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1. Overview
Variation across allocutive structures

- **Allocutive Agreement:** Morphological marking of non-participant addressees (Verma, 1991; Oyharçabal, 1993).
- An example from Magahi, an allocutive language (Verma, 1991; Alok, 2020)

(1) a. Ham jaait h-i-au
    I go.PROG be-1-NHA
    'I am going.'  (said to a friend)

b. Ham jaait h-i-o
    I go.PROG be-1-HA
    'I am going.'  (said to father)

c. Ham jaait h-i-ain
    I go.PROG be-1-HHA
    'I am going.'  (said to a teacher)

(Alok, 2020)
Variation across allocutive structures

Focus:

- What relationship, if any, exists among three kinds of variation across allocutive languages: (i) root restrictions; (ii) allocutive morpheme placement; and (iii) interactions between allocutive morphemes and other C-field heads?
Variation across allocutive structures

- The first of these has attracted some attention. Some earlier accounts modeled allocutivity as strictly a root clause phenomenon (Miyagawa 2012, 2017, Portner et al. 2019).

- More recent work has described allocutive marking in embedded domains in some languages (Alok and Baker, 2018; Alok, 2020; McFadden, 2020; Yamada, 2019; Haddican and Etxeberria, 2020).

- Less well described is the fact that languages vary in terms of the position of exponence of the allocutive morpheme (Yamada, 2019).
Variation across allocutive structures

- A third way in which allocutive languages vary is in terms of the other left peripheral elements that allocutive morphemes interact with. In some languages these interact with clause type, in others evaluative perspective, and in a third class do not interact at all.

- Here, we summarize data on these three kinds of variation from recent formal work on ten allocutive varieties: Magahi, 3 Basque dialects, Galician, Japanese, Korean, Tamil, Punjabi and Thai.

- We set aside other intriguing points of variation including the possibility of allocutive marking in self-talk (Holmberg, 2010).
Main claims

1. Allocutive varieties do indeed vary in terms of the position in which features responsible for allocutive morphology are introduced in the clausal spine, but this variation is insufficient in itself to express differences in root restrictions and the way in which allocutive morphemes interact with other left-peripheral material.

2. There is a partial correlation between the latter properties: languages in which the allocutive morpheme co-occurs with additional discourse meaning (sometimes characterized as having ”optional” marking) all have the property that they may appear in at least some embedded contexts.
3. Interactions with clause type and discourse features are best modeled in terms of licensing, i.e. the two kinds of variation are conditioned by the way allocutive hosting projections (Addr) are licensed.
   a. Force$_i$ . . . Addr$_i$
   b. Eval$_i$ . . . Addr$_i$

4. Variation in allocutive morpheme placement reflects (i) different positions in which a silent Addressee DP is found, and (ii) different positions in which a possibly silent bound pronoun may be introduced.
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2. Embedded/root-asymmetries
Allocutive marking is available in root clauses (declarative and interrogative) but sharply out in embedded ones (Pak, 2017; Kim, 2019; Portner et al., 2019).

(2) a. Inho-ka [choysen-ul ta ha-ess-supnita].
   Inho-NOM best-ACC all do-PAST-DEC.FORMAL
   ‘Inho did his best.’

   b. *Inho-ka sensayngnim-kkey [choysen-ul ta
      Inho-NOM teacher-to best-ACC all
      do-PAST-DEC.FORMAL-COMP said-DEC.PLAIN
      ‘Inho told the teacher that he did his best.’
Allocutive morphemes are person clitics, restricted to finite root contexts (Rebuschi, 1981; Oyharçabal, 1993; Laka, 1993; Albizu, 2002; Hualde, 2003; Arregi and Nevins, 2012; Haddican, 2018).

(3) a. Jon etorri-ko
   Jon-ERG come-IRREAL
du-k.
   AUX-2SG.FAM
   ‘Jon will come.’

b.*Jon-ek esa-n di-k
   Jon-ERG say-PERF AUX-2SG.FAM
   [etorri-ko du-k-ela].
   come-IRREAL AUX-2SG.FAM-C
   ‘Jon has said that he will come.’
Kaur and Yamada (2019) show that embedded allocutivity is restricted to the complement clauses of speech predicates such as ‘tell’, ‘say’, ‘speak’, ‘ask’.

(4) a. karan-ne keyaa [ki miiraa kal aayegii Karan-ERG said that Mira tomorrow come.FUT je]
ALLOC.PL
‘Karan said that Mira will come tomorrow.’

b.*karan-ne soceyaa [ki miraa kal aayegii Karan-ERG thought that Mira tomorrow come.FUT je]
ALLOC.PL
‘Karan thought that Mira will come tomorrow.’
• Outside verbal complements, the allocutive marker may occur in temporal/location-clauses but not in purpose and reason-clauses.

(5) a. maiN tadd jaavaaNgi [jaddoN karN vii jaayegaa
I then go.FUT when Karan also go.FUT
je] ALLOC.PL
‘I will go when Karan does too.’

b.*karan bajaar gayaa [kyoNkii o-nuu ikk kuRii-ne
Karan market go.PRF because 3.SG-DOM a girl-ERG
bulaayaa je] call.PRF ALLOC.PL
‘Karan went to the market because a girl called him.’
Magahi optionally allows allocutive marking on any finite clause including embedded clauses (Alok, 2020; Alok and Baker, 2018).

   Boy REL stand be-NHA my brother be-NHA
   ‘The boy who is standing there is my brother.’ (said to a friend)

   rumor COMP Ram prize won-NHA true be-NHA
   ‘The rumor that Santee won the prize is true’ (said to a friend)

(7) Creo [que *viu-cha / cha viu.] think that saw.-2SG.3SG.FEM / 2SG.3SG.FEM saw ‘I think he/she/it saw her.’

(8) Esquecin [que vos está tolo.] forgot that 2PL.FAM.DAT COP crazy ‘I forgot that he his crazy.’
• Some (often younger) speakers of Southern Basque dialects allow for allocutive clitics in **all finite embedding** types. (Azkue, 1923; Azkue Ibarbia, 1998; Hualde et al., 2003; Haddican and Etxeberria, 2020).

(9) Jon-ek esa-n di-k [etorri-ko du-k-ela].
Jon-ERG say-PERF AUX-2SG come-IRREAL AUX-2SG-C
‘Jon has said that he will come.’

(10) [Jon z-etorre-k-en-ean] ikusi-ko di-a-t.
Jon EXPL-come-2SG-C.Q-in see-FUT AUX-2SG-1SG
‘When John comes, I will see him.’

• Innovative Southern Basque dialects are identical in pragmatic behavior and morpheme order to Conserv. S. Basque

(11) Karei-mo [karei-no musuko-ga kabin-o kowasi-te he-also he-GEN son-NOM vase-ACC break-CV simai-masi-ta koto]-o wabi-te ori-mas-u.
MAL-HON-PST C-ACC apologizing-CV PRG.HON-HON-PRS ‘He; is also apologizing for his; son having broken the vase.’
(Yamada, 2019)
Mcfadden (2020) notes that the allocutive morpheme can appear in root contexts (declarative as well as interrogatives).

    I Jangri buy-PST-1SG.SBJ-ALLOC
    ‘I bought Jangri.’

b. evḷavũ aag-um-ŋgæ?
    how.much become-FUT-ALLOC
    ‘How much will it come to?’ (i.e. ‘How much does it cost?’)
Moreover, it can easily appear in the complement clause of attitude predicates. The evidence of true embedding is that there is indexical shift.

(13) Maya\textsubscript{i} [taan\textsubscript{i,j} poott-læ dżejkkæ-poo-r-een-ŋgæ-nnũ]\nMaya \textsc{ANAPH} contest-loc win-go-PRS-1SG-ALLOC-COMP]\nso-nn-aa
say-PST-3SG.F
‘Maya\textsubscript{i} said that she\textsubscript{i} would win the contest.’

In addition to complement clauses, it can also available in other types of embedding such as temporal adjuncts, hanging topics.
Root insensitive: Thai

- Most natural root clause—finally (McCready, 2014, 2019). However, it does not appear strictly in all root clauses (Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom Horie, 2000).

- But may possible in some embeddings with a topic marker,

\[(14) \text{[phrón mān pēn dūank àrákkàdāakhōm à khráp] mān because it COP July TOP HON it lēej rùcn then hot \text{ ‘Because it is July, it is hot.’}}\]

(K. Chaiphet, p.c.)

- Sensitive to main point of utterance.
3. Interactions in C
A second way that allocutive morphemes appear to vary is in terms of the other C-field elements they interact with.

In particular, allocutive languages broadly fall into one of three classes:

i. No interactions in C: appears in all specified finite contexts.
ii. Alloc. morphemes interacts with force: appears in contexts of specified clause type.
iii. Interacts with perspectival properties: appears in contexts of specified evaluative and/or discourse features.
We focus on **two kinds** of interaction in C-field.

In a first kind of languages, allocutive marking interacts with clause type.

In Zuberoan Basque (Oyharçabal, 1993), allocutive marking is only possible in root declaratives (cf. 2) and not in root interrogatives.

(15) Lan egiten dui-a/*di-n-a hire lagunak? work do-IMPERF AUX-Q/AUX-ALLOC-Q your friend
‘Does your friend work?’
Interactions with clause type

- In Japanese, allocutive marker -mas- is possible to embed under complementizer -koto, but not under -to (Yamada, 2019).

MAL-HON-PST C-ACC apologizing-CV PRG-ALLOC-PRS ‘He is also apologizing for his son’s having broken the vase.’

b. [Isogasiku sugosi-te irassyai-(*mas)-u]-to busily spend-CV PRG.HON-ALLOC-PRS-C zonzi-mas-u.
think.HON-ALLOC-PRS ‘I think that (he) is busy.’
A different kind of interaction is seen in Korean (Portner et al., 2019), where allocutive marking and the clause-typing morpheme are spelled out as a single morpheme.

(17) a. Inho-ka choysen-ul ta ha-ess-supnita.
   Inho-NOM best-ACC all do-PST-DECL.FORM
   ‘Inho did his best.’

   b. Inho-ka choysen-ul ta ha-ess-e.
   Inho-NOM best-ACC all do-PST-DECL.INTIM
   ‘Inho did his best.’
• In a second class of languages, the allocutive marking does not interact with clause type as described above, but rather co-occurs with additional pragmatic information about the speaker or hearer’s perspective on the proposition.

• In Galician and Magahi, the presence of allocutive marking involve the listener in facts being related to the event described or ask for solidarity/complicity in the events described.

• In Japanese, Yamada (2019) reports that allocutive marking has additional meaning that the speaker shares the subject’s modal commitment to the proposition.
Galician allocutive clitics tend to fall in clause with main point of utterance interpretation (Simons, 2007).

(18) Q: Que cree Xoan? what thinks Xoan ‘What does Xoan think?’

A: Xoan cree-(?che) que (che) vai chover. Xoan thinks-2SG.FAM that 2SG.FAM it.goes rain ‘Xoan thinks that it will rain.’

(19) E-(??che) que (che) está tolo. it.is-2SG.DAT.FAM that 2SG.DAT.FAM he.is crazy. ‘It’s that he’s crazy.’
4. First merged position
First-merged positions

- Portner et al. (2019) take the first-merged position of the allocutive morpheme to be quite high—TP-external and above the morpheme encoding Force. (See also Alok (2020).)
- Importantly, in several varieties, there is evidence that the allocutive morpheme sits in a lower position than what Portner et al. propose for Korean.
- In Innovative S. Basque and Magahi, the allocutive clitic sits inside the position of the clause-typing complementizer, as in (9), repeated here.

(20) Jon-ek esa-n dik [etorri-ko [du-k]-ela].
Jon-ERG say-PERF AUX come-IRREAL AUX-2SG-C
‘Jon has said that he will come.’
• Similarly, in Japanese, -mas appears below the position of the complementizer and tense markers, as in (11), repeated here.

(21) Karei-mo [karei-no musuko-ga kabin-o kowasi-te he-also he-GEN son-NOM vase-ACC break-CV simai-masi-ta koto]-o wabi-te ori-mas-u.
MAL-HON-PST C-ACC apologizing-cv PRG.HON-HON-PRS ‘He; is also apologizing for his; son having broken the vase.’
(Yamada, 2019)
• Allocutives appear in infinitives lacking independent tense values from the finite verb. If this reflects a truncated functional structure, without CP and TP layers, then these are additional cases of TP-internal allocutive morphemes.

(22) Einstein tivo que estudar-che moito.
Einstein have.3SG.PST that study.INFIN-2SG much
‘Einstein had to study a lot.’

(23)%Maria quere chegar-che pronto.
Maria wants arrive-2SG soon
‘Maria wants to arrive soon.’
Additional evidence for multiple first merged positions comes from Tamil where the allocutive marker can appear below or above the Q-particle, or in both positions simultaneously.

(24) a. niiŋgæ saap-ṭ-aačč-aa-ŋgæ?
you.PL eat-ASP-RES-Q-ALLOC
‘Have you eaten?’
b. niigæ  saap-ṭ-aaččū-ŋgæl-aa?
you.PL eat-ASP-RES-ALLOC-Q
‘Have you eaten?’
c. niigæ  saapṭ-aaččū-ŋgæl-aa-ŋgæ?
you.PL eat-RES-ALLOC-Q-ALLOC
‘Have you eaten?’

(McFadden, 2020)
### Interim summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Root effects</th>
<th>Interactions in C</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Root clauses</td>
<td>Clause type</td>
<td>Alloc &gt; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuberoan</td>
<td>Root clauses</td>
<td>Clause type</td>
<td>C &gt; Alloc &gt; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons. S. Basque</td>
<td>Root clauses</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>C &gt; Alloc &gt; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>Root clauses</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Alloc &gt; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magahi</td>
<td>All finite contexts</td>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>C &gt; Alloc &gt; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>All finite contexts</td>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>T &gt; Alloc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innov. S. Basque</td>
<td>All finite contexts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>C &gt; Alloc &gt; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>Most finite contexts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Alloc &gt; C &gt; Alloc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>All -koto contexts</td>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>T &gt; Alloc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>≥ Some embeddings</td>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>Alloc &gt; T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:** Embedding restrictions, interactions in C, and first-merged position of allocutive morpheme for 10 allocutive varieties.
5. Licensing allocutive hosts
Licensing allocutive hosts

- Four guiding observations:
  
i. There is variation across languages in the position of the allocutive morpheme.
  
ii. Languages in which allocutive morphemes interact with discourse features all have the property that allocutivity is permitted in some non-root contexts. (But this relationship is not biconditional.)
  
iii. The position of the allocutive morpheme does not correlate with sensitivity to (i.) root-clauses; (ii.) clause type; or (iii.) discourse properties.
  
iv. Languages vary in terms of the form the allocutive morpheme takes, i.e. as a clitic or agreeing head.
• Variation in allocutive morpheme placement reflects (i) different positions in which a silent Addressee DP may be introduced, and (ii) different positions in which a possibly silent bound pronoun may be introduced.

• The allocutive marker is either the bound pronoun itself (Basque, Galician) or exponed agreement with the addressee DP or bound pronoun (Korean, Magahi, Japanese, Punjabi, Thai).
• We adopt Portner et al.’s (2019) model of Korean (adjusting labels slightly). The allocutive morpheme is exponence of c, merged, universally, only in root contexts.

• In Punjabi, these will include speech predicates and some adjunct clauses.
• The locus of allocutive agreement is lower in the clause, FinP, available in all embeddings.

• The Fin head is also licensed by an evaluative feature, which we take to be the source of the empathy meaning.

• Thai will be similar, with the allocutive morpheme realized in Fin.
• Both cP and FinP are loci of allocutivity (McFadden, 2020).
• Thus, the marker is found both above and below the complementizer, which is in Force.
• Embedding is also possible.
In Galician, allocutive clitics, which are identical in exponence to thematic datives, are introduced in an applicative head licensed by an evaluative feature—the source of the empathy meaning.
• Assume, following Yamada (2019), that the allocutive head is merged below T (in -koto contexts).

• We recast Yamada’s suggestion of agreement with a clausemate high-Addr head with operator variable binding. The allocutive morpheme reflects agreement with a silent pronoun.

• Yamada’s observed commitment effect for embedded contexts reflects in part licensing by Eval.
• The allocutive morpheme is a clitic (Oyharçabal, 1993; Arregi and Nevins, 2012; Haddican, 2018).

• The Fin head introducing this clitic is licensed by Force and in the local domain of $c$ in some dialects.

\[(30) \text{ Zuberoan} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spkr} \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
\text{Addr}_i \quad \text{c'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{FinP} \quad \text{ForceP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Fin} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
(31) \text{ Cons. S. Basque}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FinP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Cl}_i \quad \text{Fin'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Fin} \quad \text{[uc]} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
(32) \text{ Innov. S. Basque}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FinP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Cl}_i \quad \text{Fin'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Fin} \\
\end{array}
\]
6. Conclusion
Main claims

1. Variation in allocutive morpheme placement reflects (i) different positions in which a silent Addressee DP may be introduced, and (ii) different positions in which a possibly silent bound pronoun may be introduced.

2. This variation is only partially correlated with two other kind of variation in the behavior of allocutive morphemes:
   i. Whether these are available in embedded contexts.
   ii. Whether these morphemes are sensitive to clause type and/or other discourse properties.

3. These latter two kinds of variation are partially correlated: languages in which the allocutive morpheme interacts with discourse properties all have the property that they may appear in embedded contexts.

4. Interactions with clause type and evaluative perspective are best modeled in terms of licensing. That is, the two kinds of variation are conditioned by the way allocutive hosting projections are licensed.
   a. \text{Force}_{F_i} \ldots \text{Addr}_{F_i}
   b. \text{Eval}_{F_i} \ldots \text{Addr}_{F_i}
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