

# A semantic-pragmatic account of generalized subject obviation

Magdalena Kaufmann (University of Connecticut)

LinG Colloquium Series, Georg-August-University Göttingen

May 20, 2020

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
  - Classical subject obviation (basics)
  - Previous accounts
- 2 Generalized obviation
- 3 Generalized obviation as a semantic conflict
- 4 Further implications

# Classical subject obviation

Ban on coreference between matrix and embedded subject of directive and desiderative predicates (Romance, Hungarian, ...):

[ **SUBJECT**<sub>*i*</sub> {want, hope, insist,...} [ **SUBJECT**<sub>*j,\*i*</sub> ...VERB<sub>Subjunctive</sub>... ] ]

# Classical subject obviation

Ban on coreference between matrix and embedded subject of directive and desiderative predicates (Romance, Hungarian, ...):

[ **SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>**; {want, hope, insist,...} [ **SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub>** ... VERB<sub>Subjunctive</sub>... ] ]

- (1) a. \*Je veux que je parte.  
 I want that I leave.SUBJ  
 int.: 'I want to leave.'
- b. Pierre<sub>i</sub> veut qu'il<sub>\*i,j</sub> parte.  
 P. wants that he leave.SUBJ  
 Pierre wants that he (≠ Pierre) leave.

French  
 Ruwet 1984

# Classical subject obviation

Ban on coreference between matrix and embedded subject of directive and desiderative predicates (Romance, Hungarian, ...):

[ **SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>**; {want, hope, insist,...} [ **SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub>** ... VERB<sub>Subjunctive</sub>... ] ]

- (2) a. Su padre le ordenó a Ana que dejara de hablar del asunto.  
 'Her father ordered Ana that (she) stop.SUBJ talking about the matter.'
- b. \*Ana se ordenó (a sí misma) que dejara de pensar en el asunto.  
 'Ana ordered herself that (she) stop.SUBJ thinking about the matter.'

Spanish, Kempchinsky 2009,10b,d

# Classical subject obviation

Ban on coreference between matrix and embedded subject of directive and desiderative predicates (Romance, Hungarian, ...):

[ **SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>**; {want, hope, insist,...} [ **SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub>** ... VERB<sub>Subjunctive</sub>... ] ]

Obviation effect is alleviated if the matrix subject referent is not in **control**

Ruwet 1984; Farkas 1988, 1992; Szabolcsi 2010

# Classical subject obviation

Ban on coreference between matrix and embedded subject of directive and desiderative predicates (Romance, Hungarian, ...):

[ **SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>**; {want, hope, insist,...} [ **SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub>** ... VERB<sub>Subjunctive</sub>... ] ]

Obviation effect is alleviated if the matrix subject referent is not in **control**

Ruwet 1984; Farkas 1988, 1992; Szabolcsi 2010

- Non-agentive complements, passives, ... :

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

# Classical subject obviation

Ban on coreference between matrix and embedded subject of directive and desiderative predicates (Romance, Hungarian, . . . ):

[ **SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>**; {want, hope, insist, . . .} [ **SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub>** ... VERB<sub>Subjunctive</sub> . . . ] ]

Obviation effect is alleviated if the matrix subject referent is not in **control**

Ruwet 1984; Farkas 1988, 1992; Szabolcsi 2010

- Non-agentive complements, passives, . . . :

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

- Joint responsibility (Szabolcsi 2010: including focus on low subject)

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

Ruwet 1984

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction)

Bouchard 1983; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, . . .

- (5) a. Pierre<sub>i</sub> veut [ que il<sub>\*</sub>/#<sub>i</sub> parte ]  
 Pierre wants [ that he leave.SUBJ ]
- b. Pierre veut [ PRO partir ]  
 Pierre wants [ PRO leave.INF ]

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction)

Bouchard 1983; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, . . .

- (5) a. Pierre<sub>i</sub> veut [ que il<sub>\*</sub>/#<sub>i</sub> parte ]  
 Pierre wants [ that he leave.SUBJ ]
- b. Pierre veut [ PRO partir ]  
 Pierre wants [ PRO leave.INF ]

- Semantic version: competitor carries additional meaning

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction)

Bouchard 1983; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, . . .

- (5) a. Pierre<sub>i</sub> veut [ que il<sub>\*</sub>/#<sub>i</sub> parte ]  
 Pierre wants [ that he leave.SUBJ ]  
 b. Pierre veut [ PRO partir ]  
 Pierre wants [ PRO leave.INF ]

- Semantic version: competitor carries additional meaning
  - Control construction expresses *de se*-attitude

Chierchia 1987; Schlenker 2005

(Scen1) Pierre sees his campaign add, fails to recognize himself and  
 thinks the guy featured should leave. – ✗(5b) *de re*

(Scen2) Pierre: 'I want to leave!'. – ✓(5b) *de se*

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction)

Bouchard 1983; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, . . .

- (5) a. Pierre<sub>i</sub> veut [ que il<sub>\*</sub>/#<sub>i</sub> parte ]  
 Pierre wants [ that he leave.SUBJ ]
- b. Pierre veut [ PRO partir ]  
 Pierre wants [ PRO leave.INF ]

- Semantic version: competitor carries additional meaning

- Control construction expresses *de se*-attitude

Chierchia 1987; Schlenker 2005

(Scen1) Pierre sees his campaign add, fails to recognize himself and  
 thinks the guy featured should leave. – ✗(5b) *de re*

(Scen2) Pierre: 'I want to leave!'. – ✓(5b) *de se*

- Control construction expresses responsibility for course of events

Farkas 1988

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction):

Bouchard 1983; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, . . .

- (5)
- a. Pierre; veux que il; parte.  
Pierre wants that he leave.SUBJ
  - b. Pierre veut [ PRO partir ]  
Pierre wants [PRO to leave]

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction):

Bouchard 1983; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, . . .

- (5) a. Pierre; veut que il; parte.  
 Pierre wants that he leave.SUBJ
- b. Pierre veut [ PRO partir ]  
 Pierre wants [PRO to leave]

✓ Ban alleviated when competitor isn't suitable (i.e., lack of *de se* or responsibility)

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction):

Bouchard 1983; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, . . .

- (5) a. Pierre; veut que il; parte.  
 Pierre wants that he leave.SUBJ
- b. Pierre veut [ PRO partir ]  
 Pierre wants [PRO to leave]

✓ Ban alleviated when competitor isn't suitable (i.e., lack of *de se* or responsibility)

✗ Obviation in the absence of a competitor (for Slovenian: Stegovec 2019)

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction):

Bouchard 1983; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, . . .

- (5) a. Pierre; veut que il; parte.  
 Pierre wants that he leave.SUBJ
- b. Pierre veut [ PRO partir ]  
 Pierre wants [PRO to leave]

- ✓ Ban alleviated when competitor isn't suitable (i.e., lack of *de se* or responsibility)
- ✗ Obviation in the absence of a competitor (for Slovenian: Stegovec 2019)
- ✗ Doesn't extend to matrix phenomena (generalized obviation)  
 Kempchinsky 2009; Stegovec 2019

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction):

Bouchard 1983; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, . . .

- (5) a. Pierre; veut que il; parte.  
 Pierre wants that he leave.SUBJ
- b. Pierre veut [ PRO partir ]  
 Pierre wants [PRO to leave]

- ✓ Ban alleviated when competitor isn't suitable (i.e., lack of *de se* or responsibility)
- ✗ Obviation in the absence of a competitor (for Slovenian: Stegovec 2019)
- ✗ Doesn't extend to matrix phenomena (generalized obviation)  
 Kempchinsky 2009; Stegovec 2019
- ✗ Cases of free variation  
 Kempchinsky 2009

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction):

Bouchard 1983; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, . . .

- (5) a. Pierre; veut que il; parte.  
 Pierre wants that he leave.SUBJ
- b. Pierre veut [ PRO partir ]  
 Pierre wants [PRO to leave]

- ✓ Ban alleviated when competitor isn't suitable (i.e., lack of *de se* or responsibility)
- ✗ Obviation in the absence of a competitor (for Slovenian: Stegovec 2019)
- ✗ Doesn't extend to matrix phenomena (generalized obviation)  
 Kempchinsky 2009; Stegovec 2019
- ✗ Cases of free variation  
 Kempchinsky 2009
- ✗ Status of presumed additional meaning  
 (control constructions without *de se*: Magidor 2015; Pearson and Roeper t.a.)

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction):

Bouchard 1983; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, . . .

- (5) a. Pierre; veut que il; parte.  
 Pierre wants that he leave.SUBJ
- b. Pierre veut [ PRO partir ]  
 Pierre wants [PRO to leave]

- ✓ Ban alleviated when competitor isn't suitable (i.e., lack of *de se* or responsibility)
- ✗ Obviation in the absence of a competitor (for Slovenian: Stegovec 2019)
- ✗ Doesn't extend to matrix phenomena (generalized obviation)  
 Kempchinsky 2009; Stegovec 2019
- ✗ Cases of free variation  
 Kempchinsky 2009
- ✗ Status of presumed additional meaning  
 (control constructions without *de se*: Magidor 2015; Pearson and Roeper t.a.)
- **Preview:** Subjunctive encodes *absence* of the meanings attributed to control construction

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 2: Anti-Locality

- Binding domain of lower subject extends to include the higher subject:  
Picallo 1985; Kempchinsky 1986,...
- (6) [ SUBJECT<sub>i</sub> want/hope/insist/... [ SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub> ... VERB<sub>Subj</sub> ... ] ]

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 2: Anti-Locality

- Binding domain of lower subject extends to include the higher subject:  
Picallo 1985; Kempchinsky 1986,...

(6) [ SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>; want/hope/insist/... [ SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub> ... VERB<sub>Subj</sub> ... ]]

- Variant: perspectival operator interacts with subjunctive subject

Stegovec 2019

(7) [ SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>; want/hope/insist/... [ PERSPOP<sub>j</sub>...SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub>...VERB<sub>Subj</sub>...]]

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 2: Anti-Locality

- Binding domain of lower subject extends to include the higher subject:  
Picallo 1985; Kempchinsky 1986,...

(6) [ SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>; want/hope/insist/... [ SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub> ... VERB<sub>Subj</sub> ... ]]

- Variant: perspectival operator interacts with subjunctive subject

Stegovec 2019

(7) [ SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>; want/hope/insist/... [ PERSPOP<sub>j</sub>...SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub>...VERB<sub>Subj</sub>...]]

- ✓ Independent of a suitable competitor

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 2: Anti-Locality

- Binding domain of lower subject extends to include the higher subject:  
Picallo 1985; Kempchinsky 1986,...

(6) [ SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>; want/hope/insist/... [ SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub> ... V<sub>ERB</sub><sub>Subj</sub> ... ]]

- Variant: perspectival operator interacts with subjunctive subject

Stegovec 2019

(7) [ SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>; want/hope/insist/... [ PERSPOP<sub>j</sub>...SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub>...V<sub>ERB</sub><sub>Subj</sub>...]]

✓ Independent of a suitable competitor

⊗ Devil in syntactic details

Kempchinsky 2009

(matrix direct objects, object clitics in embedded clause,...)

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 2: Anti-Locality

- Binding domain of lower subject extends to include the higher subject:  
Picallo 1985; Kempchinsky 1986,...

(6) [ SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>; want/hope/insist/... [ SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub> ... VERB<sub>Subj</sub> ... ]]

- Variant: perspectival operator interacts with subjunctive subject

Stegovec 2019

(7) [ SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>; want/hope/insist/... [ PERSPOP<sub>j</sub>...SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub>...VERB<sub>Subj</sub>...]]

✓ Independent of a suitable competitor

⚠ Devil in syntactic details

Kempchinsky 2009

(matrix direct objects, object clitics in embedded clause,...)

⚠ Unclear: impact of pragmatics

Farkas 1992, but: Zu 2018

# Existing accounts for subject obviation 2: Anti-Locality

- Binding domain of lower subject extends to include the higher subject:  
Picallo 1985; Kempchinsky 1986,...

(6) [ SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>; want/hope/insist/... [ SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub> ... VERB<sub>Subj</sub> ... ]]

- Variant: perspectival operator interacts with subjunctive subject

Stegovec 2019

(7) [ SUBJECT<sub>i</sub>; want/hope/insist/... [ PERSPOP<sub>j</sub>...SUBJECT<sub>j,\*i</sub>...VERB<sub>Subj</sub>...]]

✓ Independent of a suitable competitor

⊗ Devil in syntactic details

Kempchinsky 2009

(matrix direct objects, object clitics in embedded clause,...)

⊗ Unclear: impact of pragmatics

Farkas 1992, but: Zu 2018

- **Preview:** adopt perspectival operator but derive conflicts in semantics

# Existing accounts for subj. obviation 3: Anti-Logophoricity

Responsibility ('control') relates to imperatives

Farkas 1988; Quer 1998; Kempchinsky 2009

- (8) Lies dieses Buch!  
 read.IMP this book  
 'Read this book!'

German

# Existing accounts for subj. obviation 3: Anti-Logophoricity

Responsibility ('control') relates to imperatives

Farkas 1988; Quer 1998; Kempchinsky 2009

(8) Lies dieses Buch! German  
 read.IMP this book  
 'Read this book!'

- **Subjunctive:** anyone other than the matrix subject can be in control
- **Imperative:** no 1p imp.; anyone other than speaker can be in control

# Existing accounts for subj. obviation 3: Anti-Logophoricity

Responsibility ('control') relates to imperatives

Farkas 1988; Quer 1998; Kempchinsky 2009

(8) Lies dieses Buch! German  
 read.IMP this book  
 'Read this book!'

- **Subjunctive:** anyone other than the matrix subject can be in control
- **Imperative:** no 1p imp.; anyone other than speaker can be in control
- 'the imperative operator semantically binds an addressee-oriented logophoric element, the **subjunctive operator** semantically binds a subject-oriented antilogophoric element: it is in a sense **the inverse of the imperative operator**' Kempchinsky 2009

# Existing accounts for subj. obviation 3: Anti-Logophoricity

Kempchinsky's (2009) implementation:

- 'core case of subjunctive complements [...] appear with matrix verbs which introduce some set of **alternative worlds which do not hold at the time of the matrix predicate** [...] selection of **uninterpretable W feature**'

# Existing accounts for subj. obviation 3: Anti-Logophoricity

Kempchinsky's (2009) implementation:

- 'core case of subjunctive complements [...] appear with matrix verbs which introduce some set of **alternative worlds which do not hold at the time of the matrix predicate** [...] selection of **uninterpretable W feature**'
- '**quasi-imperative operator** in the Fin head of the left-periphery [...] **binds a subject-oriented antilogophoric element**; it is in essence an instruction to the semantic component on how to interpret the pronominal subject of the subjunctive clause.'



# Existing accounts for subj. obviation 3: Anti-Logophoricity

- ✓ Semantic intuitions are spot on.

# Existing accounts for subj. obviation 3: Anti-Logophoricity

- ✓ Semantic intuitions are spot on.
- ✓ Integrated into account of lexically selected and free mood marking (subjunctive/indicative).

# Existing accounts for subj. obviation 3: Anti-Logophoricity

- ✓ Semantic intuitions are spot on.
- ✓ Integrated into account of lexically selected and free mood marking (subjunctive/indicative).
- ⊗ No interpretation given. – Impact of presumed control? Connection between antilogophoricity and modality? Meaning of matrix verbs?

# Existing accounts for subj. obviation 3: Anti-Logophoricity

- ✓ Semantic intuitions are spot on.
- ✓ Integrated into account of lexically selected and free mood marking (subjunctive/indicative).
- ⊗ No interpretation given. – Impact of presumed control? Connection between antilogophoricity and modality? Meaning of matrix verbs?
- ⊗ Can it extend to generalized obviation (see *below*)?

# Existing accounts for subj. obviation 3: Anti-Logophoricity

- ✓ Semantic intuitions are spot on.
  - ✓ Integrated into account of lexically selected and free mood marking (subjunctive/indicative).
  - ⊗ No interpretation given. – Impact of presumed control? Connection between antilogophoricity and modality? Meaning of matrix verbs?
  - ⊗ Can it extend to generalized obviation (see *below*)?
- 
- **Preview:** Subjunctive operator is imperative operator, shift of perspective happens independently

# My proposal in a nutshell

- Directive subjunctives and imperatives form a **paradigm of directives**.  
Evidence: embedded imperatives and surrogate imperatives.

Stegovec 2019 for Slovenian

# My proposal in a nutshell

- Directive subjunctives and imperatives form a **paradigm of directives**.  
Evidence: embedded imperatives and surrogate imperatives.  
Stegovec 2019 for Slovenian
- All directive clauses are subject to **generalized obviation** (which includes classical subject obviation).

# My proposal in a nutshell

- Directive subjunctives and imperatives form a **paradigm of directives**.  
Evidence: embedded imperatives and surrogate imperatives.  
Stegovec 2019 for Slovenian
- All directive clauses are subject to **generalized obviation** (which includes classical subject obviation).
- Interpretation of directives references an epistemic authority (**director**), who knows what is preferable, and an agent (**instigator**), who can carry out the relevant actions, in a way such that. . .

# My proposal in a nutshell

- Directive subjunctives and imperatives form a **paradigm of directives**.  
Evidence: embedded imperatives and surrogate imperatives.  
Stegovec 2019 for Slovenian
- All directive clauses are subject to **generalized obviation** (which includes classical subject obviation).
- Interpretation of directives references an epistemic authority (**director**), who knows what is preferable, and an agent (**instigator**), who can carry out the relevant actions, in a way such that. . .  
identity between director and instigator amounts to inconsistent discourse commitments for speaker/unresolvable presuppositions.

# My proposal in a nutshell

- Directives express that an optimal action is selected by a **director** for someone else, the **instigator**, to carry out.

# My proposal in a nutshell

- Directives express that an optimal action is selected by a **director** for someone else, the **instigator**, to carry out.
- Director and instigator are determined by interplay of grammar and pragmatics.

# My proposal in a nutshell

- Directives express that an optimal action is selected by a **director** for someone else, the **instigator**, to carry out.
- Director and instigator are determined by interplay of grammar and pragmatics.
- Structure of directive clauses:

(9) [ PERSPOP [ IMPOP [ SUBJECT ... Verb<sub>Subj/Imp</sub> ] ] ]

- typically: SUBJECT = Instigator
- IMPOP: necessity modal + presuppositions;  
licenses directive subjunctive/imperative morphology
- PERSPOP = Director;  
set grammatically to discourse participant or matrix subject  
(independently motivated mechanism)

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Generalized obviation
  - Motivating a full directive paradigm
  - Generalized obviation in Slovenian
  - A more general pattern of perspectival dependence
  - Syntactic account for generalized obviation
  - Sem-prag effects on generalized obviation
- 3 Generalized obviation as a semantic conflict
- 4 Further implications

# Imperatives as embedded 2p directives

Morpho-syntactic marking of canonical imperatives in indirect speech:

- (10) Rekel (ti) je, da mu pomagaj. Slovenian  
 said.M (2.Dat) is that 3.M.DAT help.IMP.(2) Sheppard and Golden 2002  
 'He<sub>i</sub> said (to you) that you should help him<sub>i,k</sub>.'

# Imperatives as embedded 2p directives

Morpho-syntactic marking of canonical imperatives in indirect speech:

- (10) Rekel (ti) je, da mu pomagaj. Slovenian  
 said.M (2.Dat) is that 3.M.DAT help.IMP.(2) Sheppard and Golden 2002  
 'He<sub>i</sub> said (to you) that you should help him<sub>i,k</sub>.'

- (11) Hans hat gesagt ruf seinen Vater an. %German  
 Hans has said call.IMP his father up Schwager 2006  
 'Hans<sub>i</sub> said that you should call his<sub>i,l</sub> father.'

# Imperatives as embedded 2p directives

Morpho-syntactic marking of canonical imperatives in indirect speech:

- (10) Rekel (ti) je, da mu **pomagaj**. Slovenian  
 said.M (2.Dat) is that 3.M.DAT help.IMP.(2) Sheppard and Golden 2002  
 'He<sub>i</sub> said (to you) that you should help him<sub>i,k</sub>.'
- (11) Hans hat gesagt **ruf** seinen Vater an. %German  
 Hans has said call.IMP his father up Schwager 2006  
 'Hans<sub>i</sub> said that you should call his<sub>i,l</sub> father.'
- (12) John<sub>i</sub> said **call** his<sub>i,k</sub> father. %English  
 Crnič and Trinh 2009

# Imperatives as embedded 2p directives

Morpho-syntactic marking of canonical imperatives in indirect speech:

(10) Rekel (ti) je, da mu pomagaj. Slovenian  
 said.M (2.Dat) is that 3.M.DAT help.IMP.(2) Sheppard and Golden 2002  
 'He<sub>i</sub> said (to you) that you should help him<sub>i,k</sub>.'

(11) Hans hat gesagt ruf seinen Vater an. %German  
 Hans has said call.IMP his father up Schwager 2006  
 'Hans<sub>i</sub> said that you should call his<sub>i,l</sub> father.'

(12) John<sub>i</sub> said call his<sub>i,k</sub> father. %English  
 Crnič and Trinh 2009

Also: Japanese (Han 1999), Korean (Pak, Portner & Zanuttini 2008), Mbyá (Thomas 2014), Old Scandinavian (Rögnvaldsson 1998), ...

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

# Surrogate imperatives filling the paradigm

Type I surrogates fill gaps in imperative/directive paradigms:

- Negative imperatives Zanuttini 1997; Zeiljstra 2006; Isac 2015

(13) Leggi! – Non {leggere, \*leggi}. Italian  
 read.IMP2 – not read.INF, read.IMP2  
 ‘Read!’ – ‘Don’t read!’

# Surrogate imperatives filling the paradigm

Type I surrogates fill gaps in imperative/directive paradigms:

- Negative imperatives Zanuttini 1997; Zeiljstra 2006; Isac 2015

(13) 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 et al. 2012

(14) Naj pomaga! Slovenian, *naj*-subjunctive  
 SBJV help.3  
 ‘(S)he should help!’

(15) Tebulwa: sa:ph rahe! Bhojpuri  
 table-NOM clean-NOM be-IMP3Sg Zanuttini et al. 2012  
 ‘Let the table be clean!’

# Surrogate imperatives replacing canonical 2p imperatives

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

(16) 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,...*

(17) 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 and Iatridou 2017

# Slovenian *naj*-subjunctives

Stegovec 2019

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

# Slovenian *naj*-subjunctives

Stegovec 2019

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: Availability of forms is constrained

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

## Slovenian generalized obviation: matrix case

Stegovec 2019

Commitment: 'x should...!'

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

# Slovenian generalized obviation: matrix case

Stegovec 2019

Commitment: 'x should...!'

(18) Anyone **but first person exclusive**

- a. **\*Naj pomagam!** – **\*Naj pomagamo!**  
 SBJV help.1 – SBJV help.1PI
- b. Pomagaj! – Pomagajte! – Pomagajmo!  
 help.IMP.2 – Help.IMP.2PI – Help.IMP.1PI(Incl)
- c. Naj pomaga! – Naj pomagajo!  
 SBJV help.3 – SBJV help.3PI

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

(19) Anyone **but second person**

- a. Naj pomagam? – Naj pomagamo?  
 SBJV help.1 – SBJV help.1PI
- b. **\*Pomagaj?** – **\*Pomagajte?** – **\*Pomagajmo?**  
 help.IMP.2 – Help.IMP.2PI – Help.IMP.1PI(Incl)
- c. Naj pomaga? – Naj pomagajo?  
 SBJV help.3 – SBJV help.3PI

# Generalized obviation in speech reports

Stegovec 2019

- (20) 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<sub>i</sub> said (to Z) that I/you/(s)he<sub>\*i/j</sub> should... [naj V.3p]

# Generalized obviation in speech reports

Stegovec 2019

- (20) 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<sub>i</sub> said (to Z) that I/you/(s)he<sub>\*i/j</sub> should... [naj V.3p]

- (21) Me: 'I should exercise more!' – Later you remind me:
- a. \*Rekel si<sub>i</sub>, da več telovadi<sub>i</sub>.  
 said.M are.2 that more exercise.IMP.(2)  
 int: 'You said that you should exercise more.' *Obviation!*
  - b. Rekel si<sub>i</sub>, da moraš<sub>i</sub> več telovadit.  
 said.M are.2 that should.2 more exercise.INF  
 'You<sub>i</sub> said that you<sub>i</sub> should exercise more.'

# Generalized obviation in speech reports

Stegovec 2019

(20) 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<sub>i</sub> said (to Z) that I/you/(s)he<sub>\*i/j</sub> should... [naj V.3p]

(21) Me: 'I should exercise more!' – Later you remind me:

- a. \*Rekel si<sub>i</sub>, da več telovadi<sub>i</sub>.  
 said.M are.2 that more exercise.IMP.(2)  
 int: 'You said that you should exercise more.' *Obviation!*
- b. Rekel si<sub>i</sub>, da moraš<sub>i</sub> več telovadit.  
 said.M are.2 that should.2 more exercise.INF  
 'You<sub>i</sub> said that you<sub>i</sub> should exercise more.'

'It's ok to tell yourself what to do; just not with imperatives or disjunctives!' ⇒ an issue of conventional meaning of directives

# Generalized obviation is a matter of grammar

Stegovec 2019

- Standard subject obviation with directive subjunctives is one corner of generalized directive obviation
- Something about directives (imperatives, directive *naj*-clauses) blocks subjects that refer to speaker/addressee or attitude holder.

# Generalized obviation is a matter of grammar

Stegovec 2019

- Standard subject obviation with directive subjunctives is one corner of generalized directive obviation
- 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.



# Compare: Conjunct-disjunct agreement

Pattern of generalized obviation resembles **conjunct-disjunct agreement**,  
 e.g. Newari (Sino-Tibetan): Hale 1980; Wechsler 2018; Zu 2018

- Main clause, commitment (assertion):

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

- Ji** ana wan- $\bar{a}$ .  
**1P.ABS** there go-PST.**CONJ**.  
 'I went there.'
- cha ana wan-a.  
 you.ABS there go-PST.DISJ  
 'You went there.'
- wa ana wan-a  
 (s)he.ABS there go-PST.DISJ  
 '(S)he went there.'

# Compare: Conjunct-Disjunct Marking

Pattern of generalized 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:

(23) 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?'

# Compare: Conjunct-Disjunct Marking

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:

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

- a. **wõ:** [wa ana **wan-ā** dhakā:] dhā  
 (s)he.ERG (s)he there **go-PST.CONJ** that said  
 '(S)he<sub>i</sub> said that (s)he<sub>i,\*j</sub> went there.'
- b. **wõ:** [wa ana **wan-a** dhakā:] dhā  
 (s)he.ERG (s)he there **go-PST.DISJ** that said  
 '(S)he<sub>i</sub> said that (s)he<sub>\*i,j</sub> went there.'

# Compare: Conjunct-Disjunct Marking

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**

# Compare: Conjunct-Disjunct Marking

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)

# Syntactic account of generalized obviation

Stegovec 2019

- Director is represented syntactically: **perspectival PRO**  
Perspectival center in the syntax: Tenny and Speas 2004; Wechsler 2018; Zu 2015

# Syntactic account of generalized obviation

Stegovec 2019

- Director is represented syntactically: **perspectival PRO**  
 Perspectival center in the syntax: Tenny and Speas 2004; Wechsler 2018; Zu 2015
- Perspectival PRO is bound by speech act operator (COMMIT, QUESTION; Pearson 2013) or matrix predicate.

# Syntactic account of generalized obviation

Stegovec 2019

- Director is represented syntactically: **perspectival PRO**  
 Perspectival center in the syntax: Tenny and Speas 2004; Wechsler 2018; Zu 2015
- Perspectival PRO is bound by speech act operator (COMMIT, QUESTION; Pearson 2013) or matrix predicate.
- Binding domain of subject contains perspectival PRO  
 ⇒ Generalized obviation is a Condition B violation:

# Syntactic account of generalized obviation

Stegovec 2019

- Director is represented syntactically: **perspectival PRO**  
 Perspectival center in the syntax: Tenny and Speas 2004; Wechsler 2018; Zu 2015
- Perspectival PRO is bound by speech act operator (COMMIT, QUESTION; Pearson 2013) or matrix predicate.
- Binding domain of subject contains perspectival PRO  
 ⇒ Generalized obviation is a Condition B violation:

In main clause:

$$\{ \text{COMMIT}_{\text{Speaker}}, \text{QUESTION}_{\text{Addressee}} \} \lambda x [ \text{PRO}_x [ \text{SUBJECT} [ \dots ] ] ]$$

In speech report:

$$[ \text{SUBJECT} \text{ said that } [ \lambda x [ \text{PRO}_x [ \text{SUBJECT} [ \dots ] ] ] ] ] ] ]$$



# Lack of (presumed) control alleviates obviation

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

Ruwet 1984; Farkas 1988, 1992; Szabolcsi 2010

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

# Lack of (presumed) control alleviates obviation

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

Ruwet 1984; Farkas 1988, 1992; Szabolcsi 2010

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

- Lack of control in matrix directives (commitment case) ⇒ ✓1p  
Directive Greek *na*-subjunctives obviate; (25) acceptable if speaker lacks control over when they wake up:

Oikonomou 2016:(38)

- (25) 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.).

# Interrogative perspectives 1: Rhetorical questions

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

- (26) 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.)

# Interrogative perspectives 1: Rhetorical questions

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

- (26) 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.)

Imperatives in rhetorical (*wh*)-questions:

Sperber & Wilson 1988: Omotic (Southern Ethiopia);

Kaufmann and Poschmann 2013: %German

- (27) 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.)'

# Interrogative perspectives 1: Rhetorical questions

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

- (26) 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.)

Imperatives in rhetorical (*wh*)-questions:

Sperber & Wilson 1988: Omotic (Southern Ethiopia);

Kaufmann and Poschmann 2013: %German

- (27) 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**.

# Interrogatives perspectives 2: Context/Scope Marking

Interrogatives can be shifted to a non-addressee perspective:

Scope marking questions: Dayal 1994

- (28) Kaj je rekla? Kaj kupi? Slovenian  
 what AUX.3 said.F what buy.IMP.(2) Stegovec 2017  
 'What did she say? What should you buy?'

- (29) a. Ti na fas avrio? Greek  
 what SUBJ eat.2 tomorrow? Oikonomou 2016:34  
 '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?'

# Rising directives

Portner 2018; Rudin 2018

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

Portner 2018; Rudin 2018

(30) a. Help him (maybe)?

b. Pomagaj?

help.IMP.2

'Should you help him?'

Slovenian

c. {Pročitaj / Da pročitaš} ovu knjigu?

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

'Read this book, maybe?'

Serbian

# Rising directives

Portner 2018; Rudin 2018

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

Portner 2018; Rudin 2018

(30) 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 and Bruce 2010; Rudin 2018
- Perspectival center: speaker and addressee together.

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Generalized obviation
- 3 Generalized obviation as a semantic conflict**
  - Directives as modalized propositions
  - Deriving generalized obviation
- 4 Further implications

# Directives close gap between knowledge and action



DIRECTIVE  
→



# Interpreting directives

- Directive speech acts: ≈Searle 1976  
**Director** aims to get **Instigator** to bring about a specific course of events.

# Interpreting directives

- Directive speech acts: ≈Searle 1976  
**Director** aims to get **Instigator** to bring about a specific course of events.
- Directive meaning resides in directive modal operator ImpOP:  
 [ PERSPOP [ ImpOP[ SUBJECT ... Verb<sub>Subj/Imp</sub> ] ] ]

# Interpreting directives

- Directive speech acts: ≈Searle 1976  
**Director** aims to get **Instigator** to bring about a specific course of events.
- Directive meaning resides in directive modal operator ImpOP:  
 [ **PERSPOP** [ **ImpOP**[ SUBJECT ... Verb<sub>Subj/Imp</sub> ] ] ]
- Directive operator ImpOP
  - ≈ *must, should*:  
 singles out 'SUBJECT ... Verb<sub>Subj/Imp</sub>' as best course of events
  - imposes conditions on felicitous contexts of use (presuppositions)  
 that *can only be met if Director ≠ Instigator*.

# Interpreting directives

- Directive speech acts: ≈Searle 1976  
**Director** aims to get **Instigator** to bring about a specific course of events.
- Directive meaning resides in directive modal operator ImpOP:  
 [ **PERSPOP** [ **ImpOP**[ **SUBJECT** ... **Verb<sub>Subj/Imp</sub>** ] ] ]
- Directive operator ImpOP
  - ≈ *must, should*:  
 singles out 'SUBJECT ... Verb<sub>Subj/Imp</sub>' as best course of events
  - imposes conditions on felicitous contexts of use (presuppositions)  
 that *can only be met if Director ≠ Instigator*.
- Extends semantics that is independently motivated for canonical 2p imperatives

Schwager 2006; Kaufmann 2012

# Descriptive and performative modal verbs

Kamp 1973

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

- **descriptive:**

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

- (31) 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]*

# Descriptive and performative modal verbs

Kamp 1973

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

- **descriptive:**

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

- (31) 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, . . .

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

Evidence for performativity:

Kaufmann 2012

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

[Distancing Ban]

# Performative and descriptive modals

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- Modals: descriptive and performative is a distinction of use, not semantics. Kamp 1973; Schulz 2003  
Context decides: **descriptive context** vs. **performative context**

# Performative and descriptive modals

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- Modals: descriptive and performative is a distinction of use, not semantics. Kamp 1973; Schulz 2003  
Context decides: **descriptive context** vs. **performative context**
- Directive speech acts '*must*  $\phi$ ' occur in performative contexts:

# Performative and descriptive modals

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- Modals: descriptive and performative is a distinction of use, not semantics. Kamp 1973; Schulz 2003  
Context decides: **descriptive context** vs. **performative context**
- Directive speech acts '*must*  $\phi$ ' occur in performative contexts:
  - Director does not take  $\phi$  for granted independently of their utterance  
 ⇨ *Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)*

# Performative and descriptive modals

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- Modals: descriptive and performative is a distinction of use, not semantics. Kamp 1973; Schulz 2003  
Context decides: **descriptive context** vs. **performative context**
- Directive speech acts '*must*  $\phi$ ' occur in performative contexts:
  - Director does not take  $\phi$  for granted independently of their utterance  
 $\Leftrightarrow$  *Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)*
  - Instigator is considered capable of bringing about  $\phi$   
 $\Leftrightarrow$  *Decisive Modality (DM)*

# Performative and descriptive modals

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- Modals: descriptive and performative is a distinction of use, not semantics. Kamp 1973; Schulz 2003  
Context decides: **descriptive context** vs. **performative context**
- Directive speech acts '*must*  $\phi$ ' occur in performative contexts:
  - Director does not take  $\phi$  for granted independently of their utterance  
⇨ *Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)*
  - Instigator is considered capable of bringing about  $\phi$   
⇨ *Decisive Modality (DM)*
  - Modal flavor is considered decisive  
⇨ *Decisive Modality (DM)*

# Performative and descriptive modals

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- Modals: descriptive and performative is a distinction of use, not semantics. Kamp 1973; Schulz 2003  
Context decides: **descriptive context** vs. **performative context**
- Directive speech acts '*must*  $\phi$ ' occur in performative contexts:
  - Director does not take  $\phi$  for granted independently of their utterance  
⇨ *Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)*
  - Instigator is considered capable of bringing about  $\phi$   
⇨ *Decisive Modality (DM)*
  - Modal flavor is considered decisive  
⇨ *Decisive Modality (DM)*
  - Director is considered an authority  
⇨ *Epistemic Authority Condition (EAC)*

# Performative and descriptive modals

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- Modals: descriptive and performative is a distinction of use, not semantics. Kamp 1973; Schulz 2003  
Context decides: **descriptive context** vs. **performative context**
- Directive speech acts '*must*  $\phi$ ' occur in performative contexts:
  - Director does not take  $\phi$  for granted independently of their utterance  
⇨ *Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)*
  - Instigator is considered capable of bringing about  $\phi$   
⇨ *Decisive Modality (DM)*
  - Modal flavor is considered decisive  
⇨ *Decisive Modality (DM)*
  - Director is considered an authority  
⇨ *Epistemic Authority Condition (EAC)*
- Imperatives contain an operator ImpOP similar to *must* that presupposes that context is performative

Simplification: quantificational force

# Modal logic for modals and directives

- Translate into standard modal logic with  $\Box$  and  $\Diamond$  indexed for epistemic and prioritizing interpretations w.r.t. a Frame  $F = \langle W, B, R \rangle$ , where:
  - $W$  set of all possible worlds
  - $B$  maps individual  $a$  to  $a$ 's belief relation  $B_a \subseteq W \times W$
  - $R$  the salient prioritizing modal flavor

# Modal logic for modals and directives

- Translate into standard modal logic with  $\Box$  and  $\Diamond$  indexed for epistemic and prioritizing interpretations w.r.t. a Frame  $F = \langle W, B, R \rangle$ , where:
  - $W$  set of all possible worlds
  - $B$  maps individual  $a$  to  $a$ 's belief relation  $B_a \subseteq W \times W$
  - $R$  the salient prioritizing modal flavor
- Derived belief relations:

# Modal logic for modals and directives

- Translate into standard modal logic with  $\Box$  and  $\Diamond$  indexed for epistemic and prioritizing interpretations w.r.t. a Frame  $F = \langle W, B, R \rangle$ , where:
  - $W$  set of all possible worlds
  - $B$  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**  $\Box^{CG}$  Stalnaker 2002  
 indexed for transitive closure of  $B_S \cup B_A$  for Speaker and Addressee

# Modal logic for modals and directives

- Translate into standard modal logic with  $\Box$  and  $\Diamond$  indexed for epistemic and prioritizing interpretations w.r.t. a Frame  $F = \langle W, B, R \rangle$ , where:
  - $W$  set of all possible worlds
  - $B$  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**  $\Box^{CG}$  Stalnaker 2002  
 indexed for transitive closure of  $B_S \cup B_A$  for Speaker and Addressee
  - **Public Belief**: Individual  $a$  is publicly committed to believing  $p$ :  
 $\Box^{PB_a} p := \Box^{CG} \Box^{B_a} p$

# Interpreting modals and directives in $F = \langle W, B, R \rangle$

- Prioritizing modals and imperatives (directives) are indexed for the salient prioritizing modal flavor  $R$

# Interpreting modals and directives in $F = \langle W, B, R \rangle$

- Prioritizing modals and imperatives (directives) are indexed for the salient prioritizing modal flavor  $R$
- Translation (when  $\phi$  translates to  $p$ ):

' $must^R \phi$ '

imperative LF:  $[\text{ImpOP}^R \phi]$

translates to  $\Box^R p$

translates to  $\Box^R p$

# Interpreting modals and directives in $F = \langle W, B, R \rangle$

- Prioritizing modals and imperatives (directives) are indexed for the salient prioritizing modal flavor  $R$
- Translation (when  $\phi$  translates to  $p$ ):

' $must^R \phi$ '

translates to  $\Box^R p$

imperative LF:  $[\text{ImpOP}^R \phi]$

translates to  $\Box^R p$

- Example:

- (34) a. You must close the door!  
 b. Close the door!

- (34a) and (34b) translate to:  $\Box^R \text{close}(\text{you}, \text{the-door})$
- (34a) and (34b) are true at  $w$  iff you close the door in all  $w'$  s.t.  $w'$  is  $R$ -accessible from  $w$ .

# Performative contexts

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- *must*  $\phi$   
is used performatively in a **performative context**, else, it can be used descriptively.

# Performative contexts

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- *must*  $\phi$   
is used performatively in a **performative context**, else, it can be used descriptively.
- Imperative 'ImpOP  $\phi$ '  
presupposes that the context is performative, thereby, the speaker is publicly committed to believing that it is.

# Performative contexts

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- *must*  $\phi$   
is used performatively in a **performative context**, else, it can be used descriptively.
- Imperative 'ImpOP  $\phi$ '  
presupposes that the context is performative, thereby, the speaker is publicly committed to believing that it is.
- Performative contexts are characterized by three conditions:

# Performative contexts

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- *must*  $\phi$   
is used performatively in a **performative context**, else, it can be used descriptively.
  - Imperative 'ImpOP  $\phi$ '  
presupposes that the context is performative, thereby, the speaker is publicly committed to believing that it is.
  - Performative contexts are characterized by three conditions:
- (EAC) **Epistemic Authority Condition**  
Director has perfect knowledge of what is necessary w.r.t. salient prioritizing modal flavor  $R$ .

# Performative contexts

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- *must*  $\phi$   
is used performatively in a **performative context**, else, it can be used descriptively.
- Imperative 'ImpOP  $\phi$ '  
presupposes that the context is performative, thereby, the speaker is publicly committed to believing that it is.
- Performative contexts are characterized by three conditions:
  - (EAC) **Epistemic Authority Condition**  
Director has perfect knowledge of what is necessary w.r.t. salient prioritizing modal flavor  $R$ .
  - (EUC) **Epistemic Uncertainty Condition**  
(If not for the directive utterance), Director holds possible  $\phi$  and  $\neg\phi$ .

# Performative contexts

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- *must*  $\phi$   
is used performatively in a **performative context**, else, it can be used descriptively.
- Imperative 'ImpOP  $\phi$ '  
presupposes that the context is performative, thereby, the speaker is publicly committed to believing that it is.
- Performative contexts are characterized by three conditions:
  - (EAC) **Epistemic Authority Condition**  
Director has perfect knowledge of what is necessary w.r.t. salient prioritizing modal flavor  $R$ .
  - (EUC) **Epistemic Uncertainty Condition**  
(If not for the directive utterance), Director holds possible  $\phi$  and  $\neg\phi$ .
  - (DM) **Decisive Modality** (*to be unpacked*)

# Performative contexts

Kaufmann [2006]/2012, 2016

- *must*  $\phi$   
is used performatively in a **performative context**, else, it can be used descriptively.
- Imperative 'ImpOP  $\phi$ '  
presupposes that the context is performative, thereby, the speaker is publicly committed to believing that it is.
- Performative contexts are characterized by three conditions:

(EAC) **Epistemic Authority Condition**

Director has perfect knowledge of what is necessary w.r.t. salient prioritizing modal flavor  $R$ .

(EUC) **Epistemic Uncertainty Condition**

(If not for the directive utterance), Director holds possible  $\phi$  and  $\neg\phi$ .

(DM) **Decisive Modality** (*to be unpacked*)

- ↔ Speakers using directives become publicly committed to believing that EAC, EUC, and DM are mutual joint belief.

# Decisive Modality (DM)

- Given context set  $CS$  (the set of worlds compatible with mutual joint belief) and a salient partition  $\Delta$  on  $CS$ , the salient modal flavor  $R$  is **decisive** iff it constitutes the contextually agreed upon criteria to choose the preferred cell.

# Decisive Modality (DM)

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

# Decisive Modality (DM)

- Given context set  $CS$  (the set of worlds compatible with mutual joint belief) and a salient partition  $\Delta$  on  $CS$ , the salient modal flavor  $R$  is **decisive** iff it constitutes the contextually agreed upon criteria to choose the preferred cell.
- $\Delta$  is a decision problem for an agent  $\alpha$  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 and Kaufmann 2012

- $R$  being the **decisive modality** implies:
  - If  $\Box^R q$ , no participant effectively prefers  $\neg q$ .
  - If  $\Delta$  is a decision problem for  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha$  tries to find out if  $\Box^R q$  for any  $q \in \Delta$ .
  - If  $\alpha$  learns that  $\Box^R q$  for  $q \in \Delta$ ,  $\alpha$  tries to realize  $q$ .

# Generalized obviation as a clash in discourse commitments

Any performative context meets **Director's Anticipation**:

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

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

Appendix/Kaufmann 2020 for proof.

# Generalized obviation as a clash in discourse commitments

Any performative context meets **Director's Anticipation**:

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

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

Appendix/Kaufmann 2020 for proof.

Roughly:

- Modal flavor  $R$  is decisive: if  $\alpha$  believes  $p$  is necessary according to  $R$ ,  $\alpha$  will try to realize
- Presumed control:  $\alpha$  can realize  $p$

# Generalized obviation as a clash in discourse commitments

Any performative context meets **Director's Anticipation**:

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

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

Appendix/Kaufmann 2020 for proof.

Roughly:

- Modal flavor  $R$  is decisive: if  $\alpha$  believes  $p$  is necessary according to  $R$ ,  $\alpha$  will try to realize
- Presumed control:  $\alpha$  can realize  $p$
- If **Director = Instigator**: clashes with Epistemic Uncertainty and/or Epistemic Authority (**obviation**).

# Generalized obviation: matrix case, commitment

No first person directives:

(35) \*'I should...!'

# Generalized obviation: matrix case, commitment

No first person directives:

(35) \*'I should...!'

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Speaker

# Generalized obviation: matrix case, commitment

No first person directives:

(35) \*'I should...!'

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Speaker
- Speaker publicly commits to  $\Box^R p$

# Generalized obviation: matrix case, commitment

No first person directives:

(35) \*'I should...!'

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Speaker
- Speaker publicly commits to  $\Box^R p$
- By Director's Anticipation, Speaker is committed to believing that  $p$  will come about

# Generalized obviation: matrix case, commitment

No first person directives:

(35) \*'I should...!'

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Speaker
- Speaker publicly commits to  $\Box^R p$
- By Director's Anticipation, Speaker is committed to believing that  $p$  will come about
- But then, Epistemic Uncertainty Condition fails

# Generalized obviation: matrix case, commitment

No first person directives:

(35) \*'I should...!'

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Speaker
- Speaker publicly commits to  $\Box^R p$
- By Director's Anticipation, Speaker is committed to believing that  $p$  will come about
- But then, Epistemic Uncertainty Condition fails

!Inconsistent presuppositions  $\Rightarrow$  speaker incurs conflicting discourse requirements

# Generalized obviation: embedded case

Classical subject obviation:

- (36)
- a. \*I said that I should...
  - b. \*You said that you should/V.IMP.2p ...
  - c. (S)he<sub>i</sub> said that (s)he<sub>j,\*i</sub> should...

# Generalized obviation: embedded case

Classical subject obviation:

- (36) a. \*I said that I should...  
 b. \*You said that you should/V.IMP.2p ...  
 c. (S)he<sub>i</sub> said that (s)he<sub>j,\*i</sub> should...

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Matrix subject

# Generalized obviation: embedded case

Classical subject obviation:

- (36) a. \*I said that I should. . .  
 b. \*You said that you should/V.IMP.2p . . .  
 c. (S)he<sub>i</sub> said that (s)he<sub>j,\*i</sub> should. . .

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Matrix subject
- Presuppositions as in matrix case should be anchored to the speech event described by the matrix predicate van der Sandt 1992

# Generalized obviation: embedded case

Classical subject obviation:

- (36) a. \*I said that I should. . .  
 b. \*You said that you should/V.IMP.2p . . .  
 c. (S)he<sub>i</sub> said that (s)he<sub>j,\*i</sub> should. . .

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Matrix subject
- Presuppositions as in matrix case should be anchored to the speech event described by the matrix predicate van der Sandt 1992
- ⚡ Inconsistent presuppositions cannot be resolved

# Matrix case: questions

No directives in information seeking interrogatives:

(37) 'Should you...?'/ 'Do...?'

# Matrix case: questions

No directives in information seeking interrogatives:

(37) 'Should you...?'/ 'Do...?'

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Addressee

# Matrix case: questions

No directives in information seeking interrogatives:

(37) 'Should you...?'/ 'Do...?'

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Addressee
- Information seeking speaker commits to more than one semantic answer being true

# Matrix case: questions

No directives in information seeking interrogatives:

(37) 'Should you...?'/ 'Do...?'

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Addressee
- Information seeking speaker commits to more than one semantic answer being true
- Whichever answer is true, Addressee-Director knows (EAC) and will hence assume that it will come true (Director's Anticipation)

# Matrix case: questions

No directives in information seeking interrogatives:

(37) 'Should you...?'/ 'Do...?'

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Addressee
- Information seeking speaker commits to more than one semantic answer being true
- Whichever answer is true, Addressee-Director knows (EAC) and will hence assume that it will come true (Director's Anticipation)
- Addressee-Director fails Epistemic Uncertainty

# Matrix case: questions

No directives in information seeking interrogatives:

(37) 'Should you...?'/ 'Do...?'

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Addressee
- Information seeking speaker commits to more than one semantic answer being true
- Whichever answer is true, Addressee-Director knows (EAC) and will hence assume that it will come true (Director's Anticipation)
- Addressee-Director fails Epistemic Uncertainty
- ⚡ Speaker is committed to inconsistent assumptions about the discourse

# Alleviating generalized obviation

- No presumed control for subject:  
Grammatical subject (= Director)  $\neq$  Instigator  
No Director's Anticipation!

# Alleviating generalized obviation

- No presumed control for subject:  
Grammatical subject (= Director)  $\neq$  Instigator  
No Director's Anticipation!
- Tampering with perspective setting (questions):

# Alleviating generalized obviation

- No presumed control for subject:  
Grammatical subject (= Director)  $\neq$  Instigator  
No Director's Anticipation!
- Tampering with perspective setting (questions):
  - Rising intonation: *Help him (maybe)?*  
Director = Speaker+Addressee (Distributed Knowledge)

# Alleviating generalized obviation

- No presumed control for subject:  
Grammatical subject (= Director)  $\neq$  Instigator  
No Director's Anticipation!
  - Tampering with perspective setting (questions):
    - Rising intonation: *Help him (maybe)?*  
Director = Speaker+Addressee (Distributed Knowledge)
    - Scope Marking ( $\approx$  embedding, Director=Thinker)
- (38) Schema: *What does **your mother** think? What buy.2pIMP?*

# Alleviating generalized obviation

- No presumed control for subject:  
Grammatical subject (= Director)  $\neq$  Instigator  
No Director's Anticipation!
- Tampering with perspective setting (questions):
  - Rising intonation: *Help him (maybe)?*  
Director = Speaker+Addressee (Distributed Knowledge)
  - Scope Marking ( $\approx$  embedding, Director=Thinker)

(38) Schema: *What does **your mother** think? What buy.2pIMP?*

  - Rhetorical questions:  
By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Speaker

# Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Generalized obviation
- 3 Generalized obviation as a semantic conflict
- 4 Further implications**
  - Directive and desiderative subjunctives
  - Promising

# Back to classical subject obviation

Subjunctive and imperative inflection signals presence of licensing  
 clause-mate perspective dependent **modal operator**.

Oikonomou 2016

# Back to classical subject obviation

Subjunctive and imperative inflection signals presence of licensing  
 clause-mate perspective dependent **modal operator**.

Oikonomou 2016

Here: **ImpOP**

[ **SUBJ<sub>i</sub>** {want, hope, insist,... } [ **PerspOP** **ImpOP**[**SUBJ<sub>j</sub>**, \**i* ... **VERB***Subjunctive*...]]]

# Back to classical subject obviation

Subjunctive and imperative inflection signals presence of licensing  
 clause-mate perspective dependent **modal operator**.

Oikonomou 2016

Here: **ImpOP**

[ **SUBJ<sub>i</sub>** {want, hope, insist,... } [ **PerspOP** **ImpOP**[**SUBJ<sub>j</sub>**, \**i* ... VERB *Subjunctive*...]]]

- Modal meaning in obviative subjunctives has to be harmonic w.r.t.  
 matrix predicate Kratzer 2006; Moltmann 2008; Stegovec 2019

(39) Sie **verlangte**, dass alle      das Buch lesen    **sollten**.  
 she requested, that everyone the book read.INF should  
 'She requested that they (should) all read the book.'

# Back to classical subject obviation

Subjunctive and imperative inflection signals presence of licensing clause-mate perspective dependent **modal operator**.

Oikonomou 2016

Here: **ImpOP**

[ **SUBJ<sub>i</sub>** {want, hope, insist,... } [ **PerspOP** **ImpOP**[**SUBJ<sub>j</sub>**,\*<sub>i</sub> ... **VERB***Subjunctive*...]]]

- Modal meaning in obviative subjunctives has to be harmonic w.r.t. matrix predicate Kratzer 2006; Moltmann 2008; Stegovec 2019

(39) Sie **verlangte**, dass alle das Buch lesen **sollten**.  
 she requested, that everyone the book read.INF should  
 'She requested that they (should) all read the book.'

Content of request: *that they read the book*, not: *that they are under an obligation to read the book*

# An issue with desiderative predicates?

[ SUBJ<sub>*j*</sub> {want, hope, insist,... } [ PerspOPImpOP[SUBJ<sub>*j,\*i*</sub> ... VERB<sub>Subjunctive...</sub>]]]

- So far: focus on directive predicates.

# An issue with desiderative predicates?

[ SUBJ<sub>*i*</sub> {want, hope, insist,... } [ PerspOPImpOP[SUBJ<sub>*j,\*i*</sub> ... VERB<sub>Subjunctive...</sub>]]]

- So far: focus on directive predicates.
- Extends to **desiderative predicates** ('want') if they express **effective preferences** (realistic, basis for action) Condoravdi and Lauer 2012

# An issue with desiderative predicates?

[ SUBJ<sub>i</sub> {want, hope, insist,... } [ PerspOPImpOP[SUBJ<sub>j</sub>,\*<sub>i</sub> ... VERB<sub>Subjunctive</sub>...]]]

- So far: focus on directive predicates.
- Extends to **desiderative predicates** ('want') if they express **effective preferences** (realistic, basis for action) Condoravdi and Lauer 2012
- ✓ Weaker desire for course of events not under control is non-obviative Kempchinsky 2009 after Ruwet

- (40)
- \*Je **veux** que je parte.  
'I want that I leave.SUBJ.'
  - Je **voudrais** bien que je puisse enfin être autorisé à partir.  
'I would certainly want that I should(SUBJ) finally be authorized to leave.'

# An issue with desiderative predicates?

[ SUBJ<sub>i</sub> {want, hope, insist,... } [ PerspOPImpOP[SUBJ<sub>j</sub>,\*<sub>i</sub> ... VERB<sub>Subjunctive</sub>...]]]

- So far: focus on directive predicates.
- Extends to **desiderative predicates** ('want') if they express **effective preferences** (realistic, basis for action) Condoravdi and Lauer 2012
- ✓ Weaker desire for course of events not under control is non-obviative Kempchinsky 2009 after Ruwet

- (40) a. \*Je **veux** que je parte.  
'I want that I leave.SUBJ.'
- b. Je **voudrais** bien que je puisse enfin être autorisé à partir.  
'I would certainly want that I should(SUBJ) finally be authorized to leave.'

- ⊗ Many? languages that embed canonical 2p imperatives (like Slovenian) don't embed them under 'want'-predicates  
(e.g. Slovenian, German, English; exception: Turkish; Oikonomou 2016)

# An issue with desiderative predicates?

[ SUBJ<sub>i</sub> {want, hope, insist,... } [ PerspOPImpOP[SUBJ<sub>j</sub>,\*<sub>i</sub> ... VERB<sub>Subjunctive</sub>...]]]

- So far: focus on directive predicates.
- Extends to **desiderative predicates** ('want') if they express **effective preferences** (realistic, basis for action) Condoravdi and Lauer 2012
- ✓ Weaker desire for course of events not under control is non-obviative Kempchinsky 2009 after Ruwet

- (40) a. \*Je **veux** que je parte.  
'I want that I leave.SUBJ.'
- b. Je **voudrais** bien que je puisse enfin être autorisé à partir.  
'I would certainly want that I should(SUBJ) finally be authorized to leave.'

- ⊗ Many<sup>?</sup> languages that embed canonical 2p imperatives (like Slovenian) don't embed them under 'want'-predicates  
(e.g. Slovenian, German, English; exception: Turkish; Oikonomou 2016)

- ImpOP may not be only operator licensing obviating subjunctives

# Promising speculations

Promising involves identity between Director and Instigator and is an outlier in mood-marking:

- Korean: special [promissive clause type](#) Pak et al. 2008  
 Cross-linguistically extremely rare, antiquated in Korean (Jungmin Kang, Jayeon Park, p.c)

# Promising speculations

Promising involves identity between Director and Instigator and is an outlier in mood-marking:

- Korean: special [promissive clause type](#) Pak et al. 2008  
 Cross-linguistically extremely rare, antiquated in Korean (Jungmin Kang, Jayeon Park, p.c)  
Suggestion: no need to signal non-descriptivity for one's own actions  
 (no gap, committing to the truth of what's under one's control works with declaratives)

# Promising speculations

Promising involves identity between Director and Instigator and is an outlier in mood-marking:

- Korean: special **promissive clause type** Pak et al. 2008  
 Cross-linguistically extremely rare, antiquated in Korean (Jungmin Kang, Jayeon Park, p.c)  
Suggestion: no need to signal non-descriptivity for one's own actions  
 (no gap, committing to the truth of what's under one's control works with declaratives)
- 'promise'-verbs should select subjunctive; stubbornly: indicative, problematic for theories of mood selection Zanuttini et al. 2012

# Promising speculations

Promising involves identity between Director and Instigator and is an outlier in mood-marking:

- Korean: special **promissive clause type** Pak et al. 2008  
 Cross-linguistically extremely rare, antiquated in Korean (Jungmin Kang, Jayeon Park, p.c)  
Suggestion: no need to signal non-descriptivity for one's own actions  
 (no gap, committing to the truth of what's under one's control works with declaratives)
- 'promise'-verbs should select subjunctive; stubbornly: indicative, problematic for theories of mood selection Zanuttini et al. 2012  
Explanation: embedded directive (or desiderative) subjunctives signal gap between epistemic authority and control of events

# Conclusions

- Classical subject obviation is an instance of generalized obviation

# Conclusions

- Classical subject obviation is an instance of generalized obviation
- Subjunctives are licensed by a modal operator that presupposes a gap between director and instigator (knowledge and action)

# Conclusions

- Classical subject obviation is an instance of generalized obviation
- Subjunctives are licensed by a modal operator that presupposes a gap between director and instigator (knowledge and action)
- ...

# Conclusions

- Classical subject obviation is an instance of generalized obviation
- Subjunctives are licensed by a modal operator that presupposes a gap between director and instigator (knowledge and action)
- ...

**\*Thanks for zooming in!\***

# References I

- Denis Bouchard. The avoid pronoun principle and the elsewhere principle. In *NELS 13*, pages 29–36. University of Massachusetts, GLSA, Amherst, 1983.
- Gennaro Chierchia. Anaphora and attitudes de se. In B van Bartsch and E van Boas, editors, *Language and Context*. Foris, Dordrecht, 1987.
- 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.
- Luka Crnić and Tue Trinh. Embedding imperatives in English. In Arndt Riester and Torgrim Solstad, editors, *Sinn und Bedeutung 13*, pages 113–127. University of Stuttgart, 2009.
- Veneeta Dayal. Scope marking as indirect wh dependency. *Natural Language Semantics*, 2(2):137–170, 1994.
- 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 II

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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. Who controls who (or what)? *Proceedings of SALT*, 29: 636–664, 2020.
- Magdalena Kaufmann and Stefan Kaufmann. Epistemic particles and performativity. In *SALT 22*, pages 208–225. 2012.
- Magdalena Kaufmann and Claudia Poschmann. Embedded imperatives - empirical evidence from colloquial German. *Language*, 89(3):619–637, 2013.

## References III

- 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.
- Angelika Kratzer. Decomposing attitude verbs. Honoring Anita Mittwoch on her 80 th birthday at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem July 4, 2006, 2006.
- Susumu Kuno. *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse, and Empathy*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1987.
- Ofra Magidor. The myth of the de se. *Philosophical Perspectives*, pages 249–283, 2015.
- Eric McCready. Context shifting in questions and elsewhere. In Estela Puig-Waldmüller, editor, *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 11*, pages 433–447. Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, 2007.
- Friederike Moltmann. Intensional verbs and their intentional objects. *Natural Language Semantics*, 16:239–270, 2008.
- 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.
- Hazel Pearson. *The Sense of Self: Topics in the Semantics of De Se Expressions*. PhD thesis, Harvard University, 2013.

# References IV

- Hazel Pearson and Tom Roeper. Three puzzles about de se. In Rajesh Bhatt, Ilaria Frana, and Paula Menendez-Benito, editors, *Making Worlds Accessible*. t.a.
- M. Carme Picallo. *Opaque Domains*. PhD thesis, CUNY, 1985.
- Paul Portner. Commitments to priorities. In Daniel Harris, Matt Moss, and Daniel Fogal, editors, *New Work in Speech Acts*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Quer. *Mood at the Interface*. PhD thesis, UiL OTS/Universiteit Utrecht, 1998.
- Deniz Rudin. *Rising Above Commitment*. PhD thesis, University of California Santa Cruz, CA, 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'infinifit en français. *Cahiers de grammaire*, 7:75138, 1984.
- Philippe Schlenker. The lazy Frenchmans approach to the subjunctive. In Twan Geerts, Ivo van Ginneken, and Haike Jacobs, editors, *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2003: Selected papers from 'Going Romance' 2003, Nijmegen, 2022 November*, page 269310. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 2005.
- 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. *Interpreting Imperatives*. PhD thesis, University of Frankfurt, 2006.
- John R. Searle. A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1):1–23, 1976.

# References V

- 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.
- 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.
- Adrian Stegovec. Perspectival control and obviation in directive clauses. *Natural Language Semantics*, 27(1):47–94, 2019.
- Anna Szabolcsi. Infinitives vs. subjunctives: What do we learn from obviation and from exemptions from obviation. Ms. NYU, 2010.
- Carol Tenny and Peggy Speas. The interaction of clausal syntax, discourse roles, and information structure in questions. Presented at Workshop on Syntax and Pragmatics of Questions, 16th European Summer School in Logic, Language and Information; Handout available from [www.linguist.org](http://www.linguist.org), 2004.
- Rob van der Sandt. Presupposition projection as anaphora resolution. *Journal of Semantics*, 9:333–377, 1992.
- Stephen Wechsler. In Simeon Floyd, Elisabeth Norcliffe, and Lila San Roque, editors, *Egophoricity*, Typological Studies in Language 118, page 473494. 2018.

# References VI

- Rafaela Zanuttini. *Negation and Clausal Structure*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997.
- 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 Olivier Bonami and Patricia 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.

# Director's Anticipation

- (41) **Director's Anticipation:** If director  $d$  is publicly committed to believing that instigator  $a$  believes that  $p \in \Delta$  is  $R$ -necessary, then  $d$  is publicly committed to believing that  $p$  will come true:
- $$\Box^{PB_d} \Box^{B_a} \Box^R p \rightarrow \Box^{PB_d} p$$
- (42)
- a.  $\Box^{PB_d} \Box^{B_a} \Box^R p$  Assumption
  - b.  $\Box^{PB_d} (\Box^{B_a} \Box^R p \rightarrow \text{try}(a, p))$  Decisive Modality
  - c.  $\Box^{PB_d} \Box^{B_a} \Box^R p \rightarrow \Box^{PB_d} \text{try}(a, p)$  K
  - d.  $\Box^{PB_d} \text{try}(a, p)$  1, 3, MP
  - e.  $\Box^{PB_d} p$  presumed control (decision problem)

# Conflict: Commitment Case

- (43)
- |    |   |                                  |
|----|---|----------------------------------|
| a. | $\Box^{PB_d} \Box^R p$  | Committing utterance by <i>d</i> |
| b. | $\Box^{PB_d} \Box^{B_d} \Box^R p$                               | Def. of <i>PB</i>                |
| c. | $\Box^{PB_d} p$   | b, Director's Anticipation       |
| d. | $\Box^{PB_d} (\Diamond^{PB_d} p \wedge \Diamond^{PB_d} \neg p)$ | EUC                              |
| e. | $\neg \Box^{PB_d} p$  | d, System K                      |
| f. | $\Box^{PB_d} p \wedge \neg \Box^{PB_d} p$                       | c,e: ✗                           |

# Conflict: Information Seeking Question

- (44)
- a.  $\{\Box^R p, \Box^R \neg p\}$  Semantic answers
  - b.  $\Box^{PB_S}(\Box^R p \vee \Box^R \neg p)$  Interrogative commitment
  - c.  $\Box^{PB_S}(\Box^R p \leftrightarrow \Box^{B_A} \Box^R p) \wedge \Box^{PB_S}(\Diamond^{B_A} p \wedge \Diamond^{B_A} \neg p)$  EAC, EUC
  - d.  $\Box^{PB_S}((\Box^R p \wedge \Box^{B_A} \Box^R p \wedge \Diamond^{B_A} \neg p) \vee (\Box^R \neg p \wedge \Box^{B_A} \Box^R \neg p \wedge \Diamond^{B_A} p))$
- b,c; EAC

# Subjects of morphosyntactic canonical imperatives

English subjects in morphosyntactic canonical imperatives:

- (45)
- 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 1989, Zanuttini, Pak, Portner 2012

- (46)
- a. Maître'd, someone seat the guests.
  - b. #Maître'd, one of your underlings seat the guests.
- (47) Rain! Don't rain!

# Subjects of morphosyntactic canonical imperatives

English subjects in morphosyntactic canonical imperatives:

- (45)
- 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 1989, Zanuttini, Pak, Portner 2012

- (46)
- a. Maître'd, someone seat the guests.
  - b. #Maître'd, one of your underlings seat the guests.

(47) Rain! Don't rain!

(48) English 2p imperative subjects: Kaufmann 2012

When construed as a quantifier, if there is 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 1989, 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).

# 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  $p$ .

# 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  $p$ .

# 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.

# 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!

# 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.)

# Addressees of 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 IMP.2Sg.

- 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: B has to be utterance addressee (Kaufmann & Poschmann 2011)

# Compare conjunct-disjunct

Different perspectival phenomena have been associated with:

- Seat of knowledge
- Responsibility
- Internal perspective

- (50) a. I imagined driving around town in this car.  
 b. I imagined myself driving around town in this car.

Note: dream-self vs. doxastic alternative:

- (51) I dreamed I was Brigitte Bardot and I kissed myself. Lakoff; Pearson 2018

Zu (2015) proposes an implicational hierarchy of what aspects are involved in a particular phenomenon, encoded by movement in syntactic structure: Newari-conjunct marking appears only if all three are met. Control/non-control in imperatives cannot be done in this way—seat of knowledge vs. control are disjoint either way (*pace* Speas & Tenny 2004, who assume that imperatives have the Addressee as the Seat of Knowledge—at odds with the obviation data).

# Object control

Kempchinsky 2009: Spanish object control freely alternates between control and subjunctive (issue for blocking, issue for domain extension) (her 10a-d):

- (52) a. Su padre le ordenó a Ana dejar de hablar del asunto.  
'Her father ordered Ana to stop talking about the matter.'
- b. Su padre le ordenó a Ana que dejara de hablar del asunto.  
'Her father ordered Ana that she stop(SUBJ) talking about the matter.'
- (53) a. Ana se ordenó (a sí misma) dejar de pensar en el asunto.  
'Ana ordered herself to stop thinking about the matter.'
- b. \*Ana se ordenó (a sí misma) que dejara de pensar en el asunto.  
'Ana ordered herself that she stop(SUBJ) thinking about the matter.'

But compare Farkas 1992: obviative overt pronouns remain obviative in Serbo-Croatian (her 20a,b):

- (54) a. Ana je naterala Mariju<sub>i</sub> da e<sub>i</sub>/<sub>\*k</sub> dodje.  
Ana forced M. that (she) come

# Hungarian extraposition and focus, Farkas 1992

- (55) Ha az-t akarod, hogy velünk gyere, viselked-j szépen.  
 if that-ACC want that us-with come.SUBJ, behave.SUBJ well  
 'If you want to come with us, behave well. ' her (17)

*azt* construction is impossible with infinitive complements:

- (56) \*János<sub>i</sub> az-t akarja velünk jön-ni.  
 János that-ACC wants with us come-INF

Fn 6: mere presence of *az* is insufficient:

- (57) János<sub>i</sub> az-t akarja, hogy e<sub>j</sub> jöjjön velünk. 'If you want  
 János that-ACC wants that (he<sub>j</sub>) us-with come.SUBJ  
 to come with us, behave well. '

Ok also if complement subject is focused (her (19), *that HE come, and not László*)