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Overview
This project analyzes the correspondence between intonation and syntax/semanics of direct speech and indirect speech (both with and without "indexical shift" in Uyghur (Turkic: China, Kazakhstan). I. Develops a new field diagnostic that differentiates between direct quotation & indexical shift (that is far less taxing on consultants!). II. Suggests modifications to the syntactic analysis of Uyghur indexical shift in Shklovsky & Sudo (2014) (henceforth S&S).

Prior Research
In Uyghur indexicals (e.g. pronouns) can be shifted to a context distinct from the one in which they are uttered (see Sudo 2010): 1) Ahmet [ket-tim] di-di. Ahmet leave-pst.1sg say-pst.3
     "Ahmet said Ileave left."
   a) "Who did Ahmet say Ihit?" b) "Ahmet said, Who did I hit?"
   Interpretation (a) is not a direct quotation because wh-questions cannot take matrix scope from inside a quote (=indexical shift).
   In non-shifted contexts, the embedded subject is marked with accusative case and the verb has default 3rd person agreement. 3) Ahmet [meni ket-t] di-di. Ahmet l.ac leave-pst.3 say-pst.3
   "Ahmet said that Ileave left."

Direct Quotation vs. Indexical Shift
- When subjects are accusative case and matrix subjects.
- When subjects are nominative w/ normal agreement on verb, indexicals must shift (either as direct quotes or indirect speech w/ indexical shift).

Uyghur Intonation (Major & Mayer 2018)

Intonational Analysis
Shift: {Top} [Subj] [Obj] [Adv] V Syntactic
     [Subj] [Obj] [Adv] V
     H L H L H H L L H L
     {Top} [Subj] [Obj] [Adv] V
     H H L L H L H L L H L
     Acccentual Phrase (AP)
     - L (left edge)
     - H (right edge).

Methodology
We constructed discourses that were read by three different speakers.
- Each discourse was compatible with either a direct quotation reading or EC with indexical shift (crucially not both).
- We recorded both declarative and interrogative target sentences.

Intonational Analysis
Shift: {Top} [Subj] [Obj] [Adv] V Syntactic
     [Subj] [Obj] [Adv] V
     H L H L H H L L H L
     {Top} [Subj] [Obj] [Adv] V
     H H L L H L H L L H L
     Acccentual Phrase (AP)
     - L (left edge)
     - H (right edge).

Direct Quotation
- Embedded clause begins an IP.
- Large boundary before embedded clause.
- Right edge of embedded clause: H%
- Right edge of the matrix clause: L%
- Mimicry is acceptable.

Indexical Shift
- No evidence that embedded clause begins IP.
- Small boundary before embedded clause.
- Right edge of embedded clause varies.
- Right edge of matrix clause: H% for interrogatives, L% for declaratives.
- Mimicry is not acceptable.

Syntactic Analysis
S & S argue for the analysis in (4):
- Accusative subjects raise to a high position inside the EC.
- Nominative subjects remain in spec. TP of EC.
- Only indexicals within the scope of the operator, shift (accentuals are too high).

The intonational data here suggests that we modify the analysis of S&S, as shown in (5), assuming a framework that favors a mapping between syntax and prosody (e.g. "Match Theory"):• The accusative subject raises into the matrix clause.
• The presence of the monster in the left periphery coincides with a particular prosody.
• This structure is compatible with accusative subjects phrasing with matrix subjects.

Conclusion and Discussion
• Intonation can be used as a field diagnostic to differentiate between quotation and indexical shift.
• The wh-question test and NPI test are extremely taxing for speakers, especially with multiple indexicals.
• This is a more natural way for speakers to provide data and get accurate judgments!
• The intonational data/analysis suggests modifying the analysis of S&S in favor of the analysis in Major (in preparation):
  i. EC subjects get accusative case from the verb ‘say’
  ii. The monster is only conditionally present.
• This study opens the door for comparative work with other shifting languages and with other related phenomena (e.g. parentheticals, (partial) quotation, free indirect discourse, etc.)
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