Speaker visibility in syntax

Current studies in generative grammar that focus on the syntactic mapping of discourse participants propose various ways for capturing the impact of the speaker pragmatic role on the derivation of sentences (e.g., Giorgi 2010, Heim et al 2016, Hill 2007, 2014, Miyagawa 2010, 2012 in press, Ross 1970, Sigurðsson 2011, Speas & Tenny 2003). Despite the differences in frameworks and syntactic mechanisms proposed, all these studies agree on two points: (i) there is a speech act field at the left periphery of clauses from where some entity with a [speaker] feature binds pronouns inside the clause and decides on their referential content (= Sigurðsson's 'logophoric agent'); and (ii) this category is silent albeit its presence may be reflected by allocutive agreement markers on verbs (Ross 1970; Zu 2011).

In this paper, we present data where the speaker is actually visible in direct addresses that we organize in two groups: *reversed vocatives* and *inverse vocatives*. Reversed vocatives spell out both speaker and addressee through nouns **(1a)**. A pronoun may replace the addressee **(1b)** but not the speaker **(1c)**. **(1)** comes from Romanian, but equivalents are found in Georgian, Palestinian Arabic, Arbërish a.o.

(1) a. *Ioane mamă, unde te duci?* b. *Tu mamă,...* c. **Ioane eu,...*
Ion-VOC mother where REFL.2 go.2SG   you(=Ion) mother   Ion-VOC I
'Ion, where do you go? (say I, the mother)'

In **(1)**, the vocative and the speaker noun form one prosodic unit with the high pitch on the vocative. The kinship/speaker noun is bare and observes restriction of word order not only in relation to the vocative noun but also in relation to other speech act particles; see **(6)**.

Inverse vocatives, as in Turkish **(2)** (also in Sasonic Arabic) display an obligatory noun > possessive clitic string, which can equally spell out the sequences speaker > addressee **(2a)** or addressee > speaker **(2b)**. The possessive is an invariable 3rd person in this context, although it is inflected elsewhere.

(2) a. (The elder brother addresses his little female sibling = speaker > addressee)
Abi-si,   *ayakkabılar-ım-ı*   *getir-ir-mi-sin?*
brother-**3SG**   shoes-1SG-ACC   fetch-AOR-Q-2SG
'[Her] brother, can you fetch my shoes?' (from *İntihar*, a novel)
b. (A patient addresses his/her doctor = addressee > speaker)
Peki,   *sana*   *ne*   *de-meli,*   *doktor-cuğ-u?*
well   you-DAT   what   say-should   doctor-DIM-**3SG**
'Well, [his/her] doctor, what about you?' (Internet search)

Languages that display reversed or inverse vocatives also have regular vocatives (e.g., as in English) in which the speaker is not spelled out.

The questions we raise are: (i) what makes the speaker visible in these constructions? (ii) why is the speaker made visible in two different ways in **(1)** and **(2)**? what does it tell us about the syntactic mapping of speech acts?

For the analysis, we adopt the cartographic framework already explored for speech acts in the literature (e.g., Haegeman & Hill 2013). In particular, we assume the hierarchy in **(3)** and the feature distribution in **(4)**, reflecting the similarity between the argument structure for verbs and for speech acts (Speas & Tenny 2003), with a subject (speaker), a direct object (CP) and an indirect object (addressee).

(3) saP (speaker field) > SAP (addressee field) > CP/TP/vP
(4) sa = [speaker] p-role feature; speaker's point of view [pov] feature
SA = [addressee] p-role; [sentience] p-role; [bonding] (the manipulation of the addressee)

The sets in **(4)** contain argument and discourse features, expected to trigger A and A' Spec positions, respectively. A vocative phrase (VocP) merges as the indirect object and checks the [addressee] p-role in argumental Spec, SAP. CP checks [sentience]. For [speaker], an empty category is surmised in Spec, saP (or the equivalent in Sigurðsson 2011). Constituents (optionally) moved from inside the clause check the discourse features [pov] in A'-Spec, saP and/or [bonding] in A'-Spec, SAP.

The internal structure of a regular VocP has the structure in **(5)** (see Espinal 2013, Hill 2007, 2014, Stavrou 2015), where Voc carries the features $[2^{nd}]$ and inter-personal [i.p.], the latter capturing the degrees of social esteem. The noun moved to VocP (or long distance Agree) ensures the feature checking.

(5) VocP > (DP) > NP   involving: (i) N-to-Voc; or (ii) DP-to-Spec,VocP; or (iii) long distance Agree

On the basis of this framework, we analyze reversed vocatives as involving a separate mapping of [2nd] and [i.p.] within VocP, see **(6)**: the vocative noun checks [2nd], whereas the speaker spellout checks [i.p.]. The trigger for the split Voc is the valuation of [i.p.] as [kin]: only kinship nouns qualify for **(6)** and they are grammaticalized (invariable, unmodified, cannot be replaced with pronouns). The word order is rigid and so is the derivation: i.e., obligatory N-to-Voc, versus DP-to-Spec,VocP; and direct merge in lower Spec, VocP for the speaker noun. An optional vocative particle conveying familiarity may occur in higher Spec,VocP (cross-linguistically, such particles may be honorifics).

(6) [$_{VocP}$ (măi) [$_{Voc}$ Ioane $_{[2nd]}$ [$_{VocP}$ mamă $_{[kin]}$ [$_{Voc}$ <Ioane> [$_{NP}$ <Ion>..]]]

Inverse vocatives do not qualify for the analysis in **(6)**: they obligatorily reject 2nd person possessives, display non-kin relations, and equally pronominalize the speaker and the addressee. Compared to regular vocatives, inverse vocatives are reported to convey affec(ta)tion. This suggests that the relevant marked features are [p.o.v] and [bonding], not [i.p.], and that the derivation concerns the direct merge of the string noun > possessive clitic with the saP/SAP field. We propose that inverse vocatives are generated when the underspecified [p.o.v] and [bonding] are fused and valued as [affect].

First, we confirm that inverse vocatives are not generated inside VocP: (i) the possessive pronoun does not indicate possession or social belonging (as in 'my daughter'), but a discourse participant; (ii) the sequence indicates two discourse participants, while that is not possible with noun>pronoun sequences within VocP; (iii) the possessive does not agree in person or number with the noun; (iv) the possessive may display allocutive agreement (i.e., the biological gender of the addressee in Sason Arabic), which is a property of SA heads (Miyagawa 2012), not of VocPs.

Second, we argue that the speech act structure is collapsed, since [pov] and [bonding] are fused: (i) the noun and the enclitic are in a local Spec-head relation, although they do not belong to the same constituent (i.e., test: a Coordinated Phrase containing two nouns gets only one enclitic); (ii) the free switch in the checking of p-roles of [speaker] and [addressee] indicates a local relation to the same head; (iii) the noun may take a modifier, so it is a phasal DP merged in an A- Spec, since it checks a p-role.

Accordingly, we propose that the collapsed s/SAP projects one A'- Spec for the category that checks [affect]; see **(7)**. Following Collins & Postal (2012) (i.e., that "vocatives are bona fide imposters") and the developments in Podobryaev (2014), we consider that a null imposter operator, triggered by [affect], merges in Spec, s/SAP and binds the pronoun. The hypothesis is that invariable (3rd person form) pronouns can come to denote speakers or addressees in the presence of semantic imposters, which license silent assignment-function-manipulating *operators* in syntax.

(7)   a.   [$_{s/SAP}$ ① [$_{s/SAP}$ DP$_{[addressee]}$ [$_{s/SA}$ clitic pro$_{[speaker]}$]]]
    b.   [$_{s/SAP}$ ② [$_{s/SAP}$ DP$_{[speaker]}$ [$_{s/SA}$ clitic pro$_{[addressee]}$]]]

In **(7)**, the pronoun checks the p-role indicated by the imposter-operator that binds it.

In conclusion, the analysis proposed here indicates that there is a strict distribution of features within VocP and saP/SAP, and variation arises only in the degree of (under)specification of the relevant discourse features. Syntactically, such variation is implemented either by the fission or fusion of functional heads within the limits of a stable underlying pattern (i.e., either VocP or saP/SAP). Furthermore, the structure of inverse vocatives allows us to modify the location of imposter-operators, which are inside the clause in Podobryaev (2014). Our data suggest that they are much higher, in the speech act field, at least in direct addresses. This is theoretically more desirable, since it unifies the analyses in Podobryaev (2014) and Sigurðsson (2011): the imposter-operators subsume all the effects of the "logophoric agent/patient" pointed out in Sigurðsson 2011 (mainly, the switch of reference under c-command, irrespective of the morphology of the bound pronoun and its location in the clause).

Selected references: **Hill**, V. 2014. *Vocatives*: *How syntax meets with pragmatics*. Leiden: Brill. **Miyagawa**, S. 2012. Agreements that occur mainly in main clauses. In Aelbrecht, L. et al (eds), *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons*. 79-112. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins. **Podobryaev**, A. 2014. Persons, imposters, and monsters. PhD, MIT. **Speas**, M. & C. **Tenny**. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. *Asymmetry in grammar*. ed. A.-M. Di Sciullo, 315-344. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins. **Sigurðsson**, H. A. 2011. Conditions on argument drop. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(2):267- 304.