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1 Introduction

- Allocutivity is a phenomenon, wherein certain languages have distinct verbal morphology that encodes the addressee of the speech act.

- A classic example is provided by Basque, where the verb bears distinct endings -k and -n to encode the male and the female hearer of the speech act.

  (1) Pette-k lan egin di-k
     Peter-ERG work do.perf 3.ERG-M
     ‘Peter worked.’ (said to a male friend)

  (2) Pette-k lan egin di-n
     Peter-ERG work do.perf 3.ERG-F
     ‘Peter worked.’ (said to a female friend) (Oyharçabal, 1993: ex.92-93)

- The phenomenon is typically considered to be a root phenomenon, which occurs on the matrix verb and refers to the addressee of the speech act (see Miyagawa 2012, 2017 for Basque and Japanese; Portner et al. 2019 for Korean).

- While its root restriction is quite evident in some languages (Korean/Thai), recent studies on Tamil (McFadden 2017) and Magahi (Alok and Baker 2018; Baker & Alok 2019) show that allocutivity can appear in the indirect speech context.

- With a view to better understand the syntax-semantics of embedded allocutivity, we examine two understudied allocutive languages in this paper— Punjabi je (Kaur 2017, 2018) and Japanese -mas- (Miyagawa 2012; Yamada 2018).

- Punjabi (varieties in Kanpur, Lahore and Gujrat district) encodes allocutivity by the presence of ii/aa for the singular/non-honorific hearer and je for the plural/(non)-honorific hearer of the speech act (see Akhtar 1991, Butt 2007, Kaur 2017).

  (3) raam kal aayegaa ii/je.
     Ram.NOM tomorrow come.FUT.M.SG ALLOC.SG/PL
     ‘Ram will come tomorrow.’

- Similarly, it is well-known from the seminal work by Miyagawa (2012) that Japanese encodes the utterance hearer via the form -mas-.

  (4) ramu-wa ki-mas-u.
     Ram-TOP come-ALLOC.H-PRS
     ‘Ram will come’ (to an honorific hearer).
2. DESCRIPTION: EMBEDDING DOMAINS

- In this paper, we have two modest goals:

  **Embedded Allocutivity:** First, we intend to add Japanese and Punjabi to the list of languages which allow allocutivity in embedded domains (contra Miyagawa’s claim for Japanese). The embedding domains vary across the two languages, with Japanese being more generous.

  **(Non)-Shifty reading:** Secondly, examining the reference of embedded allocutivity, we show that typically, the embedded allocutive marker in both languages refers to the utterance addressee. However, in Punjabi, there is at least one condition under which embedded allocutivity can obtain a shifted reading, i.e. with a co-occurring embedded 1st person pronoun.

- We attempt an account to explain the above facts.

2 Description: Embedding domains

2.1 Japanese

2.1.1 Miyagawa’s generalization

- **Previous studies:** Previous studies have tried to reveal the conditions under which embedded allocutive markings are licensed in Japanese (Tagashira 1973; Harada 1976; Nonaka and Yamamoto 1985; Nonaka 2006; Miyagawa 2012, 2017).

- **Miyagawa’s classification:** Amongst all, Miyagawa’s (2012, 2017) work has become quite influential in recent theoretical linguistics as he discusses the problem in the context of main clause phenomena. First, he points out that there are two different types of main clause phenomena — (i) those that Emonds (1970) discussed and (ii) those that Hooper and Thompson revealed (Table 1). Second, he claims that the embedded allocutive markers are permitted only under Class A predicates, exhibiting Emonds’s environment (5a).

  (5) a. Emonds’s (1970) environment: only A
    b. Hooper and Thompson’s (1973) environment: A, B, E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emonds (1970)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooper and Thompson (1973)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded Alloc.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Miyagawa’s generalization for Japanese embedded allocutive markers.

(6) Class A

\[
\text{kare}_-\text{-wa (kanozyo-ni)} [\text{kare}_-\text{-no ha}h\text{aoy}a-ga asita mairi-\text{mas}-u-koto]-o \\
\text{he-TOP she-DAT he-GEN mother-NOM tomorrow come-ALLOC.H-PRS-C-ACC} \\
suden\text{e} tugete ori-masi\text{-ta}.
\]

already tell PRG-ALLOC.H-PST

‘He has already told her that his mother would come tomorrow .’(-\text{mas} = \text{UttAddr})
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2.1.2 Beyond speech act predicates

- **Embedded allocutive markers:** Contrary to Miyagawa’s (2012, 2017) generalization, we can find embedded allocutive markers in non-speech act predicates.

(7) Class B (Bouletic predicate)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Gakusei-wa student-TOP} \\
\text{sensei-ga teacher-NOM} \\
\text{intai} retirement \neg s\text{-are-}u\text{-koto-}o \text{do-HONs-ALLOC-PRS-COMP-ACC desire} \\
\text{ori-mas-en. PRF-ALLOC-NEG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘The students do not want the teacher (= you) to go into retirement.’ \((-\text{mas} = \text{UttAddr})\)

(8) Class B (Doxastic predicate)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Gakusei-wa student-TOP} \\
\text{sensei-ga teacher-NOM} \\
\text{intai} retirement \neg s\text{-are-}u\text{-koto-}o \text{do-HONs-ALLOC-PRS-COMP-ACC believe} \\
\text{ori-mas-en. PRF-ALLOC-NEG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘The students do not believe the teacher (= you) to go into retirement.’ \((-\text{mas} = \text{UttAddr})\)

(9) Class C

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Kabin-o vase-ACC} \\
\text{kowasite break} \\
\text{simai-mas-ta-koto-wa MAL-ALLOC-PST-COMP-TOP denial do-ALLOC-NEG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I do not deny that I broke the vase.’

(10) Class D (Emotive factive predicate)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Kabin-o vase-ACC} \\
\text{kowasite break} \\
\text{simai-mas-ta-koto-o MAL-ALLOC-PST-COMP-TOP regret do PRG-ALLOC-PRS} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I regret that (I) broke the vase.’

(11) Class E (Epistemic predicate)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{kare,-wa he-TOP} \\
\text{i-no I-GEN} \\
\text{musuko-wa son-TOP} \\
\text{asita tomorrow koko-o here-ACC} \\
\text{hanarer-u-} \text{koto-o leave-PST-ACC} \\
\text{kare,-no yesterday kanozyo-ni he-TOP} \\
\text{tutae-ta. she-DAT tell-PST} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘He knew that his mother would come tomorrow.’ \((-\text{mas} = \text{UttAddr})\)

2.1.3 Evidence for indirect speech

- **Direct speech/indirect speech.** It is important to note that the examples shown above are all indirect speech context. Koto-clauses do not have the direct speech usage.

- **TEST 1 (INDEXICAL ELEMENTS):** Indexical elements makes it easier for us to detect the difference. In direct speech, all the indexical elements in \((12)\) are interpreted under the reported context whereas those in \((13)\) are anchored in the utterance context.

(12)*\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Watasi,-no musuko-wa asita koko-o hanarer-u-koto}\text{-o kare,-wa kanozyo-ni} \\
\text{I-GEN son-TOP tomorrow here-ACC leave-PST-C-ACC yesterday he-TOP} \\
\text{tutae-ta. sh} \text{-DAT tell-PST} \\
\text{Yesterday, he, told her (said to her), “I, will leave here tomorrow” (intended).} \\
\end{array}
\]
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(13) \[ \text{Kare,-no musuko-ga asita koko-o hanarer-u-koto}-o kare,-wa kanozyo-ni he-GEN son-NOM tomorrow here-ACC leave-PST-C-ACC yesterday he-TOP tutae-ta.} \\
\text{she-DAT tell-PST}\] ‘Yesterday, he, told her that he, would leave here/*there tomorrow.’ \\
→ His son is supposed to leave tomorrow.

- **TEST 2 (SYNTACTIC WELL-FORMEDNESS):** The syntactic well-formedness is another good criterion to tease the direct speech from the indirect speech context (Banfield 1973; Clark and Gerrig 1990; Oshima 2006). Observe the contrast below.

(14) a. He said, “I eated beans.”
    b. *He said that I eated beans.

The *koto*-clause, unlike the *to*-clause, cannot accommodate an ill-formed expression as shown below; n.b., the correct form for the past tense is -*ta* not -*sa.*

(15)*Kare-wa [mame-o tabe-sa]-koto it-ta. \\
he-TOP bean-ACC eat-PST-COMP say-PST \text{‘He said, “mame-o tabe-sa” (intended).’}

- **TEST 3 (GRAMMATICAL DEPENDENCIES):** Third, grammatical dependencies (e.g., extrac-
tion out of the clause) has been used a test for the direct speech/indirect speech distinction 
(Kuno 1988; Anand and Nevins 2004; Oshima 2006; Crnič and Trinh 2009).

(16) a. *What did he say, “I read ti? 
    b. What did he say that he had read ti?

Wh-element can stay in both clauses, suggesting that both clauses have the use of introducing 
an indirect speech marker.

(17) a. \[Nani-o yon-da]-to kare-wa ziman si-ta-no?\] 
\text{what-ACC read-PST-COMP he-TOP boasting do-PST-Q} \\
‘What did he proudly say that he had read?’ \\
b. \[Nani-o yon-da-koto]-o kare-wa ziman si-ta-no?\] 
\text{what-ACC read-PST-COMP-ACC he-TOP boasting do-PST-Q} \\
‘What did he proudly say that he had read?’

Likewise, the pronoun his does not allow the binding reading with the quantifier in the main 
clause if it is a direct speech context.

(18) a. #Every professor, says, “students should buy his, book.”
    b. Every professor, says that students should buy his, book.

The same test can be applied to Japanese as demonstrated in (19)).

(19) Subete-no kyoozyu-ga [seito-ga zibun-no hon-o kat-te 
\text{every-GEN professor-NOM student-NOM self-GEN book-ACC buy-CV} 
\text{kure-ru-koto-o]} negat-te ir-u. 
\text{APPLH-PRS-C-ACC hope-CV PRG-PRS} \\
‘Every professor, hopes that students buy his, book.’
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2.1.4 Other restrictions

- **Object-control predicates?**: Unlike Magahi, embedded allocutive markings are available under non object-control predicates. Overt nominative subjects can appear inside the embedded clause; e.g., (11). This distinction seems irrelevant.

- **Tense distinction?**: Some predicates lack the tense distinction in the embedded environment (e.g., (7)) but others do exhibit the contrast (e.g., (9)). This distinction seems irrelevant.

- **Finite/non-finite distinction?**: In some non-finite environments, embedded allocutive markers are not allowed. For example, they cannot be present inside the purpose phrase, i.e., ni-clauses.

  (20) Purpose clauses
     Mahiro-TOP rice-ACC eat-to go-PST
     ‘Mahiro went to eat rice/her meal.’
     Mahiro-TOP rice-ACC eat-to go-ALLOC-PST
     ‘Mahiro went to eat rice/her meal.’

     Mahiro-TOP rice-ACC eat-ALLOC-to go-PST
     ‘Mahiro went to eat rice/her meal (intended).’
     Mahiro-TOP rice-ACC eat-ALLOC-to go-ALLOC-PST
     ‘Mahiro went to eat rice/her meal.’

In other cases, -mas is used in what appears to be non-finite clauses. For example, if English *while* ...ing or *by* ...ing is translated into Japanese, te-clauses are used. As shown below, this te-clause can accommodate -mas but not a tense-marker -u or -ta.

  (22) a. [Densya-ni not-te], suupaa-ni iki-masi-ta.
     train-DAT ride-by supermarket-to go-ALLOC-PST
     ‘I went to the supermarket by riding a train.’
  b. [Densya-ni nori-masi-te], suupaa-ni iki-masi-ta.
     train-DAT ride-ALLOC-to supermarket-to go-ALLOC-PST
     ‘I went to the supermarket by riding a train.’

- **Adjuncts**: Some adjunct clauses allow embedded allocutive markings.


    (23) Relative clause
    Watasi-wa [mizutama moyoo-no ari-mas-u] hako-o sagasi-te ori-mas-u.
    I-TOP polka dot design-GEN be--PRS box-NOM look for COP.-PRS
    ‘I am looking for the box that has polka dots.’

  - **Adverbal clauses**: Embedded allocutive markers are available in some adverbial clauses. The tara-conditional can accommodate embedded allocutive markers whereas the ba-conditional cannot.
2. DESCRIPTION: EMBEDDING DOMAINS

(24) Conditionals
a. [Kasa-o osagasi desi-tara], kotira-o otukai kudasai.
   umbrella-ACC looking for COP.ALLOC-if this-ACC use APPLH
   ‘If you are looking for an umbrella, please use this one.’

b. *[Kasa-o osagasi desi-ba], kotira-o otukai kudasai.
   umbrella-ACC looking for COP.ALLOC-if this-ACC use APPLH
   ‘If you are looking for an umbrella, please use this one.’

- Pragmatic constraints. When Japanese allocutive markers are embedded under indirect
  speech context, the sentence should be used in a hyperpolite register
1 When an embedded allocutive marking appears, another allocutive marker is typically present in the main clause.

- Summary. If the context is polite enough, allocutive markers are acceptable in Class A
  through E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>say report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be (im)possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded Alloc.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Our generalization

2.2 Punjabi

2.2.1 Distribution

- Finite/non-finite distinction: Punjabi is not as liberal as Japanese and allows embedding
  only in finite domains, akin to the subject agreement hosting auxiliaries in the language.

(25) karan [roTTii pakaanaa (*je/e)] caaNdaa
    Karan.NOM bread cook.INF ALLOC.PL/be.PRS.3.SG want.HAB.M.SG
    je/e
    ALLOC.PL/be.PRS.3.SG
    ‘Karan wants to cook bread.’

- Predicate types: Within finite domains, embedded allocutivity is restricted to the comple-
  ment clauses of speech predicates such as ‘tell’, ‘say’, ‘speak’, ‘ask’
2 see (26).

(26) Class A
    karan-ne keyaa [ ki miiraa kal aayegii je]
    Karan-ERG say.PRIF that Mira.NOM tomorrow come.FUT.F.SG ALLOC.PL
    ‘Karan said that Mira will come tomorrow.’

1 Variation among judgments: Presumably, Miyagawa gives his judgments under the non hyperpolite register,
which makes him conclude that only Class A predicates are licit because these predicates can have the direct speech
reading.
2 There is variation in the availability of embedded allocutivity. The three speakers of Lahore variety (Pakistan)
who were consulted did not permit allocutivity on the embedded verb.
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(27) karan-ne puccheyaa [ ki miiraa kadoN aayegii je]
Karan-ERG ask.PRF that Mira.NOM when come.FUT.F.SG ALLOC.PL
‘Karan asked when would Mira come.’

- No other embedding verbs (of the Hooper and Thompson’s (1973) list) are possible.

(28) Class B
*karan-ne soceyaa [ ki miiraa kal aayegii je]
Karan-ERG think.PRF that Mira.NOM tomorrow come.FUT.F.SG ALLOC.PL
‘Karan thought that Mira will come tomorrow.’

(29) Class C:
*puliis-de baar-baar pucchan-de [ ki o-ne corii kittii je]
[ karan nayii maneyaa police-GEN again-again ask.inf-GEN after even Karan.NOM NEG agree.PRF.M.SG
that he-ERG theft(f) do.PRF.M.SG ALLOC.PL
‘Despite being asked by the police again and again, Karan denied having committed the theft.’

(30) Class D
*karan hairaan e [ ki miraa paper-vicc fel ho gayii
Karan surprised be.PRS.3.SG that Mira.NOM exam-in fail be go.PRF.M.SG
] ALLOC.PL
‘Karan is surprised that Mira has failed the exam.’

(31) Class E
??/*karan jaandaa e [ ki miiraa kal aayegii je]
Karan know be.PRS.3.SG that Mira.NOM tomorrow come.FUT.F.SG ALLOC.PL
‘Karan knows that Mira will come tomorrow.’

- Adjuncts: Outside verbal complements, je can occur in finite adjuncts (temporal/location), but is not permitted in purpose and reason-clauses with kyunkii/taaki.

(32) maiN tadd jaavaaNgii [ jaddoN kar an vii jaayegaa je]
I.NOM then go.FUT.F.SG when Karan.NOM also go.FUT.M.SG ALLOC.PL
‘I will go when Karan does too.’ (Temporal adjunct)

(33) maiN otthe jaa rayii aaN [ jithe kar an vii gayaa
I.NOM there go PRG.F.SG be.PRS.1.SG where Karan.NOM also go.PRF.M.SG
] ALLOC.PL
‘I am going there where Karan has gone too.’ (Location adjunct)

(34) *karan bjaar gayaa [ kyoNkii o-nuu ikk kuRii-ne bulaayaa
Karan market go.PRF.M.SG because 3.SG-DOM a girl-ERG call.PRF.M.SG
] ALLOC.PL
‘Karan went to the market because a girl called him.’ (Reason clause)
3. Description: Reference

3.1 Japanese

- **Japanese**: Japanese does not permit the embedded addressee indexical to shift as per the reported context.

---

3. DESCRIPTION: REFERENCE

- For example, in (40) the indexicality of the embedded -mas is determined wrt the utterance context. It is the addressee of the utterance context, not of the reported context, who is admired by the speaker of the utterance context. Presence or absence of the dative noun (Akira-ni) does not affect the reading.

    tell PRG-ALLOC.H-PST
    ‘Mahiro has already told (Akira) that Mira would come tomorrow.’

3.2 Punjabi

- Punjabi: Like in Japanese, the reference of embedded allocutivity in Punjabi is typically restricted to the utterance context.

- To see this, let us refer back to (41), where the embedded je refers to the UttAddr.

(41) karan-ne keyaa [ ki miiraa kal aayegii je]
    Karan-ERG say.PRF that Mira.nom tomorrow come.FUT ALLOC
    ‘Karan said that Mira will come tomorrow.’ (je = UttAddr or the reported hearer of Karan)

- The sentence in (41) can be used correctly only when the utterance speaker is speaking to someone elder.

- These facts replicate the Japanese pattern indicating a uniform analysis for the two languages under study.

- However, we observe that Punjabi allows embedded allocutivity to obtain a shifted reading in at least one condition:

  Co-occurring embedded 1st person pronoun: If the embedded domain consists of a 1st person pronoun, embedded allocutivity seems to allow a shifted reading.

(42) karan-ne keyaa [ ki maiN kal aavaaNgaa je]
    Karan-ERG say.PRF that I.NOM tomorrow come.FUT ALLOC
    ‘Karan said that I will come tomorrow.’ (I = UttSpeaker or Karan; je = UttAddr or the reported hearer of Karan)

- This shifted reading can be better understood by zooming out to include Punjabi full pronouns.

- Independently of allocutivity, Punjabi seems to pattern like an indexical shift language with speech predicates (see Bhatia 2000; ex. 3a). Let us first see a classic example of indexical shift from Zazaki, as reported in Anand (2006).

(43) Heseni va [kE Ez newEsha]
    Hesen. said [that I be-sick-PRS]
    Hesen, said that he, was sick. (Anand, 2006, 77)

(44) Heseni va (Ali-ra) [kE ti newEsha]
    Hesen. said (Ali-to) [that you be-sick-PRS]
    Hesen said to Ali, that he, was sick. (Anand, 2006, 77)
4. TOWARDS AN ANALYSIS

- In Punjabi, 1st person pronouns undergo indexical shift like in Zazaki, as shown below:

\[(45) \text{karan-ne} \quad \text{keyaa} \quad [\text{ki} \quad \text{maiN} \quad \text{baRaa} \quad \text{syaaanaa} \quad \text{aaN}]\]

Karan-\text{ERG} \quad \text{say.PRF} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{I.nom} \quad \text{very} \quad \text{smart} \quad \text{be.PRS.1.SG}

‘Karan said that I (= UttSpeaker or Karan) am very smart.’

- That this is true indexical shift and not a direct quotation is evidenced by the following data which illustrates NPI-licensing across domains.

\[(46) \text{karan-ne} \quad \text{nayii} \quad \text{keyaa} \quad [\text{ki} \quad \text{maiN} \quad \text{koyii} \quad \text{vii} \quad \text{kitaab} \text{paRh} \text{saknaa}]\]

Karan-\text{ERG} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{say.PRF} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{I.nom} \quad \text{any} \quad \text{also} \quad \text{book} \quad \text{read} \quad \text{can.HAB.M.SG aaN}\]

\text{be.PRS.1.SG}

‘Karan did not say that I (= Karan/UttSpeaker) can read any book.

- Unlike the 1st person pronoun, the 2nd person pronoun does not seem to receive a shifted reading.

\[(47) \text{karan-ne} \quad \text{keyaa} \quad [\text{ki} \quad \text{tuu} \quad \text{baRaa} \quad \text{syaaanaa} \quad \text{eN}]\]

Karan-\text{ERG} \quad \text{say.PRF} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{you.nom} \quad \text{very} \quad \text{smart} \quad \text{be.PRS.2.SG}

‘Karan said that you (= UttAddr) are very smart.’

- However, the presence of a 1st person pronoun in the embedded domain seems to activate a shifted reading for the 2nd person pronoun, like for embedded allocutivity.

\[(48) \text{karan-ne} \quad \text{keyaa} \quad [\text{ki} \quad \text{maiN-nuu} \quad \text{tuu} \quad \text{baRii} \quad \text{pasand} \quad \text{eN}]\]

Karan-\text{ERG} \quad \text{say.PRF} \quad \text{that} \quad \text{I.dat} \quad \text{you.nom} \quad \text{very} \quad \text{like} \quad \text{be.PRS.2.SG}

‘Karan said that I (= Karan) like you (= hearer of Karan (who can be the UttSp)) very much.’

- In summary, the 1st person pronoun in Punjabi permits both shifted and non-shifted readings. On the other hand, 2nd person pronominals do not shift on their own and need a 1st person pronoun to trigger the shifted reading.

4 Towards an analysis

- We have seen that both languages allow embedded allocutivity, which typically refers to the UttAddr across both languages.

- **Speech act projection:** We propose that embedded (finite) clauses in both languages project a speech act layer composed of at least a pro-Addr(essee) that sanctions embedded allocutivity.

- **Agreement:** The embedded allocutive marker is obtained by agreement between the interpretable/valued instance of [addressee] on the pro and the uninterpretable/unvalued instance of [addressee] on a lower functional head, see [49] (cf., Miyagawa 2012; McFadden 2017 among others).
• **Shifty operators**: To deal with the reference of the embedded allocutive marker, we assume the presence of shifty operators, distinct from the pro-Hearer that triggers allocutive agreement. This is due to the observation that both Japanese and Punjabi allow allocutivity in embedded domains. However, neither of the two languages allow the embedded allocutivity to shift (on its own). If the pro-Hearer was the monster, it would have triggered a shifted reading of the embedded allocutivity, contra facts.

• We follow a version of the “shifty operator” approach (Anand & Nevins 2004, Anand 2006; Sundaresan 2011, 2012; Shklovsky & Sudo 2014; Deal 2017 a.o), as per which complements of attitude predicates encode shifty operators. The operator’s function is to overwrite the context parameter of interpretation for its complement with the (bound) index parameter.

— For Japanese, the proposal is straightforward. There are no shifty operators in the embedded left-periphery. As a consequence, the allocutive marker realized via agreement between the functional probe and pro-Hearer can only be interpreted against the utterance context, resulting in a non-shifted reading.

— Punjabi patterns differently. While it typically does not allow shifted readings of embedded allocutivity, the presence of a 1st person pronoun permits shifty readings.

— A possible way to account for this fact is via the implicational hierarchy proposed in Deal (2017). Essentially, the idea is that monstrous operators are arranged in a hierarchical order vis-a-vis one another- the Addressee-shifting operator is higher than the Speaker-shifting operator, and the location shifting operator is the highest.

(50) Loc-OP > Addr-OP > Auth-OP

• As per the implicational hierarchy, the higher operator cannot be evoked/activated without activating the operator lower in the hierarchy first. For instance, the presence of Addr-OP in the structure requires the presence of an Auth-OP. This gives us the desired results for Punjabi where 1st person pronouns can shift on their own. However, shifting of the 2nd person pronoun requires a co-occurring and shifted 1st person pronoun.

• We propose that the embedded left-periphery in Punjabi consists of shifty operators (Auth-OP and/or the Addr-OP), in addition to the pro-Hearer that controls allocutive agreement. The operators scope over the pro-Hearer, like they scope over other 1st and 2nd pronouns in the embedded domain, yielding shifted readings.

(51) Addr-OP > Auth-OP > pro-Hearer > TP...
5 Summary and remaining issues

5.1 Summary

• In this talk, we have shown that differently from the intuitive view that speech act projections licensing allocutivity are only restricted to main clause (Zu 2015, 2018; Portner et al. 2019), they can be embedded across distinct predicates in Punjabi and Japanese.

1. **Japanese**: Embedded allocutive markers are observed not only under speech act predicates but also under a wider range of predicates.

2. **Punjabi**: Embedded allocutive markers are observed under finite, speech act predicates.

• Furthermore, the reference of embedded allocutivity in Japanese is always interpreted with regard to the utterance context in the absence of monsters, while in Punjabi, the Auth-OP can activate Addr-OP, permitting shifted allocutivity in select structures.

• However, there are two curious facts about embedded allocutivity in both languages that are rather unclear at the moment, and require careful investigation.

5.2 Two curious issues

1. **Blended discourse**: In Japanese, when the embedding predicate is iw- ‘say,’ the respect encoded by the embedded -mas exceptionally targets the addressee of the reported context.

   For example, in [52], -mas is evaluated with respect to the reported speech context. However, pronouns (e.g., anata ‘you’) and deictic expressions (e.g., asita ‘tomorrow’) are interpreted in terms of the utterance context.

   (52) *Ototoi, the day before yesterday kare-wa [asita-made-ni anata-ni nimotu-o
todoke-mas-u] to it-te i-masi-ta.*
   ‘The day before yesterday, he said, “I will deliver the package to you by tomorrow.”’

2. **Overtness of the matrix goal IO**: Punjabi presents a curious pattern pertaining to the overtness of a reported hearer, realized as IO of the matrix verb ‘say’.

   Typically, (c)overtness of an item is inconsequential in a language like Punjabi, which is a pro-drop language. The IO of the verb ‘say’ can be readily dropped, with no consequences for syntactic phenomena such as binding, control.

   (53) *karan-ne (saareyaaN-nuu) [PROt, ikk-duje-de, ghaar jaan-nuu] keyaa*
   ‘Karan said (to everyone) to go to each other’s house.’

   However, with regard to the reference of the embedded 2nd person item (full pronoun or allocutive marker), it seems to be of consequence in that it allows a shifted reading.
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(54) karan-ne aman-nuu keyaa [ki tuu baRaa syaanaa eN]
Karan-ERG Aman-DAT say.PRIF that you very smart be.PRS.2.SG
‘Karan said to Aman that you (= Aman or UttAddr) are very smart.’

(55) karan-ne daarjii-nuu/*apne puttar-nuu keyaa [ki aman kal
Karan-ERG grandfather-DAT/*self son-DAT say.PRIF that Aman tomorrow
aayegaa come.FUT.M.SG ALLOC.PL
‘Karan said to grandfather that Aman will come tomorrow.’ (je= grandfather)

These structures test positive for indirect embedding with regard to NPI-licensing, but not with regard to the behaviour of co-occurring embedded indexicals. Similar results seem to obtain with embedded allocutivity.

(56) NPI-licensing
karan-ne aman-nuu nayii keyaa [ki tai-nuu kire-vii cale jaanaa
Karan-ERG Aman-DAT NEG say.PRIF that you-DAT anywhere-also walk go.INF
caayidaa should.HAB.M.SG be.PRS.3.SG
e
‘Karan did not say to Aman that you (= Aman or UttAddr) should go anywhere.’

(57) Coreference (with a shifted reading for ’you’)

karan-ne, aman-nuu keyaa [ki tai-nuu oddii*i/j kitaab wapas karni
Karan-ERG Aman-DAT say.PRIF that you-DAT his book return do.INF
caayidii should.HAB.F.SG be.PRS.3.SG
e
‘Karan said to Aman that you (= Aman) should return someone else’s book.’

— Since these structures with overt IO show mixed properties with regard to (in)direct speech, it is unclear how to (a) define their status, and (b) determine their effect on indexical shifting.
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