

left periphery, resulting in allocutivity.

Given the presence of an Addressee-DP as indicated by allocutivity, we ascertain that the structural factor determining agreement between the subject and the Addressee-DP corresponds to the lack of prior case-valuation on the former. This is done by comparing the perfective verb in the allocutive imperative in (3) with its declarative counterpart in (1). The perfective verb in the allocutive imperative is invariable, (5), as opposed to the perfective verb in the declarative, which manifests agreement with the unmarked object, (6).

(5) *tussii kuRii/kuRiyaaN vekhyaa je*
 2.pl/hon girl/girls.acc see.perf allocH
 'Please see the girl/girls.'

(6) *tussii kuRii/kuRiyaaN vekhii/vekhiyaaN je/e*
 2.pl/hon girl/girls.acc see.perf.f.sg/f.pl allocH/be.pres.3.sg
 'You have seen the girl/girls.'

Assuming ergative valuation within vP (Legate 2008; Woolford 2006 a.o), the phi-invariable perfective verb in the imperative does not value an ergative case on its subject, as evidenced by the unmarked nominative inflection on the modifying quantifier (7). In contrast, the perfective domain of the declarative values ergative on its subject, which despite being unmarked itself, triggers ergative (-ne) inflection (8); (for the diagnostic, see Legate 2014).

(7) *tussii saare kuRii vekhyaa je*
 2.pl all.nom girl.acc see.perf allocH
 'Please see the girl!'

(8) *tussii saareyaa-ne/*saare kuRii vekhii je/e*
 2.pl all-erg/all.nom girl.acc see.perf.f.sg allocH/be.pres.3sg
 'You all have seen the girl.'

I take this difference in case of the imperative and the declarative subject to underlie distinct syntactic dependencies with the allocutive head, resulting in distinct clause types. In the absence of case valuation in the Asp-vP domain, the imperative subject targets the next available functional head, corresponding to the finite T-alloc with an [iCase] and an [uAddr]. The subject agrees with T-alloc for case, while T-alloc undergoes Upward Agree for allocutive marking. These two agreement relations- between the subject and T for case on the one hand, and between T and the Addressee-DP for allocutive marking on the other, result in a multiple agreement chain (in the spirit of Arregi & Hanink 2018; Bjorkman & Zeijlstra 2018). The interpretable component of [Addressee] on the Addressee-DP in the chain transmits the [Addressee] feature to the subject, over and above its lexically specified phi-feature set, resulting in the subject being interpreted as the addressee of the speech act, (9). It should be added that the [Addressee] feature could potentially be transmitted to any subject (1st/2nd or 3rd). However, the derivation with a 1st/3rd subject will crash at LF due to presupposition failure; (10).

(9) [ADDR-DP_[iAddr] [alloc-T_[uAddr, iCase] [2Subj_[uCase, i2pl, Addr]]]]

(10) **asii/o kuRii vekhyaa je*
 1pl.nom/3pl.nom girl.acc see.perf alloc.hon
 'We/they see the girl!'

In contrast with the imperative subject, the declarative subject gets an ergative case within the vP. This renders it inactive for further case-agreement purposes (following Chomsky's Activity Condition, 1995). Upon merger of the T-alloc, the [uAddr] on T agrees with the Addressee-DP to be realized as *je*; however, there is no agreement between the ergative subject and T, and consequently between the subject and the Addressee-DP; this yields a declarative with allocutivity, see (11). Evidence for the lack of agreement between the subject and the Addressee-DP comes from the possibility to have all 1st/2nd and 3rd subjects, (1). Nothing precludes accidental-coreference between the allocutive marker and the 2nd subject, when available in the declarative. However, this coreference is not grammaticalized via agreement, contra accounts that propose operator-variable binding for all pronouns (Baker 2008).

(11) [ADDR-DP_[iAddr] [alloc-T_[uAddr, iCase] [AspP-vP 2Subj_[uErg, i2pl]]]]

Conclusion: A Jussive-free analysis of the allocutive imperative is parsimonious in that it employs the already existing Addressee-DP instead of postulating a (c)overt functional head. The consequence of such an analysis for imperative syntax is that it weakens the requirement for a construction-specific notion of the Addressee—other conditions met, any source of the addressee situated in the left-periphery suffices to yield imperative syntax. Furthermore, this analysis also contributes to the existing literature on encoding speech act participants in the left-periphery by emphasizing both the presence and the role of Addressee-DP in clause-typing.

Selected References: Bjorkman, B. & H. Zeijlstra (2018) Checking up on phi-Agree; Miyagawa, S. (2012) Agreements that occur mainly in main clauses; Pancheva, R. & M. Zubizarreta (2017) The Person Case Constraint: The syntactic encoding of perspective; Zanuttini, R. (2008) Encoding the addressee in the syntax: evidence from English imperative subjects; Zanuttini, R., Pak, M. & P. Portner (2012) A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects.