

Embedded allocutivity and its reference

Gurmeet Kaur and Akitaka Yamada

(University of Goettingen)

(Georgetown University)

Introduction. Allocutivity is typically considered to be a root phenomenon, which occurs on the matrix verb and refers to the addressee of the speech act (see Miyagawa 2012, 2017 for Basque; Portner et al. to appear for Korean). Such a discourse-participant has been claimed to have a syntactic representation above CP and to enter an agreement relation with the verbal morphology. While its root restriction is quite evident in some languages (Korean/Thai), recent studies on Tamil (McFadden 2017) and Magahi (Alok & Baker, ms) show that allocutivity can appear in the indirect speech context. With a view to better understand the reference of embedded allocutivity, we examine two understudied allocutive languages — Punjabi *je* (Kaur 2017, 2018) and Japanese *-mas* (Miyagawa 2012; Yamada 2018).

(1) *raam aayegaa je.*

Ram.NOM come.FUT.M.SG ALLOC.H

‘Ram will come’ (to an honorific hearer).

(2) *ramu-wa ki-mas-u.*

Ram-TOP come-ALLOC.H-PRS

‘Ram will come’ (to an honorific hearer).

In the domain of embedded allocutivity, Punjabi and Japanese differ along two dimensions. First, the predicates that can embed the allocutive marking are different. Furthermore, the embedded allocutive marker takes reference from distinct sources—it always refers to the utterance addressee in Japanese while in Punjabi, its reference alternates between the utterance and the reported addressee based on two structural properties: (a) (c)overt-ness of the goal argument of the matrix verb, and (b) the presence of a 1st subject in the embedded clause. Following Alok & Baker, we claim that there is a syntactically represented Addr(essée) in the embedded left-periphery in both languages; however, this embedded Addr can be controlled by distinct loci — the utterance Addr(essée), the goal argument of the matrix verb, or even a syntactically unrealized but contextually salient addressee of the reported speaker — deriving the differences between and within the two languages.

When can allocutivity be embedded? JAPANESE. Contrary to Miyagawa (2012, 2017), who claims that Japanese allocutive markers are restricted to verbs-of-saying as in (3) (Class A in Hooper and Thompson’s (1973) classification), we show that they can appear in wider indirect speech contexts. In the hyperpolite speech register, we can find examples not only with (a) verbs-of-saying but also with (b) factive predicates (*know, realize, understand, apologize, and thank*) and (c) bouletic predicates (e.g., *want, desire and wish*; n.b., the complement of these verbs are non-finite, lacking tense distinction). For example, the sentence in (4) contains *-mas*, which appears in a factive, indirect speech context. The coindexation between the two *kare*’s ‘he’ confirms that this is a non-direct speech environment (Crnič and Trinh 2009).

(3) *kare_i-wa kanoz_{yo}-ni [kare_i-no haha_oya-ga asita mairi-mas-u-koto]-o tugete ori-masi-ta.*

he-TOP she-DAT he-GEN mother-NOM tomorrow come-ALLOC.H-PRS-C-ACC tell PRG-ALLOC.H-PST

‘He was telling her that his mother would come tomorrow.’ (-*mas* = UttAddr)

(4) *kare_i-wa [kare_i-no haha_oya-ga asita mairi-mas-u-koto]-o zonzite ori-masi-ta.*

he-TOP I-GEN mother-NOM tomorrow come-ALLOC.H-PRS-C-ACC know PRF-ALLOC.H-PST

‘He knew that his mother would come tomorrow.’ (-*mas* = UttAddr)

PUNJABI. Punjabi is not as liberal as Japanese and allows embedding only in finite domains, further restricted to the complement clauses of speech predicates such as *tell, say, speak, ask* — within this list, the structures with *say* are the most natural, and we employ *say* for all relevant Punjabi examples in this paper; see (5). Evidence for indirect speech in the example comes from the possibility to coindex the embedded 3rd pronoun with the matrix subject.

(5) *karan-ne_i keyaa [ki oddii_i maa kal aayegii je]*

Karan-ERG say.PRF that his mother tomorrow come.FUT ALLOC.H

‘Karan said that his mother will come tomorrow.’ (*je* = UttAddr)

Who can embedded allocutivity refer to? Below, we will compare how allocutive markers behave under the speech act predicate in these two languages. JAPANESE. Japanese does not permit the embedded addressee indexical to shift as per the reported context. In (3), the indexicality of the embedded *-mas* is determined *w.r.t.* the utterance context. It is the addressee of the utterance context, not of the reported context, who is admired by the speaker of the utterance context; it cannot mean that **he has/had respect to her*. PUNJABI. Differently from Japanese, the reference of embedded allocutivity in Punjabi is not restricted to the utterance context, and is determined by two factors — (a) an overt goal of *say*, and (b) a co-occurring 1st subject. To see this, let us refer back to (5), where in the absence of a GOAL of *keyaa* ‘say’, the embedded *je* refers to the UttAddr. In contrast, the presence of an overt goal with matching (honorific) specifications shifts the reference of the embedded *je*, (6); this (overt target) requirement for indexical shift also holds for other 1st and 2nd pronouns in the language.

(6) *karan-ne daari_{jii}-nuu keyaa [ki miraa kal aayegii je]*

Karan-ERG grandfather-DAT say.PRF that Mira.NOM tomorrow come.FUT ALLOC.H

‘Karan said to his grandfather that Mira will come tomorrow (*je* = grandfather).’

Furthermore, the person specification of the embedded subject also determines the possibility to shift the embedded allocutive marker. With a 3rd embedded subject (seen so far), and also for a 2nd subject, overtness of the GOAL argument is the relevant factor for shifted reference. However, with a 1st person subject, the requirement of an overt GOAL for *je*

is lifted and it can refer to a discourse salient hearer of Karan, (7). Crucially, this connection does not hold in the other direction such that when there is no overt GOAL for ‘I’ but there is one for *je*, neither of them shift, (8).

(7) *karan-ne keyaa [ki maiN aavaangaa.je]*

Karan-ERG say.PRF that I.NOM come.FUT ALLOC.H

‘Karan said that I will come (I = Karan and *je* = discourse salient hearer of Karan).’

(8) *karan-ne suneyaa [ki maiN aavaangaa.je]*

grandfather-ERG hear.PRF that I.NOM come.FUT ALLOC.H

‘Karan heard that I will come (I = UttSpeaker; *je* = UttAdd).’

Analysis. Based on the findings, we propose that embedded clauses in both languages (*koto*-clause in Japanese and finite complements of speech predicates in Punjabi) project a speech act layer composed of at least a *pro*-Addr(essee) that sanctions embedded allocutive markers. Following standard assumptions (Miyagawa 2012; McFadden 2017 among others), the embedded allocutive marker is obtained by agreement between the interpretable/valued instance of [addressee] on the *pro* and the uninterpretable/unvalued instance of [addressee] on a lower functional head, see (9).

(9) [*pro*-Addr_[i,Addr] [XP X_[u,Addr] YP]]

We model the different loci of addressee-reference across the two languages by parameterizing control of the *pro*-Addr. Concretely, we follow Alok & Baker in assuming that indexical shift does not require a distinct shift operator (contra Anand 2004; Deal 2018). Instead, it can be explained by the presence of a DP-hearer in the left periphery which binds all 2nd person pronouns in its domain, and is controlled by the GOAL argument of a higher ‘speech act structure’. To capture the language variation, we add one modification to their claim; *i.e.*, languages differ in Addr-controllers. First, Punjabi exhibits shifting of the embedded allocutive marker in the presence of an overt GOAL DP. (a) In this case, embedded *pro*-Addr is controlled by the GOAL of the matrix verb, as in (10). As envisioned in Speas and Tenny (2003), the saP is seen as a ‘speech act structure’ akin to speech act VP predicate, specifying AGENT (speaker), GOAL (addressee) and THEME (utterance). (b) If the GOAL DP is absent in VP, the closest GOAL argument is provided by the highest saP, resulting in the relation between the two Addrs as in (11), where the embedded allocutive refers to the UttAddr.

(10) [_{saP} *pro*-Addr_[i,Addr] [Subj_{matrix} [VP *say* GOAL [*pro*-Addr_[i,Addr] [Subj_{embedded} X_[u,Addr] YP]]]]

(11) [_{saP} *pro*-Addr_[i,Addr] [Subj_{matrix} [VP *say* [*pro*-Addr_[i,Addr] [Subj_{embedded} X_[u,Addr] YP]]]]

Second, for Japanese, in which allocutive-shift never exists, the strategy in (11) is always adopted with/without the GOAL DP in VP. (We are agnostic about the mechanism that suppresses the intervention effect of GOAL DP; this may have to do with the fact that no indexical shifting is allowed in this language, unlike Punjabi and Magahi). Since *pro*-Addr is not sanctioned by the higher GOAL, (a) the embedded *-mas* can appear in the complement clause whose embedding predicate does not have a GOAL argument, *e.g.*, *know* (= (4)), and (b) it always refers to the UttAddr.

However, Punjabi presents one additional factor determining indexical shift of the embedded allocutive marker. To recall, we have seen that in the presence of a co-occurring 1st subject which shifts, the embedded allocutive marker can shift without a corresponding overt GOAL. Magahi also provides a comparable scenario, though with different results. Unlike Punjabi, Magahi does not seem to factor in the (c)overtness of the GOAL DP in shifting the embedded allocutive marker for *tell*. However, with the verbs *think* and *say*, the covertness of the goal argument is crucial in that the embedded allocutive marker is allowed only when there is no shift of co-occurring indexicals. Thus, with a shifting ‘I’ (with an overt target) in (12), the allocutive marker (= *au*) is disallowed.

(12) *John socha h-o [ki ham tej h-i-(*au)]*

John think be-ALLOC.H that I smart be-1.SG-(*ALLOC.H)

‘John thinks that I (= John) am smart.’

(Alok & Baker, ms)

Returning to Punjabi, the same configuration albeit with ‘say’ does not rule out the allocutive marker. Instead, the indexical shift of ‘I’ forces a context-shift of the embedded allocutive marker irrespective of a (c)overt GOAL. The reverse configuration, however, does not show any shift, (8). We take this to indicate that there is an intrinsic hierarchy between *pro*-Speaker and *pro*-Addr in the language (in the spirit of Deal 2017, 2018), such that if *pro*-Speaker gets controlled by the reported speaker, *pro*-Addr must also find a local controller. This local controller is typically realized in syntax; however, it can also be located in discourse as a last resort.

Alok, D. & Baker, M. ms. *On the Mechanics (Syntax) of Indexical Shift: Evidence from Allocutive Agreement in Magahi.* / **Deal, A. R.** 2017. *Shifty asymmetries: universals and variation in shifty indexicality.* / **Deal, A. R.** 2018. *Indexiphors: Notes on embedded indexicals, shifty agreement, and logophoricity.* / **Kaur, G.** 2017. *Variation in subject-triggered clitic restrictions: A Case of Punjabi.* / **Kaur, G.** 2018. *Addressee Agreement as the Locus of Imperative Syntax.* / **McFadden, T.** 2017. *The morphosyntax of allocutive agreement in Tamil.* / **Miyagawa, S.** 2012. *Agreements that occur mainly in main clauses.* / **Miyagawa, S.** 2017. *Agreement beyond phi.* / **Portner, P., Pak, M., Zanuttini, R.** to appear. *The addressee at the syntax-semantics interface: Evidence from politeness and speech style.* / **Yamada, A.** 2018. *Historical developments/variations of Japanese addressee-honorific markers and economy principles.*