

Who controls who (or what) – evidence from embedded imperatives and other directives

Magdalena Kaufmann (University of Connecticut)

SALT 29, UCLA

May 17-19, 2019

From knowledge to action



- 1 Introduction
- 2 Directive obviation as evidence for a perspectival center
 - Exploring a full person paradigm: Slovenian
 - Similar phenomena
 - Syntactic account
- 3 Contextual assumptions affect obviation effects
 - Questions under non-addressee perspective
 - Lack of control
- 4 Directive obviation as a semantic conflict
 - The idea
 - Imperatives as modalized propositions
 - Deriving directive obviation
- 5 Subjects and Instigators
 - Subjects
 - Wish-Imperatives
- 6 Conclusions etc.

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Directive obviation as evidence for a perspectival center
- 3 Contextual assumptions affect obviation effects
- 4 Directive obviation as a semantic conflict
- 5 Subjects and Instigators
- 6 Conclusions etc.

Canonical imperatives

- **Directive speech acts** are 'attempts [...] by the speaker to get the hearer to do something' Searle 1976:11
- **Canonical (morphosyntactically marked 2p) imperatives** are sentential form types associated with directive speech acts as a default

- | | | | |
|-----|----|--|-----------|
| (1) | a. | Read this book! | English |
| | b. | Kono hon-o yom-e!
this book-ACC read-IMP | Japanese |
| | c. | I chayk-ul ilk-ela.
this book-ACC read-IMP | Korean |
| | d. | Lies dieses Buch!
read.IMP this book | German |
| | e. | Preberi to knjigo!
read.IMP this.F.SG.ACC book.F.SG.ACC | Slovenian |

Focus in literature: addressee-orientedness; today: speaker.

Directive participation for *Read this book!*

'attempts [...] by the speaker to get the hearer to do something'

(2) Canonical imperative ' ϕ !' (with **prejacent** ϕ):

Zanuttini 2008, Alcazar & Saltarelli 2014

- a. Speaker as **director**
 - selects and promotes the course of events described by ϕ
- b. Addressee as **instigator**
 - *sees to it that* (or, causes) the course of events described by ϕ

Farkas 1988,1992; Belnap, Perloff & Xu 2001
- c. Addressee as referent of (covert, agentive) **subject** of ϕ

Role	Discourse Participant
Director	Speaker
Instigator	Addressee
Subject	Addressee

Person table for canonical imperatives

Role	Discourse Participant
Director	Speaker
Instigator	Addressee
Subject	Addressee

Which speech act related aspects are encoded linguistically, and how?

- Compositionally Kamp 1978, Krifka 2014, Murray 2014, Starr Ms.,...
- Post-compositionally Table model, Farkas & Bruce 2009;
Use conditions, Portner 2007;
...

Preview: At least some speech act related aspects feed into semantic computation

Person table for canonical imperatives

Role	Discourse Participant
Director	Speaker
Instigator	Addressee
Subject	Addressee

[[Subject]] =₁ Addressee =₂ Instigator

Accounts differ regarding which of =_{1/2} are encoded grammatically

Preview:

- Grammatical constraints on Instigator and Subject are language dependent
- Languages studied: neither Instigator nor Subject is fully determined by grammar

Person table for canonical imperatives

Role	Discourse Participant
Director	Speaker
Instigator	Addressee
Subject	Addressee

Director...

- Not encoded
e.g. Hausser 1980, Huntley 1984, Han 1999, 2000, Portner 2004, 2007, Barker 2010, von Stechow & Iatridou 2017, Barker 2010
- Plays a role in conventional semantics
e.g. Bierwisch 1980, Kaufmann [2006]/2012, Eckardt 2011, Condoravdi & Lauer 2012, Oikonomou 2016
- Relevant syntactically?
 - No evidence: Isac 2015
 - Yes: Alcazar & Saltarelli 2014, Stegovec 2018

Preview: Director active compositionally; this data: need not be in syntax

Person table for canonical imperatives

Role	Discourse Participant
Director	Speaker
Instigator	Addressee
Subject	Addressee

With recent literature:

Insights from embedded imperatives and other directives ('surrogate imperatives').

Evidence 1: Embedded imperatives

Morpho-syntactic marking of canonical imperatives in indirect speech:

(3) Rekel (ti) je, da mu pomagaj. Slovenian
 said.M (2.Dat) is that 3.M.DAT help.IMP.(2) Sheppard&Golden 2002
 'He_i said (to you) that you should help him_{i,k}.'

(4) Hans hat gesagt ruf seinen Vater an. %German
 Hans has said call.IMP his father up Schwager 2006
 'Hans_i said that you should call his_{i,l} father.'

(5) John_i said call his_{i,k} father. %English
 Crnic & Trinh 2009

Also: Japanese (Han 1999), Korean (Pak, Portner & Zanuttini 2008), Mbyá (Thomas 2012), Old Scandinavian (Rögnvaldsson 1998), ...

But not: Greek, French, Italian, Serbian, ...

Evidence 2: Other directives - Type I

Type I surrogates fill gaps in imperative/directive paradigms:

- Negative imperatives Zanuttini 1997, Zeiljstra 2006, Isac 2015
 - (6) Leggi! – Non {leggere, *leggi}. Italian
 read.IMP2 – not read.INF, read.IMP2
 ‘Read!’ – ‘Don’t read!’
- Regulating course of events described with non-2p subject ‘3rd person imperatives’, Zanuttini, Pak & Portner 2012
 - (7) Naj pomaga! Slovenian, *naj*-subjunctive
 SBJV help.3
 ‘(S)he should help!’
 - (8) Tebulwa: sa:ph rahe! Bhojpuri
 table-NOM clean-NOM be-IMP3Sg Zanuttini, Pak & Portner 2012
 ‘Let the table be clean!’

Evidence 2: Other directives - Type II

Type II surrogates can replace canonical (i.e., 2p) imperatives in at least some functions:

- (9) Greek: Oikonomou 2016:(59a,b)
- a. Trekse tora amesos! imperative
 run.IMP now immediately
- b. Na treksis tora amesos! *na*-subjunctive
 SBJV run now immediately
 ‘Run right now!’ *commands, invitations, advice,...*
- (10) Slovenian
- a. Pojdi levo! imperative
 go.IMP left
- b. Da mi greš levo! *da*-clause
 that 1.DAT go.2 left
 ‘Go left!’ *only command(-like);*
strong directive (von Fintel & Iatridou 2017)

Type II surrogates can also be used with non-2p subjects.

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Directive obviation as evidence for a perspectival center
 - Exploring a full person paradigm: Slovenian
 - Similar phenomena
 - Syntactic account
- 3 Contextual assumptions affect obviation effects
- 4 Directive obviation as a semantic conflict
- 5 Subjects and Instigators
- 6 Conclusions etc.

Slovenian *naj*-subjunctives

Stegovec 2018

fill morphological gaps in directive paradigm (dual omitted):

Person	Sg	Pl
1(Excl)	naj pomaga-m I should help	naj pomaga-mo we.EXCL should help
1+2	–	pomaga-j-mo (we.INCL) let's help
2	pomaga-j (you.SG) help!	pomaga-j-te (you.PL) help!
3	naj pomaga (s)he should help	naj pomag-jo they should help



Finding: Distribution of forms is constrained

- main clause: by function (committing/asking)
- embedded: by subject obviation

Slovenian directive obviation: matrix case

Stegovec 2018

Commitment: 'x should...!'

- (11) Anyone **but first person exclusive**
- *Naj pomagam!** – ***Naj pomagamo!**
SBJV help.1 – SBJV help.1PI
 - Pomagaj! – Pomagajte! – Pomagajmo!
help.IMP.2 – Help.IMP.2PI – Help.IMP.1PI(Incl)
 - Naj pomaga! – Naj pomagajo!
SBJV help.3 – SBJV help.3PI

Information seeking interrogatives: 'Should x...?'

- (12) Anyone **but second person**
- Naj pomagam? – Naj pomagamo?
SBJV help.1 – SBJV help.1PI
 - *Pomagaj?** – ***Pomagajte?** – ***Pomagajmo?**
help.IMP.2 – Help.IMP.2PI – Help.IMP.1PI(Incl)
 - Naj pomaga? – Naj pomagajo?
SBJV help.3 – SBJV help.3PI

Directive obviation in indirect speech

Stegovec 2018

(13) Anyone **but attitude holder**

- a. I said that *I/you/he should... [naj V.1p]
 b. You said that I/*you/he should... [IMP.2]
 c. (S)he_i said (to Z) that I/you/(s)he_{*i/j} should... [naj V.3p]

(14) *Rekel si_i, da več telovadi_i.

said.M are.2 that more exercise.IMP.(2)

int: 'You said that you should exercise more.

Obviation!

'An objection one could raise here is that the coreference ban is not a grammatical effect—it is merely odd in most cases to tell or remind oneself what to do, so reporting such cases should be likewise odd. [...] does not hold up mainly because [...] *scenarios of this kind can be reported felicitously—just not using imperatives or subjunctives.*' (Stegovec 2018)

Directive obviation in indirect speech

Stegovec 2018

- (13) Anyone **but attitude holder**
- a. I said that *I/you/he should... [naj V.1p]
- b. **You** said that I/*you/he should ... [IMP.2]
- c. (S)he_i said (to Z) that I/you/(s)he_{*i/j} should... [naj V.3p]

- (14) *Rekel si_i, da več telovadi_i.
- said.M are.2 that more exercise.IMP.(2)
- int: 'You said that you should exercise more. *Obviation!*

CONTEXT: I proclaim 'I should exercise more!' Later you remind me:

- (15) Rekel si_i, da moraš_i več telovadit.
- said.M are.2 that should.2 more exercise.INF
- 'You_i said that you_i should exercise more.'

Directive obviation is a matter of grammar

Stegovec 2018

- Something about directives (imperatives, directive *naj*-clauses) blocks subjects that refer to speaker/addressee or attitude holder.
- Purely pragmatic account is implausible: self-directing can happen and can be reported.
- Similar patterns:
 - **Interrogative flip** (assertion/question) in dependence of epistemic modals, evidentials, speech act adverbials, ...
Speas & Tenny 2003; Faller 2002, ...
 - Japanese experiencer predicates (Kuno 1987, McCready 2007, ...)
 - Subject obviation with subjunctives under verbs of directing and desiring
 - Conjunct-disjunct agreement systems
 - ...

Compare 1: Standard subject obviation

Disjointness effect for matrix and embedded subjects of subjunctives
(Romance, Hungarian, ...):

[**SUBJ_i** { want, hope, insist, ... } [**SUBJ_j** ... **VERB_{Subjunctive}** ...]]

- (16) a. Je veux partir. French
 I want leave.INF Ruwet 1984
 ‘I want to leave.’
 b. *Je veux que je parte.
 I want that I leave.SUBJ

- Blocking? Farkas 1988, Schlenker 2005, ...
- Syntactic conflict (Condition B violation)?
Picallo 1985, Kempchinsky 1986, 2009, ...
- Third way: – Semantic incompatibility?
Extend semantic account for directive obviation as following

Compare 2: Conjunct-disjunct agreement

Overall pattern of perspectival obviation resembles **conjunct-disjunct agreement**, e.g. Newari (Sino-Tibetan):

Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018

- Main clause, commitment (assertion):

(17) DISJ for everyone other than **speaker** (1p.Excl):

a. **ji** ana wan-ā.
1P.ABS there go-PST.**CONJ.**

'I went there.'

b. cha ana wan-a.
 you.ABS there go-PST.DISJ

'You went there.'

c. wa ana wan-a
 (s)he.ABS there go-PST.DISJ

'(S)he went there.'

Hale 1980:1-3/Zu 2018:109a-c, her transl.

Compare 2: Conjunct-Disjunct Marking

Overall pattern of perspectival obviation resembles **conjunct-disjunct agreement**, e.g. Newari (Sino-Tibetan):

Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018

- Main clause, commitment (assertion): CONJ for **Speaker**
- Main clause interrogatives, information seeking:

(18) DISJ for everyone other than **addressee** (2p):

- a. ji ana wan-a lā.
I.ABS there go-PST.DISJ Q
'Did I go there?'
- b. **cha** ana wan-ā lā
you.ABS there **go-PST.CONJ** Q
'Did you go there?'
- c. wa ana wan-a lā.
(s)he.ABS there go-PST.DISJ Q
'Did (s)he go there?'

Hale 1980:1-3/Zu 2018:110a-c, her transl.

Compare 2: Conjunct-Disjunct Marking

Overall pattern of perspectival obviation resembles **conjunct-disjunct agreement**, e.g. Newari (Sino-Tibetan): Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018

- Main clause declarative, commitment (assertion): CONJ for **Speaker**
- Main clause interrogative, information seeking: CONJ for **Addressee**
- In speech reports:

(19) DISJ for everyone (also utterance speaker) other than matrix speaker (identified *de se*):

- a. **wō:** [wa ana **wan-ā** dhakā:] dhā
 (s)he.ERG (s)he there **go-PST.CONJ** that said
 '(S)he_i said that (s)he_{i,*j} went there.'
- b. **wō:** [wa ana **wan-a** dhakā:] dhā
 (s)he.ERG (s)he there **go-PST.DISJ** that said
 '(S)he_i said that (s)he_{*i,j} went there.'

Compare 2: Conjunct-Disjunct Marking

Overall pattern of perspectival obviation resembles **conjunct-disjunct agreement**, e.g. Newari (Sino-Tibetan): Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018

- Main clause, commitment (assertion): CONJ for **Speaker**
- Main clause interrogatives, information seeking: CONJ for **Addressee**
- In speech reports: CONJ for **MatrixSubj**

Additionally, in Newari: subject of conjunct sentence has to control the event intentionally. (Zu 2015)

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Directive obviation as evidence for a perspectival center
- 3 Contextual assumptions affect obviation effects**
 - Questions under non-addressee perspective
 - Lack of control
- 4 Directive obviation as a semantic conflict
- 5 Subjects and Instigators
- 6 Conclusions etc.

Rhetorical questions

Newari rhetorical questions behave like declaratives Hale 1980:(100), Zu 2018

- (20) a. **ji** ana **wan-ā**?
 I there go-PST.CONJ
 'Did I go there?' (=Of course I did not.)
- b. cha ana **wan-a**
 you there go-PST.DISJ
 'Did you go there?' (=Of course you did not.)

Some languages allow imperatives in rhetorical (*wh*)-questions:

Wilson & Sperber 1988: Omotic (Southern Ethiopia);

Kaufmann & Poschmann 2013: %German

- (21) Wo stell den Blumentopf (schon) hin? %German
 where put.IMP the flower.pot DISCPART VERBPART
 'Come on, where should you put that flower pot? (It's obvious.)'

Suggests: rhetorical questions keep the speaker as the perspectival center.

Contextual factors and scope marking questions

can shift information seeking questions to non-addressee perspective

Scope marking questions: Dayal 1994

- (22) Kaj je rekla? Kaj kupi?
 what AUX.3 said.F what buy.IMP.(2)
 'What did she say? What should you buy?'

Slovenian
 Stegovec 2017

- (23) a. Ti na fas avrio?
 what SUBJ eat.2 tomorrow?
 'What could you eat tomorrow?' (*deciding together*)
 b. Ti gnomi ehi i mama? Na pas sto parti?
 What opinion has the mom SUBJ go.2 at-the party
 'Whats your moms opinion? Can/Should you go to the party?'

Greek
 Oikonomou 2016:34

Rising directives

Portner 2018, Rudin 2018

Canonical imperatives and surrogates (with 2p subjects) are ok with rising intonation ⇒ Suggestions

Portner 2018, Rudin 2018

(24) a. Help him (maybe)?

b. Pomagaj?

help.IMP.2

'Should you help him?'

Slovenian

c. {Pročitaj / Da pročitajš} ovu knjigu?

read.IMP2 / that read.2.Pfv this book

'Read this book, maybe?'

Serbian

- Rising tune calls off speaker commitment, imperative content placed on the Table

Farkas & Bruce 2010, Rudin 2018

- Perspectival center -?

Compare subject obviation

Obviation effects are alleviated in the absence of **control**

Ruwet 1989, Farkas 1988, 1992; Szabolcsi 2010

Non-agentive complements,

- (25) Je veux que je sois très amusant ce soir.
I want for me to be quite amusing tonight.

Ruwet 1989:(68a)

Dependence on others (including focus on low subject),...

Szabolcsi 2010:4

- (26) Je veux que tu partes et que je reste.
I want for you to go and for me to stay.

Ruwet 1989:(49)

Lack of control in commitment directives

- Directive Greek *na*-subjunctives obviate; (27) acceptable if speaker lacks control over when they wake up:

Oikonomou 2016:(38)

(27) Avrio na ksipniso stis 6:00am.
 Tomorrow NA wake.1Sg at 6:00am.
 'Tomorrow I should wake up at 6:00am.'

- Same judgment for Slovenian *naj*-subjunctives (A. Stegovec, p.c.).
- Effect of presumed control: looks less like syntax or lexical semantics
 But: Szabolcsi 2010, Zu 2018 for arguments from PPIs

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Directive obviation as evidence for a perspectival center
- 3 Contextual assumptions affect obviation effects
- 4 Directive obviation as a semantic conflict**
 - The idea
 - Imperatives as modalized propositions
 - Deriving directive obviation
- 5 Subjects and Instigators
- 6 Conclusions etc.

The idea in a nutshell

- Directives (imperatives & directive subjunctives):
 - used by **Director** D to influence actions of **Agent** α to verify prejacent ϕ

⇔ **directive speech act**
- Canonical imperative in directive use:
 - Director = utterance speaker
 - Agent α = utterance addressee
- Directive speech acts are useful only if
 - D does not take ϕ for granted

⇔ *Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)*
 - D possesses authority

⇔ *Epistemic Authority Condition (EAC)*
+ *Decisive Modality (DM)*
- For starters: matrix imperatives in directive uses.

Descriptive and performative modal verbs

Kamp 1973

Two uses of declaratives with (deontic) modals ...

- **descriptive:**

describing what is permitted, commanded, recommended, ...

- (28) a. You should call your mother. *[that's what she said]*
 b. You may take an apple.
[that's what the guy in the uniform said]

- **performative:**

issuing permissions, commands, recommendations, ...

- (29) a. You must clean up your desk now!
 b. Ok, you may take an apple.

Evidence for performativity:

Kaufmann 2012

- (30) a. #That's (not) true! *[That's not true-test]*
 b. #... but I (absolutely) don't want you to do this.
[Distancing Ban]

Imperatives and modals

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

Imperatives are similar to declaratives with performative modals:

(31) Clean up your desk now!

≈ You must clean up your desk now!

no distancing by S: # '... but I absolutely don't want you to do this.'

no natural rejection for A: 'That's not true.'

Assumptions:

- Semantically, imperatives are just like performative modal verbs.
- There is no semantic distinction between descriptive and performative modals.

Kamp 1973, Schulz 2003

Performative and descriptive modals

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- Context decides if modalized declaratives are used descriptively (**descriptive context**) or performatively (**performative context**).
- Imperatives contain an operator OP_{Imp} similar to *must*:

Simplification: Schwager 2005, Oikonomou 2016, Francis 2018

for issues of universal quantificational force

[[OP_{Imp} Clean up your desk!]] \approx [[You must clean up your desk.]]

Assumptions:

Imperatives carry presuppositions that constrain their felicitous use to performative contexts.

Modal logic for modals and directives

Translate imperatives to standard modal logic with \Box and \Diamond indexed for epistemic and prioritizing interpretations:

Frame $F = \langle W, B, R \rangle$, where

- B maps individual a to a 's belief relation $B_a \subseteq W \times W$
- R the salient prioritizing modal flavor

Derived belief relations:

- **Mutual joint belief** \Box^{CG}

indexed for transitive closure of $B_S \cup B_A$ for Speaker and Addressee

Stalnaker 2002

- **Public Belief:** Individual a is publicly committed to believing p :

$$\Box^{PB_a} p := \Box^{CG} \Box^{B_a} p$$

(32) If ϕ translates to p ,

- $must^R \phi$ translates to $\Box^R p$
- imperative $\phi^R!$ (also: $OP_{Imp}^R \phi$) translates to $\Box^R p$

Performative contexts

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- (33) \square^R close(you,the-door)
- a. You have to close the door!
 - b. Close the door!

Characterization of performative contexts:

- (DM) Decisive Modality
- (EAC) Epistemic Authority Condition
- (EUC) Epistemic Uncertainty Condition

Decisive Modality (DM)

- Given context set CS (the set of worlds compatible with mutual joint belief) and a salient partition Δ on CS , the salient modal flavor R is **decisive** iff it constitutes the contextually agreed upon criteria to choose the preferred cell.
- Δ is a decision problem for an agent α iff for all $q \in \Delta$, $\text{control}(\alpha, q)$,
where $\text{control}(\alpha, q) := \text{try}(\alpha, q) \rightarrow \text{cause}(\alpha, q)$

Kaufmann & Kaufmann 2012

- R being the **decisive modality** implies:
 - If $\Box^R q$, no participant has an effective preference against q . Condoravdi & Lauer 2012
 - If Δ is a decision problem for α , α tries to find out if $\Box^R q$ for any $q \in \Delta$.
 - If α learns that $\Box^R q$ for $q \in \Delta$, α tries to realize q .



Epistemic Authority & Epistemic Uncertainty

Kaufmann 2012

(S: speaker, A: Addressee)

(EAC) Authority Condition

S has perfect knowledge of R :

For any $p \in \Delta$: $\Box^R p \leftrightarrow \Box^{B_S} \Box^R p$.

(EUC) Epistemic Uncertainty Condition

In uttering $\text{MODAL}_{perf} p$ or $p!$, S holds possible both p and $\neg p$.

$\Diamond^{B_S} p \wedge \Diamond^{B_S} \neg p$

Generalizing to directives

Directives can occur in questioning or reported events – requirements are generalized:

- **Director** has epistemic authority (EAC) and uncertainty (EUC)
(*Matrix, committed directives: Speaker*)
- **Instigator** is in control if Δ is a decision problem
(*Matrix, committed directives: Addressee*)

Speakers of directive clauses in actual or hypothetical utterance events e presuppose these conditions about the context of e .

- Reported speech: binding of presuppositions to parameters of reported event.
- ⇒ Directive speakers become publicly committed to believing that EAC, EUC, and DM are mutual joint belief.

Directive obviation as a clash in discourse commitments

Director's Anticipation:

If Director D is publicly committed to believing that Instigator α believes that $p \in \Delta$ is R -necessary, then D is publicly committed to believing that p will come true:

$$\Box^{PB_D} \Box^{B_\alpha} \Box^R p \rightarrow \Box^{PB_D} p$$

Proof:

- ① $\Box^{PB_D} \Box^{B_\alpha} \Box^R p$ (Assumption)
- ② $\Box^{PB_D} (\Box^{B_\alpha} \Box^R p \rightarrow \text{try}(\alpha, p))$ (Decisive Modality)
- ③ $\Box^{PB_D} \Box^{B_\alpha} \Box^R p \rightarrow \Box^{PB_D} \text{try}(\alpha, p)$ (K)
- ④ $\Box^{PB_D} \text{try}(\alpha, p)$ (1, 3, MP)
- ⑤ $\Box^{PB_D} p$ (control)

Commitment case

(34) Director = Instigator = Actual speaker

a. **Naj pomagam.*

I should help

b. *no designated 1pExcl imperative verb forms

(35) Director = Instigator = Matrix subject referent

(speaker in reported event)

a. **I said that I should...*

b. **You said that you should/V.IMP.2p...*

c. *(S)he_i said that (s)he_{j,*i} should...*

① $\square^{PB_D} \square^R p$

Committing utterance (Gunlogson 2003, Farkas & Bruce 2009, a.o.)

② $\square^{PB_D} \square^{B_D} \square^R p$

(Def. of PB/EAC)

③ $\square^{PB_D} p$

(Director's Anticipation)

④ $\diamond^{PB_D} p \wedge \diamond^{PB_D} \neg p$

(EUC)

⑤ $\square^{PB_D} p \wedge \neg \square^{PB_D}$

(3,4; †)

Questioning utterance

- (36) Matrix interrogative: Director = Instigator = Actual Addressee
 a. **Should you go...?*

- ① $\{\Box^R p, \neg\Box^R p\}$ (or strengthened to $\{\Box^R p, \Box^R \neg p\}$)
- ② $\Box^{PB_S}(\Box^R p \vee \neg\Box^R p)$ Interrogative speaker commitment
- ③ $\Box^{PB_S}((\Box^R p \wedge \Box^{B_D} p) \vee \neg\Box^R p)$ EAC (and K)
- ④ $\Box^{PB_S}((\Box^R p \wedge \Box^{B_D} p \wedge \neg\Box^{B_D} p) \vee \neg\Box^R p)$ EUC (and K)
- ⑤ Unstrengthened, S committed to negative answer; strengthened:
 both answers impose conflicting commitments) $\not\zeta$

Rising directives

Many languages allow 2p imperatives with rising intonation for suggestions:

Portner 2018, Rudin 2018

(37) a. Help him (maybe)?

b. Pomagaj?

help.IMP.2

'Should you help him?'

Slovenian

Proposal:

- Question-like move: S does not commit to $\Box^R p$ Rudin 2018
- S and A share epistemic authority (director = S + A)
- EAC is evaluated w.r.t. **Distributed Belief**

(38) a. $R^{DB_{S,A}} := B^S \cap B^A$

b. $\Box^{DB_{S,A}} \Box^R p \leftrightarrow \Box^R p$

Fagin & al. 1995

- Instigator = A (\neq S+A)
 \Leftrightarrow *No Director's Anticipation (so, no obviation)*

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Directive obviation as evidence for a perspectival center
- 3 Contextual assumptions affect obviation effects
- 4 Directive obviation as a semantic conflict
- 5 Subjects and Instigators**
 - Subjects
 - Wish-Imperatives
- 6 Conclusions etc.

Back to directive participants

Role	Discourse Participant
Director	Speaker
Instigator	Addressee
Subject	Addressee

- Director: epistemic authority about the modality to be followed
- All participants presumed to accept decisiveness of modality
- So how did the Addressee get involved? (Subject, Instigator)
 - Grammatical principles special to canonical '2p' imperatives
 - Defeasible pragmatic inference in 3p directives

Subjects of morphosyntactic canonical imperatives

English subjects in morphosyntactic canonical imperatives:

- (39)
- a. $\{\emptyset, \text{You}\}$ read the book!
 - b. Nobody $\{\emptyset, \text{of you}\}$ move!
 - c. Kids, Sebastian open the door and Tobias put away the toys.

Subject referent cannot be disjoint from an existing addressee:

Downing 1969 (*pace* Potsdam 1998, Zanuttini, Pak & Portner 2012)

- (40)
- a. Maître'd, someone seat the guests.
 - b. #Maître'd, one of your underlings seat the guests.

(41) Rain! Don't rain!

(42) **English 2p imperative subjects:**

When construed as a quantifier, if there is a non-empty set of addressees, the domain of the imperative subject contains at least one of them.

Subjects of morphosyntactic canonical imperatives

English subjects in morphosyntactic canonical imperatives:

- (39)
- a. $\{\emptyset, \text{You}\}$ read the book!
 - b. Nobody $\{\emptyset, \text{of you}\}$ move!
 - c. Kids, Sebastian open the door and Tobias put away the toys.

Subject referent cannot be disjoint from an existing addressee:

Downing 1969, *pace* Potsdam 1998, Zanuttini, Pak, Portner 2012

- (40)
- a. Maitre'd, someone seat the guests.
 - b. #Maitre'd, one of your underlings seat the guests.

(41) Rain! Don't rain!

(43) **German generalization:** Kaufmann 2012

The domain of the imperative subject is the set of addressees. –
 *(39c), *(41).

Absence of (perceived) addressee control

can allow for Wish-readings

Bolinger 1967, Culicover & Jackendoff 1997, Kaufmann 2012

- (44)
- | | | |
|----|--|------|
| a. | Get well soon! | Wish |
| b. | Please have the keys with you! | Wish |
| c. | Please don't have broken another vase! | Wish |

but not always

Condoravdi & Lauer 2012

- (45)
- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|----------------|
| a. | #Get tenure! | |
| b. | Get work done on the train! | Command, #Wish |

- '[...] only if it is taken for granted that speaker and addressee have no influence on the realization of the content.' Condoravdi & Lauer 2012 – (45a)?
- 'wish-imperatives are possible only under settledness' Kaufmann 2016 – (44a)?

Wish-imperatives

- (44) a. Get well soon! Wish
 b. Please have the keys with you! Wish
 c. Please don't have broken another vase! Wish
- (45) a. #Get tenure!
 b. Get work done on the train! Command, #Wish

New proposal: Canonical morphosyntactic 2p-imperatives p ! in English pre-suppose:

If it is possible that some agent controls p , then the addressee controls p .

- Absent any controlling agent, decisive modality is compatible with a mere wish-reading.
- (In)felicity of passives depends on presumed control: Farkas 1988

- (46) a. Be seen by a specialist! ✓ Command/Advice
 b. #Be hit by Mary!

- Greek: *(44a) Oikonomou 2016; ok: (44b,c) (D.O., p.c.)

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Directive obviation as evidence for a perspectival center
- 3 Contextual assumptions affect obviation effects
- 4 Directive obviation as a semantic conflict
- 5 Subjects and Instigators
- 6 Conclusions etc.**

Conclusions

- Imperatives are modals used by a **director** to select courses of events they consider best but can't control and can't be sure will be followed absent their utterance:
Directives grammaticalize a gap between (presumed acknowledged) expert knowledge and practical powers (control of world as such).
- Cases with prejacents with directors as agentive subjects are typically at odds with them being unable to ensure that the prejacent is brought about
- Director and Instigator are determined by grammar in interplay with contextual assumptions, Subject is determined by grammar

Promising speculations

- Korean has a promissive clause type that serves to commit the speaker to carrying out an action Pak, Portner, Zanuttini 2008
Anti-obviation form: Director = Instigator
- Promissives are rare
- *promise*: should select subjunctive but selects indicative, problematic for theories of mood selection Zanuttini, Pak & Portner 2012
Suggestion: *promise* describes an anti-obviation speech act, embedded directive subjunctives signal gap between epistemic authority and control
- Maybe promissives are rare because there is no need to signal non-descriptivity for one's own actions? (committing to the truth of a future statement under one's control can happen with a declarative)

Thank you. . .

and the UConn Meaning Group. For extensive discussion of data and theory, I would like to thank in particular specifically to Eno Agolli, Ivana Jovović, Stefan Kaufmann, Neda Todorović, Despina Oikonomou, and Adrian Stegovec.

Many thanks also to: Sarah Asinari, Chris Barker, Željko Bošković, Cleo Condoravdi, Norbert Corver, Miloje Despić, Mike Donovan, Donka Farkas, Jon Gajewski, Matthew Henderson, Sabine Iatridou, Robin Jenkins, Lily Kwok, Si Kai Lee, Gabriel Martinez-Vera, Yuya Noguchi, Hiromune Oda, Paul Portner, Nic Schrum, Una Stojnić, Yuta Tatsumi. The usual disclaimer applies.

Appendix: embedded '2p' imperatives

Kaufmann 2016

Canonical imperatives differ cross-linguistically in who ends up being the addressee under embedding:

(47) A said (to B) that **Subject** IMP.2Sg.

Referent of embedded imperative **Subject**?

- Korean, Japanese: B (matrix indirect object, \approx object control)
- Slovenian: utterance addressee
- English: B or utterance addressee

(48) [Context: *Peters visa is about to expire. His good friend Mary tells him:*]

I talked to a lawyer yesterday, and he said marry my sister.

(49) [Context: *Mary has lost her wallet. She tells her husband:*]

I talked to John, and he said call his bank.

- German: grammatical only if B is the utterance addressee Kaufmann & Poschmann 2011

References I

- Asier Alcázar and Mario Saltarelli. *The Syntax of Imperatives*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Chris Barker. Free choice permission as resource-sensitive reasoning. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 3(10):1–38, 2010. doi: 10.3765/sp.3.10.
- Nuel Belnap, Michael Perloff, and Ming Xu. *Facing the Future*. Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Manfred Bierwisch. Semantic structure and illocutionary force. In John Searle, editor, *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1980.
- Dwight Bolinger. The imperative in English. In Morris Halle, H Lunt, and H MacLean, editors, *To honor Roman Jakobson. Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, volume 1 of *Janua Linguarum, Studia Memoria, Series Major 31*, pages 335–362. Mouton, The Hague, Paris, 1967.
- Cleo Condoravdi and Sven Lauer. Imperatives: Meaning and illocutionary function. In Christopher Piñon, editor, *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics*, volume 9, pages 1–21. 2012.
- Cleo Condoravdi and Sven Lauer. Conditional imperatives and endorsement. In Andrew Lamont and Katerina Tetzloff, editors, *NELS 47: Proceedings of the 47th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, pages 185–204. 2017.

References II

- Luka Crnić and Tue Trinh. Embedding imperatives in English. In Arndt Riester and Torgrim Solstad, editors, *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 13*, pages 113–127. University of Stuttgart, 2009.
- Peter W. Culicover and Ray Jackendoff. Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28:195–217, 1997.
- Veneeta Dayal. Scope marking as indirect wh dependency. *Natural Language Semantics*, 2(2):137–170, 1994.
- Bruce Downing. Vocatives and third-person subjects in English. *Papers in Linguistics*, 1:570–592, 1969.
- Regine Eckardt. Imperatives as future plans. In Ingo Reich, editor, *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 2010*. Universität des Saarlandes, 2011.
- Ronald Fagin, Joseph Halpern, Moshe Vardi, and Yoram Moses. *Reasoning about Knowledge*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995.
- Martina Faller. *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2002.
- Donka Farkas. On the semantics of subjunctive complements. In P Hirschbühler and E. F. K. Koerner, editors, *Romance Languages*, pages 69–104. Benjamins, 1992.
- Donka Farkas and Kim B Bruce. On reaction to assertions and polar questions. *Journal of Semantics*, 27:81–118, 2010.
- Donka F. Farkas. On obligatory control. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 11:27–58, 1988.

References III

- Kai von Stechow and Sabine Iatridou. A modest proposal for the meaning of imperatives. In Ana Arregui, María Luisa Rivero, and Andrés Salanova, editors, *Modality Across Syntactic Categories*, pages 288–319. 2017.
- Thomas Guillaume. Embedded imperatives in Mbyá. In *Proceedings of NELS 43*. 2012.
- Christine Gunlogson. *True to Form: Rising and Falling Declaratives as Questions in English*. Routledge, New York, 2003.
- Austin Everett Hale. Person markers: finite conjunct and disjunct verb forms in Newari. In Ronald L Trail, editor, *Papers in South East Asian linguistics*, volume 7, page 95106. Australian National University, Canberra, 1980.
- Chung-hye Han. Deontic modality, lexical aspect and the semantics of imperatives. In The Linguistic Society of Korea, editor, *Linguistics in the morning calm*, volume 4. Hanshin Publications, Seoul, 1999.
- Chung-hye Han. *The structure and interpretation of imperatives: mood and force in universal grammar*. Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics. Garland, New York, 2000.
- Roland Hausser. Surface compositionality and the semantics of mood. In John Searle, Ferenc Kiefer, and Manfred Bierwisch, editors, *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*, volume II, pages 71–95. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1980.
- M. Huntley. The semantics of English imperatives. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 7(2): 103–133, 1984.

References IV

- Daniela Isac. *The Morphosyntax of Imperatives*. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2015.
- Hans Kamp. Free choice permission. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 74: 57–74, 1973.
- Hans Kamp. Semantics versus pragmatics. In F. Guenther and S. J. Schmidt, editors, *Formal Semantics and Pragmatics for Natural Languages*, pages 255–287. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1978.
- Magdalena Kaufmann. *Interpreting Imperatives*. Springer, Berlin, 2012.
- Magdalena Kaufmann. Fine-tuning natural language imperatives. *Journal of Logic and Computation*. First published online, June 18, 2016, doi:10.1093/logcom/exw009, 2016.
- Magdalena Kaufmann and Stefan Kaufmann. Epistemic particles and performativity. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 22*, pages 208–225. 2012.
- Magdalena Kaufmann and Claudia Poschmann. Embedded imperatives - empirical evidence from colloquial German. *Language*, 89(3):619–637, 2013.
- Paula Kempchinsky. *Romance Subjunctive Clauses and Logical Form*. PhD thesis, UCLA, 1986.
- Paula Kempchinsky. What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive? *Lingua*, 119(12):1788–1810, 2009.

References V

- Manfred Krifka. Embedding illocutionary acts. In Tom Roeper and Margaret Speas, editors, *Recursion, Complexity in Cognition*, volume 43 of *Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics*, pages 125–155. Springer, Berlin, 2014.
- Sven Lauer. *Towards a Dynamic Pragmatics*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2013.
- Sarah E. Murray. Varieties of update. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 7(2):1–53, March 2014. doi: 10.3765/sp.7.2.
- Despina Oikonomou. *Covert modals in root contexts*. PhD thesis, MIT, 2016.
- Miok Pak, Paul Portner, and Raffaella Zanuttini. Agreement in promissive, imperative, and exhortative clauses. *Korean Linguistics*, 14:157–175, 2008.
- M. Carme Picallo. *Opaque Domains*. PhD thesis, CUNY, 1985.
- Paul Portner. The semantics of imperatives within a theory of clause types. In Kazuha Watanabe and Robert B. Young, editors, *Proceedings of SALT 14*. CLC Publications, New York, 2005.
- Paul Portner. Imperatives and modals. *Natural Language Semantics*, 15:351–383, 2007.
- Paul Portner. Commitments to priorities. In Daniel Harris, Matt Moss, and Daniel Fogal, editors, *New Work in Speech Acts*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Eric Potsdam. *Syntactic Issues in English Imperatives*. Garland, 1998. Unrevised UCSC PhD Thesis from 1996.
- Einar Rögnvaldsson. The syntax of the imperative in Old Scandinavian. Manuscript, University of Iceland., 1998.

References VI

- Deniz Rudin. Rising imperatives. In Sireemas Maspong, Brynhildur Stefánsdóttir, Katherine Blake, and Forrest Davis, editors, *Proceedings of SALT 28*, pages 100–119. 2018.
- Nicolas Ruwet. Je veux partir/* je veux que je parte. a propos de la distribution des complétives à temps fini et des compléments à l'infinitif en français. *Cahiers de grammaire*, 7:75138, 1984.
- Kathrin Schulz. You may read it now or later: A case study on the paradox of free choice permission. Master's thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2003.
- Magdalena Schwager. Exhaustive imperatives. In Michael Franke and Paul Dekker, editors, *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Amsterdam Colloquium*, pages 233–238. ILLC, Amsterdam, 2005.
- Magdalena Schwager. *Interpreting Imperatives*. PhD thesis, University of Frankfurt, 2006.
- John R. Searle. A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1):1–23, 1976.
- Milena Milojević Sheppard and Marija Golden. (Negative) Imperatives in Slovene. In Sjeff Barbiers, Frits Beukema, and Wim van der Wurff, editors, *Modality and its Interaction with the Verbal System*, volume 47 of *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*, pages 245–260. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 2002.

References VII

- Peggy Speas and Carol Tenny. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In Anna Maria DiSciullo, editor, *Asymmetry in Grammar*, pages 315–343. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 2003.
- Robert Stalnaker. Common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 25:701–721, 2002.
- Will Starr. A preference semantics for imperatives. Conditionally accepted at *Semantics & Pragmatics*, 2018.
- Adrian Stegovec. !? (where's the ban on imperative questions?). *Proceedings of SALT*, 27:153–172, 2017.
- Adrian Stegovec. Perspectival control and obviation in directive clauses. *Natural Language Semantics*, t.a.
- Adrian Stegovec and Magdalena Kaufmann. Slovenian imperatives: You can't always embed what you want! In Eva Csipak and Hedde Zeijlstra, editors, *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, pages 621–638, Göttingen, 2015.
- Una Stojnić. One's modus ponens: Modality, coherence and logic. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 95(1):167–214, 2016.
- Anna Szabolcsi. Infinitives vs. subjunctives: What do we learn from obviation and from exemptions from obviation. Ms. NYU, 2010.
- Hubert Truckenbrodt. On the semantic motivation of syntactic verb movement to C in German. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 32(3):257–306, 2006.
- Stephen Wechsler. In Simeon Floyd, Elisabeth Norcliffe, and Lila San Roque, editors, *Egophoricity*, Typological Studies in Language 118, page 473494. 2018.

References VIII

- Deirdre Wilson and Dan Sperber. Mood and the analysis of non-declarative sentences. In J Dancy, J Moravcsik, and C Taylor, editors, *Human agency: Language, duty and value*, page 77101. Stanford University Press, Stanford CA, 1988.
- Rafaela Zanuttini. *Negation and Clausal Structure*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997.
- Raffaella Zanuttini. Encoding the addressee in the syntax: evidence from English imperative subjects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 26(1):185–218, 2008.
- Raffaella Zanuttini, Miok Pak, and Paul Portner. A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 30:1231–1274, 2012.
- Hedde Zeiljstra. The ban on true negative imperatives. In O Bonami and P Cabredo Hofherr, editors, *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 6*, pages 405–424. 2006.
- Vera Zu. Competition and obviation from French to Newari. To appear in *Proceedings of NELS 46*, 2015.
- Vera Zu. *Discourse Participants and the Structural Representation of the Context*. PhD thesis, New York University, 2018.