

Addressee Agreement in Kiitharaka and Speech Act Projection Theory

In this talk we connect plural addressee suffixes (PAS) found in Bantu languages to recent work on allocutive agreement and the representation of discourse participants in syntax. Muriungi (2008) shows that Kiitharaka's PAS *-ni* may encode the plurality of a 2nd person argument, whether an overt goal or theme (1) or the null argument of an imperative (2) or exhortative (3).

- (1) I-ba-bu-thok-ir-i-e-**ni**. [addressee agreement with DO]
 Foc-2SM-2 PL.OM-invite-PERF-PA
 'They invited you guys.'
- (2) a. Ring!
 hit
 'Hit!' *singular addressee*
- b. Ring-*(**ni**)! [Imperative]
 hit-PA
 'Hit!' *plural addressee*
- (3) a. Tu-thoom-e Kiitharaka!
 1PL-study-SBJ Kiitharaka
 'Let's study Kiitharaka!' *singular addressee*
- b. Tu-thoome-**ni** Kiitharaka! [Exhortative]
 1PL-study-SBJ-PA Kitharaka
 'Let's study Kiitharaka!' *plural addressee*

Muriungi (2008) also shows that Kiitharaka *-ni* can encode the plurality of a non-argument addressee (see (4)), like better-studied allocutive agreement in Basque and Jingpo (5) and (6).

- (4) I-rio i-bi-bi-ir-e-**ni**. [Kiitharaka: Muriungi 2008:132]
 8-food FOC-8SM-cook-PERF-PA
 'Food is cooked' (✓a mother addressing her three children)
- (5) Pette-k lan egin di-**n**. [Basque; Oyharcabal 1993:92-3]
 Peter-ERG work do.PFV 3.ERG-F
 'Peter worked.' (said to a female friend)
- (6) Hkying gade htu **sə**-ta? [Jingpo; Zu 2018:55]
 time how.many point 2sg-WH
 'What time is it?'

On this basis we propose a unified analysis of addressee agreement in terms of selection: the syntactic location determines the domain from which the controller of agreement is drawn. We argue that (1)-(3) motivate an AddresseeP relatively low in the structure: selected by *v** in cases like (1) (see (7)a) and by the Jussive head of imperatives and exhortatives in (2)b, (3)b (see (7)b,c and Zanuttini et al 2012). We follow Zanuttini et al in positing that a *pro* subject of imperatives and exhortatives has unvalued phi-features; we diverge in attributing the valued features to Spkr and Addr heads; this is crucial since their number features vary independently. (7)d shows the highest position of Speech Act Participant Ps, reflecting discourse alone.

- (7) a. ...[_{VP} They *v** [_{AddrP} *-ni* [_{VP} invited *pro*_{2pl}]]] = (1)
- b. ...[_{JussiveP} Jussive:IMP [_{SpkrP} Spkr_{i1st.sg} [_{AddrP} *-ni*_{i2nd.PI} [_{VP} *pro*_{u2,uNum} *v* [_{VP} hit!]]]]] = (2)b
- c. ...[_{JussiveP} Jussive:EXH [_{SpkrP} Spkr_{i1st.sg} [_{AddrP} *-ni*_{i2nd.PI} [_{VP} *pro*_{u1,u2,uNum} *v* [_{VP} study DP]]]] = (3)b
- d. [_{SpkrP} Spkr_{i1st.sg} [_{AddrP} *-ni*_{i2nd.PI} [_{TP} food was cooked]]] = (4)

Muriungi (2008) shows that in a multiclausal construction with a 2.PL internal argument, the PAS may occur on either the highest or most embedded verb or both, confirming the existence of distinct Merge locations for Kiitharaka AddrPs (see (9)).

(8) N-a-ku-irir-a(-ni) ati mu-nene n-a-tangac-ire ati ba-ka-bu-gwat-a(-ni)
 FOC-1SM-regret-FV-PA that 1-boss FOC-1SM-announce-PERF-FV that 2SM-FUT-2pl.OM-arrest-PA
 'He regrets that the boss announced that they will arrest you.'

(9) [_{SpkrP} Spkr_{i1st.sg} [_{AddrP} -ni_{i2nd.PI} [_{TP} he regrets [_{CP} that the boss announced
 [_{CP} that they will [_{VP} <they> v* [_{AddrP} -ni [_{VP} arrest *pro*_{2pl}]]]]]]]]] = (8)

References: •Muriungi, P. 2008. Phrasal movement inside Bantu verbs. Tromsø PhD thesis. •Oyharcabal, B. 1993. Verb agreement with nonarguments. In Urbina & Hualde (eds.), *Generative studies in Basque linguistics*, 89–114. •Zanuttini et al 2012. A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 30.4: 1231–1274. •Zu, V. 2018. Discourse participants and the structural representation of the context. NYU PhD thesis.