## Addressee Agreement as the Locus of Imperative Syntax

Gurmeet Kaur

## Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

**Problem & Key claims**: In addition to its standard imperatives composed of an imperative verb form (1) (Bhatia 1993, Kaur 2018), Punjabi, an Indo-Aryan language makes another imperative with a declarative verb-form bearing obligatory overt addressee/allocutive (honorific/plural) agreement indicated by *-je*, (2).

 1. (tuu/tussi) bacce-nuu vekh-Ø/vekh-o
 2. (tussi) bacce-nuu vekhyaa-je

 (2.sg/2.pl) child-acc see.imp-2.sg/see.imp-2.pl
 (2.pl) child-acc see.perf.m.sg-alloc

 'Look after/see the child.'
 'Look after/see the child!'

Unlike sentences such as 'You will work tomorrow' in English, which have a declarative syntax, but can be used either as a declarative or as an imperative in the appropriate context, (2) cannot alternate as per the context or prosody, and corresponds uniquely to a command/request. Given this lack of ambiguity, this paper claims that despite its declarative appearance, (2) has an underlying imperative (and not declarative) syntax. Specifically, the presence of addressee agreement in (2) provides all the building blocks that make a standard imperative. These are: a  $2^{nd}$  person feature which encodes the notion of an addressee, a defective/null T and an 'agreeing'  $2^{nd}$  subject (see Jensen 2003, Bennis 2006, Zanuttini 2008 *a.o* for varied versions). This uniquely imperative structure hosts a strong covert modal operator, resulting in its restricted (and strong imperative force related) semantic-pragmatic properties.

Account: Punjabi (select varieties) is a language with optional allocutive agreement (Akhtar 1999, Kaur 2017, 2018). Consider (3), where the verb agrees with the unmarked object in number and gender, and optionally hosts the addressee agreement marker -je. Note that -je in (3) does not correspond to either the subject or the object, and instead encodes the honorific/plural addressee of the utterance.

3. karan-ne kuRii vekhii -(je) Karan-erg girl.f.sg see.perf.f.sg -(alloc) '(Lam telling you) Karan saw a girl '

'(I am telling you), Karan saw a girl.'

**A. Defective/null T:** The occurrence of allocutivity in the language is contingent on the persondefectiveness of v-T. To elaborate, Punjabi is a split ergative language, such that imperfective subjects agree with the T head in full phi and are valued as nominative, (4). In contrast, perfective subjects do not agree with T and are valued as non-nominative, (5) (Deo & Sharma 2006, Chandra & Kaur 2017). Given (4) and (5), only the default (3.masculine.sg) auxiliary e, which obtains with all  $1^{st}/2^{nd}$  and  $3^{rd}$  (nonnominative) perfective subjects and with  $3^{rd}$  imperfective subject, can be dropped to realize -je, as in (6).

4. maiN/tuu/o kuRii-nuu vekhdaa aaN/eN/e 1.sg/2.sg/3.sg.nom girl-acc see.hab.m.sg be.pres.1.sg/2.sg/3.sg (default) 'I/you/(s)he am/are/is seeing the girl.'

- 5. maiN/tuu/o-ne kuRii-nuu vekhyaa **e** 1.sg.obl/2.sg.obl/3.sg-erg girl-acc see.perf.m.sg be.pres.3.sg (default) 'I/you/(s)he saw the girl.'
- 6. maiN/tussi/o-ne/o kuRii-nuu vekhyaa-je/vekhdaa-je 1.sg.obl/2.hon/pl.obl/3.sg-erg/3.sg.nom girl-acc see.perf.m.sg-alloc/see.hab.m.sg-alloc 'I/vou/(s)he saw the girl/he sees the girl.'

**B.** Agreeing  $2^{nd}$  argument: The second property of addressee agreement in the language is that it can also co-occur with a  $2^{nd}$  argument (unlike Basque; see Miyagawa 2012). If the  $2^{nd}$  argument and *-je* refer to the hearer of the same Speech act projection/SAP, they must 'agree'; see (7) with an honorific/pl  $2^{nd}$  object. Failure to 'agree' results in ungrammaticality, as in (8) with the non-honorific/sg  $2^{nd}$  object.

7. karan-ne twaa-nuu bulaayaa -je<br/>Karan-erg 2.pl/hon-acc call.perf.m.sg -alloc<br/>'Karan has called you.'8. \*karan-ne tai-nuu bulaayaa -je<br/>Karan-erg 2.sg/non.hon-acc call.perf.m.sg -alloc<br/>'Karan has called you.'

To confirm this further, consider the following embedded context, (9).

9. mira-ne<sub>i</sub> tai-nuu keyaa sii ki mai $N_i$  match jitt jaavaangi - je Mira-erg 2.sg-acc say.perf be.past that 1.sg.nom match win go.fut.1sg.f -alloc

'Mira had said to you that she will win the match.' (Shifted reading; \*non-shifted)

Punjabi is an indexical shift language, such that the embedded subject *maiN* can refer either to the matrix speaker, or to the matrix subject *mira*. In the non-shifted reading, *-je* refers to the matrix hearer, and so

does the 2<sup>nd</sup> object in the matrix clause; mismatch of features on the two items causes ungrammaticality. In the shifted reading, all pronominals in the embedded domain shift, with -ie referring to the embedded speech act addressee, who is elder to Mira. The 2<sup>nd</sup> argument in the matrix clause gets its reference from the utterance addressee, who is not evaluated for (non)honorificity vis-à-vis the embedded speaker Mira, but the matrix speaker. Since the  $2^{nd}$  argument and *-je* do not get their reference from the same hearer, no agreement is required.

Given these properties of allocutivity, we can see how (2) is derived; consider the schema in (10).

10. [SAP Addr(i) [CP<sub>[uAddr](i)</sub> [TP<sub>[uPhi]</sub> [vP<sub>perf</sub> 
$$2^{nd}$$
 subj(i) [VP Obj V]]]]]

\_\_\_\_e ♠ je Adopting the standard analysis for addressee agreement, I posit that the C head in Punjabi enters the derivation with a [u2/Addr], which must agree with the addressee of the utterance located in the Speech Act Projection (SAP) (Speas&Tenny 2003, Miyagawa 2012, McFadden 2017). This agreement takes place via Upward Agree (Zeijlstra 2012), and is realized as -ie. The T head has a [uPhi], which must be valued by agreement with a nominative subject. In the presence of a perfective verb, however, the 2<sup>nd</sup> subject is (unmarked) ergative and cannot control agreement. This results in default agreement, e, which is dropped leaving the T head null. Furthermore, the case-valued 2<sup>nd</sup> subject, which also refers to the hearer of the same SAP, undergoes "agree" with the addressee agreement -ie. This relation between the  $2^{nd}$  subject and -ie can be understood in terms of the Person Licensing Condition/PLC (Baker 2008), which states that "a DP/NP is second person only if it is locally bound by the closest c-commanding addressee or by another element that is itself second person". Analyzed thus, (2) has the same components as a standard imperative- a  $2^{nd}$  person feature realized as -*je*, a defective/null T and an agreeing  $2^{nd}$ subject. A change in any of the three properties yields a declarative, (11) - (13).

11. tussi bacce-nuu vekhyaa

2.pl/hon child-acc see.perf.m.sg

baccii vekhii-je 12. tussi

'You saw the child.' (Drop *je*: DECL)

2.pl/hon child.f.sg see.perf.f.sg-alloc 'You saw the child.' (Non-default agr: DECL)

bacce-nuu vekhyaa-je 13. maiN/o-ne

1.sg/3.sg-erg child-acc see.perf.m.sg-alloc

'I am telling you, I/(s)he saw the child.' (1<sup>st</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> subject: DECL)

Modal operator: As illustrated above, (2) has the same underlying imperative syntax as standard imperatives. However, it manifests distinct semantic-pragmatic patterns. First, (2) can only occur in commands/request, but not the other imperative uses (as listed in Schmerling 1982). Furthermore, it does not allow for an acquiescence reading (14), and cannot be used in IaDs (15) (von Fintel & Iatridou 2017). Standard imperatives in Punjabi, in contrast, have a wider usage, and allow for weaker readings.

14. A: 'I am feeling hot. Can I open the window?'

B: haan, khol lo /# haan, khol leyaa-je

yes, open take.imp.2.pl/hon /# yes, open take.perf.m.sg-alloc

/#kareyaa-je 15. mainat te tussi karo paas ho javoge

hard work do.imp.2.pl/hon /#do.perf.m.sg-alloc and 2.pl/hon pass be go.fut.m.pl/hon 'Work hard and you will pass.'

Given the absence of weak readings for (2), I propose that it contains a strong covert modal component which is responsible for the command/request reading (Schwager 2006, Kaufmann 2012 among others). For the standard imperative, in contrast, the semantic effects obtain possibly from the presence of an existential modal that can be strengthened (following Oikonomou 2016).

Cross-linguistic predictions: This paper has shown that allocutive agreement in languages like Punjabi can provide a  $2^{nd}$  person feature, which can encode the notion of an addressee and compose an imperative. Punjabi allocutivity is contingent on a null T and can co-occur with a 2<sup>nd</sup> subject, providing a very conducive environment for imperative formation. We predict that in languages where allocutivity obtains with richer T heads, the imperative will not obtain. This is evidenced by Tamil (see 16 from McFadden 2017). Furthermore, see (17, based on Alcázar & Saltarelli 2014) from Basque, which not only has a rich T head, but also bans a  $2^{nd}$  subject with allocutivity, ruling out an imperative.

16. nii-ngae jangri vangu-ni-ngae

2SG-HON jangri buy-pst-HON

17. Zu-k platera-k apurtu d-it-u-zu

'You bought a jangri.' NOT: Buy a jangri!

2sg-erg plate-abs.pl broken Ø-pl(A)-aux.have-2sg(E) 'You broke the plates.' NOT: Break the plates!