & Grosz's (2017) *Minimize DP!*.

What I wish to suggest then is that whereas dialect B is governed by the *Minimize DP!* constraint, dialects A1 and A2 are governed by *Restricted Minimize DP!* The latter principle

⁶ More precisely, Messick tries to derive a general preference for non-overt (minimal) realization for elements with a *de se* interpretation, including but not limited to 1st person shifted indexicals.

⁷ This constraint has been proposed in various forms by a number of other authors (see references in the cited work).

The data in (18)–(19) follow from the account proposed in section 3.2 if we assume that the ablative source is *less* prominent than the current speaker (as opposed to the matrix subject). Under this assumption, dialects A1 and A2, which are governed by *Restricted Minimize DP!*, will disallow co-indexation of the null pronoun with the ablative source in (19) as it is a less prominent antecedent; note that the co-indexation of the null pronoun with the matrix subject (the hearer) is independently blocked in PC (see Knyazev 2019). Further evidence for this account comes from Russian, where the embedded subject can be realized as either an overt or a null pronoun when co-indexed with a matrix subject in the unmarked case, as in (20a), but *only* as an overt pronoun when co-indexed with the ablative source, as in (20b); see Shushurin 2018 for some discussion.

- (20) a. Vasja skazal, čto {*pro* / on }
 priedet. Vasya said that
 he.NOM will come ‘Vasya₁ said that he₁
 will come.’
- b. Ja slyšal ot Vasi, čto {^{??}*pro* / on } priedet.
 I heard from Vasya that he.NOM will
 come ‘I heard from Vasya₁ that he₁ would come.’

As for dialect B, which is governed by *Minimize DP!*, it will allow the overt pronoun (*vəl*) in (19) under the plausible assumption that in such examples *vəl* serves a special pragmatic function, namely, disambiguation toward the nonprominent antecedent (ablative source), cf. the account of German demonstrative pronouns in Patel-Grosz & Grosz 2017. Because this function is irrelevant in examples with verbs of speech like (5), where the matrix subject is the most prominent antecedent, overt pronouns will be correctly predicted to be blocked in this dialect.

3.4 Account of asymmetry #1

Now, we are ready to provide an account of the first asymmetry in (8), namely, why a null pronoun is blocked in the first conjunct in dialects A1 and A2, but allowed in dialect B. As I suggested in section 2.2, the subject in the first conjunct in examples like (6) is a contrastive topic. In order to account for the rejection of a null pronoun in dialects A1 and A2, I propose that a null pronoun, being a marked option under *Restricted Minimize DP!*, is incompatible with contrastive topics in these dialects. The basic intuition is that this construction is too ‘special’ and is thus simply outside the environment in which a null pronoun can appear (which is perhaps restricted to the unmarked construction like (1a)). Consequently, in configurations like (6) an overt pronoun, which is an unmarked option reserved for ‘elsewhere’ cases, is required in these dialects. Evidence in favor of this account, again, comes from Russian, where the embedded subject in the corresponding construction must also be realized overtly, as shown in (21), cf. (20a).⁸

⁸I use negation in the matrix clause to make the high attachment parse for the second conjunct less plausible.

- (21) Vasja ne govoril, [čto {^{??}pro / on } priedet, a Maša ostanetsja].
 Vasya NEG said that he.NOM will come CONJ Masha will stay
 ‘Vasya₁ didn’t say that he₁ would come and Masha would stay.’

Turning to dialect B, which is governed by *Minimize DP!*, we may assume that while the first conjunct construction is too ‘special’ for the purposes of licensing *pro* in dialects A1 and A2, it still does not provide any *pragmatic* relevance for the purposes of licensing an overt subject (*vəl*) in this dialect. Thus, an overt subject will be correctly blocked in this dialect, as we saw in (7).

The asymmetry between the proposed accounts for dialects A and B (i.e., the first conjunct construction is sufficiently ‘special’ to block *pro* but not sufficiently ‘special’ to license *vəl*) may be undesirable, so it remains to be seen whether this asymmetry could be made to follow from some general principles, a topic left for future research.

3.5 Account of the English-style pattern and asymmetry #2

Let’s now turn to the second asymmetry in (13), namely, why the English-style pattern is disallowed in dialect A1 (but not in dialects A2 and B) in the unmarked construction, as we saw in (9b), but becomes acceptable in the first conjunct construction, as in (11).

First of all, I will analyze the English-style pattern in PC on a par with Messick’s (2017) analysis of English in (15), i.e., as a result of the (marked) impoverishment rule (15a), deleting the [+author] feature from the embedded T. I will tentatively assume that this is the result of Russian influence on these dialects. One way of thinking about it is that in these dialects (but not in dialect A1) the markedness constraint in (17b) is lifted due to exposure to Russian. What remains unexplained is why (17b) is also lifted in the first conjunct construction even in dialect A1.

What I wish to suggest is that the constraint in (17b) should be *relativized to the unmarked construction*. Specifically, I propose that the preference to realize the reported participant (Person) features, as opposed to the current participant (Person*) features, on the embedded T, does not extend to all embedded Ts but only to *specific constructions* which are most typical instances of reported discourse, presumably constructions involving ordinary embedding under speech/thought predicates, as, e.g., in (22). If this is on the right track, then, for those dialects where the constraint(22) exists at all (i.e., A1), the markedness of the Person* (i.e., [–author*]) feature on T (ruling out deletion of [+author] and, consequently, 3rd person agreement), will only matter in the unmarked construction in (10b) but not in the first conjunct construction—assuming that this construction does not satisfy the schema in (22). As for dialects that do not have the constraint (i.e., A2 and B), they are correctly predicted to show the English-style pattern across the board, cf. (10a), (10c) and (12).

- (22) subj₁ [[pron_i ... T] C_{say}] V_{speech/thought}: Person_T > *Person_T

Evidence for this account comes from constructions with verbs of hearing, which we already saw in (18)–(19). As shown in (23), these constructions allow the English-style pattern in all dialects, including, crucially, dialect A1. This is exactly what we expect under the plausible assumption that this construction is not a ‘typical’ reported discourse construction and hence

does not satisfy the general schema in (22).

(23) *All dialects*

ep boris-ran [vəl san-ba ëel-e-t]
 1SG.NOM Boris-ABL 3SG.NOM 2SG-INS work-NPST-
 3SG
 te-n-i-ne ëlt-r^j-em.
 say-PST.PTCP-POSS3-OBJ hear-PST-1SGS
 ‘I heard from Boris₁ that he₁ was going to work with you_{addressee}.’

4 Conclusion

In this paper, I have discussed inter-speaker variation with respect to the realization of the embedded subject co-indexed with the reported speaker in PC. I identified three different dialects on the basis of their acceptance of the so-called default pattern (null subject + 1st person agreement), monstrous agreement (3rd person subject + 1st person agreement) and the English-style pattern (3rd person subject + 3rd person agreement). The main focus was on the special distributional profile (i.e., asymmetries) exhibited by the complement clause in the first conjunct in a construction with coordination of clauses and contrastive topics, as opposed to the unmarked construction (ordinary embedding under verbs of speech/thought). Specifically, there are dialects that disallow the default pattern in the first conjunct but allow it in the unmarked case and dialects that disallow the English-style pattern in the unmarked case but allow it in the first conjunct. I proposed an account of these two asymmetries within Messick’s (2017) analysis of Person(*) features and a competition between null and overt pronouns. The first asymmetry follows from the assumption that different dialects internalize different constraints on the distribution of pronouns (with null vs. overt pronouns as the marked option), whereas the second asymmetry follows from relativizing the constraint on the realization of reported Person on T to the unmarked construction.

References

- Anand, P. & Nevins, A. 2004. Shifty operators in changing contexts. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory XIV*, ed. Robert B. Young, 20–37. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- Curnow, T. J. 2002. Three types of verbal logophoricity in African languages. *Studies in African Linguistics* 31. 1–25.
- Deal, A. R. 2017. Shifty asymmetries: universals and variation in shifty indexicality. Available at: <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~ardeal/papers/Deal-indexicals-2017.pdf>
- Knyazev M. Two SAY-complementizers in Poshkart Chuvash: Subject-orientation, logophoricity and indexical shift under verbs of hearing. In *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL14)*, ed. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 2019. p. 137-144.
- Mayol, L. & Clark R. 2010. Pronouns in Catalan: Games of partial information and the use of linguistic resources. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42:781–799.

- Messick, T. 2017. *The Morphosyntax of Self-ascription: A Cross-linguistic Study*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Patel-Grosz, P. & Grosz, P. G. 2017. Revisiting Pronominal Typology. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48. 259– 297.
- Podobryaev, A. 2014. *Persons, imposters, and monsters*. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- Shushurin P. 2018. Null Pronouns in Russian Embedded Clauses. In: Patel-Grosz P., Grosz P., Zobel S. (eds) *Pronouns in Embedded Contexts at the Syntax-Semantics Interface. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy*, vol 99.
- Sundaresan, S. 2018. An alternative model of indexical shift: Variation and selection without context-overwriting. Available at: <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004115>