Allocutive agreement and indexicals Shift Together, but not always

Both allocutive agreement (AllAgr, morphosyntactic agreement with the addressee) and indexical shift (IndShift, interpretation of indexical elements including 1st and 2nd person pronominals against an intensional context rather than the utterance context) involve the grammatical treatment of contextual participants, thus we might expect them to involve shared underlying mechanisms. However, they differ in several ways. AllAgr is largely a phenomenon of root clauses, manifests as morphological agreement, and specifically involves the Addressee. IndShift, on the other hand, is only found in intensional embedding, manifests as special interpretations of morphosyntactic material, and can involve the full range of contextual parameters, most centrally revolving around the Speaker. Furthermore, the two phenomena have rather restricted cross-linguistic distributions. Together, these result in the fact that languages that display both seem to be quite rare. This, in turn, makes it difficult to study direct interactions between the two phenomena and complicates any potential unified account.

Nonetheless, recent work on two languages, Magahi and Tamil, has uncovered important connections in the specific contexts where AllAgr and IndShift do co-occur. In both, there is a circumscribed class of embedded clauses which allow both phenomena, and here we find a shifted interpretation of AllAgr that parallels the shifted interpretation of the indexicals — agreement is with the Addressee of the intensional (rather than the utterance) context — what we will refer to as $\text{AllAgr}_{\text{shifted}}$. This presentation will examine these patterns in detail, adding crucial novel data from Tamil. We will argue that the connections we see have important consequences for our theories of AllAgr and IndShift.

The basic pattern in both Magahi and Tamil is a dependency between IndShift and $\text{AllAgr}_{\text{shifted}}$. In Tamil, given the background in (1), Anand can felicitously say either (2) or (3):

(1) Maya$_M$ has told Latha$_L$, her boss, that she (Maya) is going to win an award. Anand$_A$ witnessed this and wants to report it to Venkat$_V$, his boss, who wasn't there.

(2) M. L.-ʈʈæ [taan$_M$ parisŭ ʤejkkæ-poo-r-een$_M$-ŋgæ$_L$-nnŭ] so-nn-aa.
M. L.-LOC [ANAPH prize win-go-PRS-1S-ALL-C] say-PST-3SF
'Maya told Latha that she$_M$ would win an award.' (Maya being polite to Latha)

(3) M. L.-ʈʈæ [taan$_M$ parisŭ ʤejkkæ-poo-r-aa⌊$_M$-ŋgæ$_V$-nnŭ] so-nn-aa.
M. L.-LOC [she prize win-go-PRS-3SF-ALL-C] say-PST-3SF
'Maya told Latha that she$_M$ would win an award.' (Anand being polite to Venkat)

(2) has IndShift of 1st person agreement under an anaphor subject, what Sundaresan (2012) dubs 'monstrous agreement'. It also has AllAgr, with an obligatorily shifted interpretation tracking the addressee of the matrix clause, Latha. Crucially, unshifted AllAgr is only possible in the absence of IndShift, as in (3), which has non-monstrous 3rd person agreement, and AllAgr tracking the addresses of the utterance, Venkat. As argued by Alok and Baker (2018, 2022); Alok (2021) based on parallel Magahi data, this amounts to an instance of the Shift Together constraint — the observation that a shifty indexical cannot shift to the exclusion of another in its local intensional domain (Anand, 2006).

This means, then, that $\text{AllAgr}_{\text{shifted}}$ should be understood as a type of IndShift, but this still doesn't tell us much about the details of the underlying mechanisms involved for each. This we can learn from where Shift Together *fails*. In Tamil, overt 1st person pronouns, unlike 1st person agreement, cannot shift. Thus, in a clause with monstrous 1st person agreement plus an overt 1st person pronoun, we get a violation of Shift Together (Sundaresan, 2018). In (4), the 1st singular agreement in the embedded clause is shifted to track matrix attitude-holder Raman, but the embedded object pronoun *enn-æ* 'me' cannot shift, but must refer to the utterance speaker:

(4) Raman [$_{CP}$ taan$_R$ enn-æ$_{speaker/*R}$ paartt-een$_R$-nnŭ] ottŭɳɖ-aan.
Raman ANAPH.NOM me-ACC saw-1SG-COMP admitted.-3MSG
'Raman admitted that he$_R$ had seen me$_{speaker/*R}$.'

Deal (2018, 2020) has argued that this kind of shifted agreement under anaphoric subjects in languages like Tamil is not true IndShift. Rather than an indexical interpreted against a shifted context, she posits a

1st-person logophor — an "indexiphor" — which has a restricted logophoric interpretation and triggers a kind of 1st person agreement. Absent a shifted context, actual 1st person pronouns do not shift. Taken together, this results in what looks like but isn't actually a Shift Together violation in (4).

However, we have now seen that Tamil monstrous agreement **is** subject to Shift Together when we put it in the same domain as AllAgr. Note, furthermore, that here it's not simply a requirement that all 1st person elements shift together, but that 1st and 2nd person elements shift together (Alok and Baker, 2022's Shift Together 2). What we're observing is not a shifting of individual contextual parameters, but apparently of two parameters jointly as a unit, i.e. as part of a non-trivial (if not necessarily complete) context. This challenges Deal's analysis of monstrous agreement, at least in Tamil. If that pattern really did just amount to a logophoric pronoun that triggers 1st person agreement, it would not involve actual contextual parameters, let alone a non-trivial context, and thus there would be no expectation of an effect on $\text{AllAgr}_{\text{shifted}}$ or any other kind of Shift Together.

A further challenge comes from the fact that we can replicate this kind of Shift Together exception in the 2nd person as well, in cases where we have an overt 2nd person pronoun in addition to $\text{AllAgr}_{\text{shifted}}$. Consider the context described in (5), in which (6) is possible:

(5) Raman_R, Maya_M, Latha_L and Venkat_V are cousins. Latha and Venkat have recently appeared in their first movie roles. Maya has seen one of these movies, and Raman has conveyed this fact to their grandfather_G. Latha is now relating this state-of-affairs to Venkat, i.e. Latha is the *Speaker* of the following sentences and Venkat the *Addressee*.

(6) Raman taattaa-kiʈʈæ [Maya $\boxed{\text{onn-æ}_{V,*G}}$ paa-tt-aa-$\boxed{\text{ŋgæ}_G}$-nnŭ] so-nn-aan.
Raman Grandpa-LOC [Maya you-ACC see-PST-3SF-ALL-COMP] say-PST-3SM
'Raman told Grandpa that Maya saw you_V.'

The cousins all use honorific forms with their grandfather but familiar forms with each other, thus honorific AllAgr is only felicitous as targetting grandfather. Since he's the Addressee of the matrix speech verb, not of the utterance, this means an $\text{AllAgr}_{\text{shifted}}$ interpretation. Nonetheless, the overt *onn-æ* 'you' must track the Addressee of the utterance, Venkat. This constitutes another superficial violation of Shift Together, this time for 2nd person.

What this data shows is that AllAgr and monstrous agreement obey Shift Together with respect to each other, but not with respect to their corresponding overt pronominals. This strengthens the parallel between AllAgr and IndShift while also giving us a clue about how Shift Together violations can occur in the first place, and what this then means for a theory of IndShift. Sundaresan (2018) notes that a number of languages show variation in the shiftability of specific pronouns, and that it is frequently covert pronouns and agreement that shift, while overt pronouns resist shifting. In fact, *no* language seems to attest a paradigm where the overt indexical shifts while its covert counterpart remains unshifted. The novel Tamil facts regarding $\text{AllAgr}_{\text{shifted}}$ fit in perfectly here, with the silent representation of the Addressee shifting, while the overt 2nd person pronoun does not. This nuanced pattern where Shift Together is a real and consistent restriction on IndShift, but also has systematic, genuine exceptions, presents a challenge for context-overwriting approaches to IndShift (Anand, 2006; Shklovsky and Sudo, 2014; Deal, 2020, etc.). Such overwriting is motivated by the desire to enforce Shift Together, but if this completely obliterates the utterance context, there is no way to accommodate the interpretation of unshiftable indexicals, like the overt 1st and 2nd pronouns of languages like Tamil, which still need access to that context. The data presented here thus motivates pursuing alternative approaches to IndShift where shifting is implemented via a monstrous quantifier that binds contextual variables associated with shiftable indexicals in its scope in a way that respects minimality in order to derive Shift Together, but leaves the existing utterance context unchanged (Schlenker, 2003; Sundaresan, 2018, etc.). Individual indexical elements can then be pre-specified as shiftable or non-shiftable in terms of whether they contain a contextual variable that could be bound by the monster. Those which do, must shift and indeed Shift Together in the scope of such a monster. Those which do not, simply track the utterance context, which has not been overwritten and thus remains accessible. Genuine Shift Together violations as seen here arise when indexicals of these two types co-occur in the scope of a single monster.

References

Alok, Deepak. 2021. The morphosyntax of Magahi addressee agreement. *Syntax* 24:263–296.

Alok, Deepak, and Mark Baker. 2018. On the mechanics (syntax) of indexical shift: Evidence from allocutive agreement in Magahi. Ms. Rutgers University.

Alok, Deepak, and Mark Baker. 2022. Perso and honotification: Features and interactions in Magahi. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 7(1):1–35.

Anand, P. 2006. De de se. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Deal, Amy Rose. 2018. Indexiphors: Notes on embedded indexicals, shifty agreement, and logophoricity. Http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003836, University of California, Berkeley.

Deal, Amy Rose. 2020. *A theory of indexical shift: Meaning, grammar and crosslinguistic variation*. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph Series. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Schlenker, Philippe. 2003. A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26:29–120. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Shklovsky, Kirill, and Yasutada Sudo. 2014. The syntax of monsters. *LI* 45:381–402.

Sundaresan, Sandhya. 2012. Context and (Co-)reference in the syntax and its interfaces. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tromsø (CASTL)/Universität Stuttgart, Tromsø.

Sundaresan, Sandhya. 2018. An alternative theory of indexical shift: variation and selection without context-overwriting. Paper given at the 2018 MIT Linguistics Colloquium and Triple A4, Gothenburg: https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004115.