Sources of Second Person: Connecting Imperatives and Indexical Shift

Mark C. Baker
Rutgers University (Joint work with Deepak Alok)

It is by now very clear that there is more to being grammatically second person than simply referring to the addressee of a sentence, both syntactically and semantically. One can have expressions that refer to the addressee but are not second person (e.g. *the person who I am talking to now*), and one can have second person pronouns that do not refer to the person currently being spoken to (e.g. in contexts of indexical shift—see (2a)).

There is reason to think that designated functional heads play a crucial role in whether a DP is second person or not. For example, a DP like *everyone* is normally 3rd person ((1b)), but it can become second person when it is in an Agree relationship to a Juss(ive) head, present only in imperative clauses, as shown by examples like (1b), after Zanuttini (2008).

(1) a. Everyone raised their/*your hand when the light flashed.
     b. Everyone raise your hand when the light flashes!

Furthermore, whether a pronoun in an embedded clause that is coreferential with a DP in the matrix clause can be second person or not (a type of indexical shift) is often dependent on whether a particular complementizer is present. This can be seen, for example, in the minimal pair in (2) from the Indo-Aryan language Magahi, where *ki* but not *taaki* licenses shifted 'you'.

(2) a. Baabaa   Banteeaa-se batiailthi **ki** tu   dukhii na   ho.
        Grandfather Bantee-INS talked-3HS that you sad   NEG be
        'Grandfather talked to Bantee so that you (=Bantee or =addressee) would not be sad.'
     b. Baabaa   Banteeaa-se batiailthi   taaki tu   dukhii na   ho.
        Grandfather Bantee-INS talked-3HS that you sad   NEG be
        'Grandfather talked to Bantee so that you (=addressee, *=Bantee) would not be sad.'

Here we explore the possibilities of having a unified theory of the two phenomena, united by a principle that states: "A DP is second person if and only if (i) it agrees with a designated functional head from the set {Juss, C_{SA}, …} or (ii) it is locally bound by a DP that is second person." Like Pancheva and Zubizaretta's (2018) theory of Person Case Constraints crosslinguistically, this assumes that functional heads can bear interpretable person features which they impose on nearby DPs, raising the possibility of a still larger unification.

A positive effect of our unification is that it predicts that imperative heads can be a vehicle of indexical shift even in languages that do not have the sort of C head that licenses this shift. This seems to be true in Japanese, where indexical shift in (3) is possible even for speakers that don't allow indexical shift in embedded declarative clauses. This also raises the possibility that there are person sensitive phenomena that are not perspectival in nature—since we are not sure that Juss creates a new perspective in examples like (1) the way that finite Cs do.

(3) ?Sensei-wa Taroo-ni   anata-no heya-o   itu katazuke-nasai-to   it-ta-no?
     teacher-TOP Taroo-DAT you-GEN room-ACC when clean-POL.IMP-that say-PAST-Q
     'When did the teacher tell Taroo [to clean your (=Taro's) room t]?'