Finding the speaker in the language.
Martina Wiltschko
ICREA/Universitat Pompeu Fabra

Much of traditional and modern work on grammar is characterized by the assumption that the sentence (expressing some kind of thought) is the unit of analysis. Moreover, the role of *speaker* and *addressee* have been incorporated mainly via by means of grammatical features (PERSON) which define pronouns and agreement paradigms. However, research following in the footsteps of Ross' (1970) performative hypothesis has fundamentally challenged both these assumptions. Accordingly, the unit of analysis for syntax extends to the utterance (or speech act) and *speaker* and *addressee* roles have been treated as actual *roles* associated with particular syntactic (specifier) positions (akin to grammatical roles assigned to specifier positions within the sentence proper). This enterprise, while having accumulated a significant body of work (as evidenced, for example, by this conference) is still subject to criticism that can be summarized as follow: "Why do you guys put pragmatics into the syntax"?

In this talk, I demonstrate that there is a qualitative difference between the pragmatic (real-world) notions of *speaker* and *addressee* (which is simply established by speaking and being spoken to) and the syntactic roles that are rooted in these notions. The latter are assumed to be represented at the very top of the tree and crucially, as is common for syntactic roles, they become somewhat opaque to real world knowledge.

For example, I argue that the addressee role is defined as a role that someone OTHER than the speaker holds and hence their mind is inaccessible to the speaker. Therefore, I cannot tell you how you feel, for example. Evidence from self-talk demonstrates that this is true even if the speaker and the addressee are identical and hence the issue of inaccessibility disappears. Crucially, real-world knowledge cannot override this constraint providing evidence for the grammatical reality of the addressee role (akin to the distinction between grammatical and biological/social gender).

Aside from self-talk I provide evidence from language-acquisition, neurodiversity, as well as human-machine interaction for this division between real-world (pragmatic) and grammatically mediated *speaker* and *addressee* roles. And if there is a difference, we have an argument for the linguistic reality of syntactically conditioned *speaker* and *addressee* roles.

In conclusion, I wish to establish that the expansion of syntactic analysis into the realm of pragmatic domains calls for new windows of investigation. That is, if we attempt to find the speaker (and addressee) in the language, we need to explore the linguistic properties of non-canonical interactions (such as talking to oneself, interaction with children, human-machine interaction etc.) as they tell us much about which aspects of these roles are based on real-world knowledge and which are grammatically conditioned.