

Toward a unified syntax of Addressee in C: Evidence from Galician solidarity datives

Recent literature has seen a considerable growth in formal descriptions of allocutivity—morphological marking of non-thematic addressees—across language families. Important analytical differences in this literature notwithstanding, a consensus has emerged about two core properties of representations of allocutivity: (i) that they involve an Addressee-related projection in the left periphery of the clause; and (ii) this projection contains a (usually) silent nominal that participates in case/agreement operations (Verma 1991, Oyharcabal 1993, Speas & Tenny 2003, Miyagawa 2012, 2017, Zu 2013, 2017, McFadden 2017, Portner et al. to appear).

A question largely unaddressed in this literature is what the relationship is between this Addressee element and the loci of person features associated with two other phenomena in the left periphery discussed in the literature: (i) person features inherited by T (Chomsky 2008); and (ii) the operator or *pro* that governs indexical shift (Baker 2008, Deal 2017, Sundaresan 2018). This paper presents novel evidence from Galician supporting a unified approach to these three different facets of second person features in the left periphery. Specifically, this paper analyzes a set of second person clitics in Galician called “solidarity clitics” in the Romance literature. These clitics, which are identical in exponence to thematic dative clitics, agree in number and status with the addressee, even when the latter is not a participant in the events described. Unlike Romance ethical datives, the addressee need not have an “affected” or experiencer interpretation.

- (1) Mourreu-**che** a vaca.
died.3SG-**2SG.FAM.DAT** the cow
‘The cow died.’ (Carbón-Riobóo (1995: 89))

Evidence for an interaction between allocutivity and person feature inheritance comes from a contrast between second person subjects and second person objects in their ability to block allocutivity. For some speakers, at least, these clitics are marginally able to co-occur with a second person non-subject, as in (2). With second person subjects, however, solidarity clitics are completely impossible, as in (3).

- (2) ?%Manolo vai-**che**-vos a buscar.
Manolo go-**2.SG.FAM.-2PL.FAM.** to look.for
‘Manolo will go to pick you all up.’ (Spoken to one of the people to be picked up.)
- (3) *Tendes-**che** moito que facer.
have.2PL.FAM-**2.SG.FAM** much that do
‘You all have a lot to do.’ (Spoken to one of the people with much to do.)

Similar facts are reported in Tamil by McFadden (2017). Here, again, while allocutive marking can co-occur with a second person object (4), co-occurrence with a second-person subject is blocked (5).

- (4) naan onga[-æ] paḍatt-læ paa-tt-een-**ṅgæ**
I you.PL.OBL-ACC film-LOC see-PST-1SG.SBJ-**ALLOC**
‘I saw you in a film.’ (McFadden 2017)
- (5) *niingæ rombaa smart-aa iru-kk-iingæ-**ṅgæ**
you.PL very smart-PRED be-PRS-2PL-**ALLOC**
‘You’re very smart.’ (McFadden 2017)

Following Chomsky (2008), let us assume that T inherits uninterpretable [1,2] person features from one or more higher heads. In particular, let us take this head to be Addressee in the case of second person agreement. If this probe agrees with another element—say, a silent addressee morpheme in the SpeechAct layer—before inheritance applies, then agreement on T with the subject is blocked. Assuming the person features involved in object agreement are merged lower, then the absence of an interaction between allocutive marking and addressee agreement is explained.

Evidence supporting the proposal that the left periphery of clause contains a silent nominal comes from the absence of clitic doubling in solidarity clitic constructions. Thematic dative clitics in Galician freely permit doubling, that is, they may co-occur with a clausemate co-referential DP, as in (6). Solidarity dative clitics, on the other hand can never co-occur with an overt double, as in (7).

- (6) Dei-**lle** o libro ao meu amigo.
 give-**3SG.DAT** the book to.the my friend.
 ‘Give the book to my friend.’
- (7) Os venres os alumnos sempre chégan-**che** (***a tí**) tarde á clase.
 the Fridays the students always arrive-2SG (***to you**) late to-the class
 ‘The students always arrive late to the class on Fridays.’

Similar facts obtain in Basque, another allocutive clitic language (Arregi & Nevins 2012, Haddican to appear). Basque ergative, absolutive and dative clitics, which are obligatory, may co-occur with an overt coreferential DP as in (8). In contrast, allocutive clitics which are identical in exponence to ergative and dative clitics, can never co-occur with an overt double, as in Galician, (9).

- (8) (**Hik**) egin du-**k**. (9) (***Hi**) mintza niaiteke-**k**.
2SG.ERG do AUX-**2SG.ERG** **2SG.ERG** talk AUX.1SG-**ALLOC**
 ‘You have done it.’ ‘I can talk.’ (Oyharçabal 1993)

The absence of an overt double in (7) and (9), with clitics that otherwise freely allow doubling, suggests that the doubled nominal in such contexts is silent. McFadden (2017) and Sundaresan (2018) report that in Tamil, the individual honored in allocutive marking correlates with indexical shift. Sundaresan (2018) takes this as evidence that allocutive marking and indexical shift are related syntactically, both reflecting properties of an Addressee-related head. Following Sundaresan, we propose that the most plausible identity for the silent clitic double in Galician is Addressee operator or *pro* proposed to model the interpretation of first second person pronouns in indexical shift contexts (Schlenker 2003, Anand & Nevins 2004, Baker 2008, Sundaresan 2018). Specifically, we follow Nevins (2011) in taking clitics and their doubles to be merged in a “big DP” structure of category KP, such that solidarity datives and their associated operator have the representation in (10). The exponence of these clitics as datives supports the view of Addressee as a species of Applicative head (Haegeman & Hill 2013, Miyagawa 2013).

- (10) [AddresseeP [KP D_{SolidarityClitic} [K' K **OP**_{Addressee}]] Addressee [TP T . . .]]

This approach also suggests a partial answer to the further question of why allocutive clitics are obligatory in Basque but optional in Galician in reducing the problem to whatever accounts for the fact that clitic doubling is obligatory in the former, but optional in the latter.