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Classical subject obviation

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

\[
\text{[ } \text{SUBJECT}_i \{ \text{want, hope, insist,} \ldots \} \text{ [ } \text{SUBJECT}_j, ^* \ldots \text{VERB}_\text{Subjunctive} \ldots \text{ ]} \text{ ]}
\]
Classical subject obviation

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

\[ \text{SUBJECT}_i \{\text{want, hope, insist, . . .}\} \[ \text{SUBJECT}_j, \ast_i \ldots \text{VERB}_{\text{Subjunctive}} \ldots \] \]

(1)  

a. *Je veux que je parte.
   I want that I leave.\text{SUBJ}
   int.: ‘I want to leave.’

b. Pierre_\ast_i \text{ veut qu’il, } \ast_i, j \text{ partie.}
P. wants that he \_ leave.\text{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,…):

\[
[ \text{\textsc{subject}}_i \ \{\text{want, hope, insist,} \ldots \} \ [ \text{\textsc{subject}}_j, \star_i \ \ldots \ \text{\textsc{verb}}_\text{subjunctive} \ldots ]]
\]

(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, ...):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Subject}_i \{\text{want, hope, insist, ...}\} \ [ \text{Subject}_j,^*\text{i} \ \ldots \text{Verb}_{\text{Subjunctive}} \ldots \ ]
\end{array}
\]

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, ...):

\[
\left[ \text{SUBJECT}_i \{\text{want, hope, insist,} \ldots \} \right] \left[ \text{SUBJECT}_j, \ast_i \ldots \text{VERB}_{\text{Subjunctive}} \ldots \right]
\]

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, ...):

\[
[ \text{Subject}_i \{\text{want, hope, insist,}...\} \ [ \text{Subject}_j, \ast_i \ ... \text{Verb}_{\text{Subjunctive}} ... ]]\]

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)


(5) a. Pierre_i veux [ que il_i/#_i partie ]
Pierre wants [ that he leave.SUBJ ]

b. Pierre veux [ PRO partir ]
Pierre wants [ PRO leave.INF ]
Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction)


(5)  
a. Pierre\textsubscript{i} veut \[ que il*/#i \text{parte} \]
     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)


(5)  

a.  
Pierre veux [ que il∗/#i parti ]  
Pierre wants [ that he leave.SUBJ ]

b.  
Pierre veux [ 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. – $\times$(5b)  

(Scen2) Pierre: ‘I want to leave!’ – $\checkmark$(5b)
Existing accounts for subject obviation 1: Competition

Blocking by competitor (typically, control construction)

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

(5)  a. Pierre\textsubscript{i} veux \[ que \textsc{il}*/\#_i \text{parte} \]

Pierre wants [ that he leave.SUBJ ]

b. Pierre veux \[ PRO partir \]

Pierre wants [ PRO leave.INF ]

• Semantic version: competitor carries additional meaning
  – Control construction expresses \textit{de se}-attitude

    Chierchia 1987; Schlenker 2005

(Scen1) Pierre sees his campaign add, fails to recognize himself and
thinks the guy featured should leave. – \textbf{X}(5b) \textit{de re}

(Scen2) Pierre: ‘I want to leave!’ – \textbf{✓}(5b) \textit{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\textsubscript{i} veut que il\textsubscript{i} 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):


(5)  

a. Pierre\textsubscript{i} veux que il\textsubscript{i} parte.  
Pierre wants that he leave.SUBJ  
b. Pierre veux [ PRO partir ]  
Pierre wants [PRO to leave]

✓ Ban alleviated when competitor isn’t suitable (i.e., lack of \textit{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_{i} veut que il_{i} 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):


(5)  

a. Pierre\textsubscript{i} veux que il\textsubscript{i} parte.
Pierre wants that he leave.SU

b. Pierre veux [PRO partir ]
Pierre wants [PRO to leave]

✓ Ban alleviated when competitor isn’t suitable (i.e., lack of \textit{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 veux que il parti.
Pierre wants that he leave.SUBJ

b. Pierre veux [ 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 veux que il parte.  
      Pierre wants that he leave. 
   
   b. Pierre veux [ 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) \[
  \text{[SUBJECT}_i\text{ want/hope/insist/... [SUBJECT}_j,^*i ... \text{ VERB}}_{\text{Subj}} ... ]
  \]
Existing accounts for subject obviation 2: Anti-Locality

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

  (6) \[
  \text{[SUBJECT}_i\text{ want/hope/insist/... [SUBJECT}_j,*i \text{ ... VERB}_{\text{Subj}} \text{ ... ]}}
  \]

- Variant: perspectival operator interacts with subjunctive subject
  Stegovec 2019

  (7) \[
  \text{[SUBJECT}_i\text{ want/hope/insist/... [PERSPOP}_i...\text{SUBJECT}_j,*i ... \text{VERB}_{\text{Subj}}...]}\]
Existing accounts for subject obviation 2: Anti-Locality

- Binding domain of lower subject extends to include the higher subject:
  

  (6) \[
  \text{SUBJECT}_i \text{ want/hope/insist/... [ SUBJECT}_j,^{*}i \text{ ... VERB}_{Subj} \text{ ... ]}
  \]

- Variant: perspectival operator interacts with subjunctive subject
  
  Stegovec 2019

  (7) \[
  \text{SUBJECT}_i \text{ want/hope/insist/... [ PERSPOP}_i \text{...SUBJECT}_j,^{*}i \text{...VERB}_{Subj} \text{...]}
  \]

  ✔ 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)  [ \text{SUBJECT}_i \text{want/hope/insist/…} \ [ \text{SUBJECT}_j,^*i \ … \ \text{VERB}_{\text{Subj}} \ … \ ] ]

• Variant: perspectival operator interacts with subjunctive subject
  Stegovec 2019

  (7)  [ \text{SUBJECT}_i \text{want/hope/insist/…} \ [ \text{PERSPOP}_i…\text{SUBJECT}_j,^*i…\text{VERB}_{\text{Subj}}…] ]

✓ Independent of a suitable competitor

⚠ Devil in syntactic details
  (matrix direct objects, object clitics in embedded clause,…)

Kempchinsky 2009
Existing accounts for subject obviation 2: Anti-Locality

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

  \[(6) \quad [\text{\textsc{subject}}_i \text{want/hope/insist} / \ldots \quad [\text{\textsc{subject}}_j \ast_i \ldots \quad \text{\textsc{verb}}_{\text{subj}} \ldots \quad ]]\]

- Variant: perspectival operator interacts with subjunctive subject
  Stegovec 2019

  \[(7) \quad [\text{\textsc{subject}}_i \text{want/hope/insist} / \ldots \quad [\text{\textsc{perspop}}_i \ldots \text{\textsc{subject}}_j \ast_i \ldots \text{\textsc{verb}}_{\text{subj}} \ldots ]]\]

- 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:

\[
(6) \quad [\text{Subject}_i \text{ want/hope/insist/... } [\text{Subject}_j, *i ... \text{Verb}_{\text{Subj}} ... ]]\]

- Variant: perspectival operator interacts with subjunctive subject
  Stegovec 2019

\[
(7) \quad [\text{Subject}_i \text{ want/hope/insist/... } [\text{PerspOP}_i ... \text{Subject}_j, *i ... \text{Verb}_{\text{Subj}} ... ]]\]

✔ 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!
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
Responsibility (‘control’) relates to imperatives

Farkas 1988; Quer 1998; Kempchinsky 2009

(8) Lies dieses Buch!
‘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
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’
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

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.’

\[ \text{[CP [ForceP Force}_{\nu W}] [\text{FinP [Fin Op]} [\text{IP (DP) [MoodP [V+T+M}_W] [TP … ]}]]) \]

selection (identification) checking (Agree)
Existing accounts for subj. obviation 3: Anti-Logophoricity

✓ Semantic intuitions are spot on.
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✓ 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).
@testable: 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

  Stegovec 2019 for Slovenian
My proposal in a nutshell


- 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

  
  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.
• Directives express that an optimal action is selected by a \textit{director} for someone else, the \textit{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:

  \[
  [\text{PerspPOP} [\text{ImpOP} [\text{Subject} \ldots \text{Verb}_{\text{Subj/Imp}} ]]]
  \]

  a. typically: **Subject** = Instigator
  b. **ImpOP**: necessity modal + presuppositions; licenses directive subjunctive/imperative morphology
  c. **PerspPOP** = Director;
     set grammatically to discourse participant or matrix subject (independently motivated mechanism)
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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 said (to you) that you should help him.’
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)
    ‘He i said (to you) that you should help him i, k.’

    % German
    Hans has said call.IMP his father up
    ‘Hans i said that you should call his i, l 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 said (to you) that you should help him.’

(11) Hans hat gesagt ruf seinen Vater an. %German
    Hans has said call.IMP his father up Schwager 2006
    ‘Hans said that you should call his father.’

(12) John said call his 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)
     ‘Hei said (to you) that you should help himi,k.’

(11) Hans hat gesagt ruf seinen Vater an. %German
     Hans has said call.IMP his father up
     ‘Hansj said that you should call hisi,l father.’

(12) Johni said call hisi,k 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**  
  
  (13) Leggi!  –  Non {leggere, *leggi}.  
  read.IMP2 – not read.INF, read.IMP2  
  ‘Read!’ – ‘Don’t read!’

Zanuttini 1997; Zeiljstra 2006; Isac 2015

Italian
Surrogate imperatives filling the paradigm

**Type I surrogates** fill gaps in imperative/directive paradigms:

- **Negative imperatives**  
  Zanuttini 1997; Zeilstra 2006; Isac 2015

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

- **Regulating course of events described with non-2p subject**  

  (14) Naj pomaga!  
       SBJV help.3  
       ‘(S)he should help!’

  (15) Tebulwa: sa:ph rahe!  
       table-NOM clean-NOM be-IMP3Sg  
       ‘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

Fill morphological gaps in directive paradigm (dual omitted):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(Excl)</td>
<td>naj pomaga-m</td>
<td>naj pomaga-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I should help</td>
<td>we.EXCL should help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>pomaga-j-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(we.INCL) let’s help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pomaga-j</td>
<td>pomaga-j-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(you.SG) help!</td>
<td>(you.PL) help!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>naj pomaga</td>
<td>naj pomag-jo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(s)he should help</td>
<td>they should help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Slovenian *naj*-subjunctives

Fill morphological gaps in directive paradigm (dual omitted):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(Excl)</td>
<td><em>naj pomaga-m</em>&lt;br&gt;I should help</td>
<td><em>naj pomaga-mo</em>&lt;br&gt;we.EXCL should help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td><em>pomaga-j-mo</em>&lt;br&gt;(we.INCL) let’s help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>pomaga-j</em>&lt;br&gt;(you.SG) help!</td>
<td><em>pomaga-j-te</em>&lt;br&gt;(you.PL) help!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>naj pomaga</em>&lt;br&gt;(s)he should help</td>
<td><em>naj pomag-jo</em>&lt;br&gt;they should help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding: Availability of forms is constrained

- **matrix clause:** by discourse function (committing/asking)
- **embedded:** by subject obviation
Slovenian generalized obviation: matrix case

Commitment: ‘x should...!’

(18) Anyone but first person exclusive

a. *Naj pomagam! – *Naj pomagamo!
   SBJV help.1 – SBJV help.1Pl

b. Pomagaj! – Pomagajte! – Pomagajmo!
   help.IMP.2 – Help.IMP.2Pl – Help.IMP.1Pl(Incl)

c. Naj pomaga! – Naj pomagajo!
   SBJV help.3 – SBJV help.3Pl
Commitment: ‘x should. . .!’

(18) Anyone but first person exclusive

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

Information seeking interrogatives: ‘Should x. . .?’

(19) Anyone but second person

a. Naj pomagam? – Naj pomagamo?
   SBJV help.1 – SBJV help.1Pl
   help.IMP2 – Help.IMP.2Pl – Help.IMP.1Pl(Incl)
c. Naj pomaga? – Naj pomagajo?
   SBJV help.3 – SBJV help.3Pl
(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 said (to Z) that I/you/(s)he* i/j should... [naj V.3p]
(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 said (to Z) that I/you/(s)he*i/j should... [naj V.3p]

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

   said.M are.2 that more exercise.IMP.(2)
   int: ‘You said that you should exercise more.’ Obviation!

b. Rekel si, da moraš več telovadit.
   said.M are.2 that should.2 more exercise.INF
   ‘You; said that you; should exercise more.’
Generalized obviation in speech reports

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

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

a. *Rekel si, da več telovadi. said.M are.2 that more exercise.IMP.(2)
   int: ‘You said that you should exercise more.’ Obviation!

b. Rekel si, da moraš več telovadit. said.M are.2 that should.2 more exercise.INF
   ‘You; said that you; 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

- Standard subject obviation with directive subjunctives is one corner of generalized directive obviation
- Something about directives (imperatives, directive \textit{naj}-clauses) blocks subjects that refer to speaker/addressee or attitude holder.
Generalized obviation is a matter of grammar

- 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.

Stegovec 2019
Generalized obviation is a matter of grammar

- 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.
- Similar patterns:
  - **Interrogative flip** (assertion/question) in dependence of epistemic modals, evidentials, speech act adverbials, . . . Speas and Tenny 2003; Faller 2002, . . .
  - Conjunct-disjunct agreement systems
  - . . .
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):

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.’
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.
  1.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):

- 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. \[wō: [wa ana wan-ã dhakãː:] dhã (s)he.ERG (s)he there go-PST.CONJ that said \]
\[‘(S)he_i said that (s)he_i,*j went there.’\]

b. \[wō: [wa ana wan-a dhakãː:] dhã (s)he.ERG (s)he there go-PST.DISJ that said \]
\[‘(S)he_i said that (s)he_*i,j went there.’\]
Pattern of perspectival obviation resembles conjunct-disjunct agreement, e.g. Newari (Sino-Tibetan):

- 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)
• Director is represented syntactically: **perspectival PRO**

  Perspectival center in the syntax: Tenny and Speas 2004; Wechsler 2018; Zu 2015
• 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

- 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
  \[ \Rightarrow \text{Generalized obviation is a Condition B violation:} \]
Syntactic account of generalized obviation

- 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
  \( \Rightarrow \) Generalized obviation is a Condition B violation:

In main clause:
\[
\{ \text{COMMIT}_{\text{Speaker}}, \text{QUESTION}_{\text{Addressee}} \} \; \lambda x \; [ \text{PRO}_x \; [ \text{SUBJECT} \; [ \ldots ]] ]
\]

In speech report:

\[
[ \text{SUBJECT} \; \text{said that} \; [ \lambda x \; [ \text{PRO}_x \; [ \text{SUBJECT} \; [ \ldots ] ]] ]]
\]
Syntactic account of generalized obviation

- 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:
\[
\{ \text{COMM} \text{IT}_{\text{Speaker}}, \text{QUESTION}_{\text{Addressee}} \} \lambda x [ \text{PRO}_x [ \text{SUBJECT} [ \ldots ]]]
\]

In speech report:
\[
[ \text{SUBJECT} \text{ said that } [ \lambda x [ \text{PRO}_x [ \text{SUBJECT} [ \ldots ] ]]]]
\]

Alternative (here): Semantic infelicity (independent of Condition B).
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) $\Rightarrow \checkmark 1p$
  Directive Greek na-subjunctives obviate; (25) acceptable if speaker
  lacks control over when they wake up:
  Oikonomou 2016:(38)

(25) Avrio na kskipniso 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?
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?
     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?
what AUX.3 said.F what buy.IMP.(2)
‘What did she say? What should you buy?'

Stegovec 2017

(29) 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

Slovenian
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Rising directives

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

(30) a. Help him (maybe)?
b. Pomagaj? help.IMP.2 ‘Should you help him?’
c. {Pročitaj / Da pročitaš} ovu knjigu? read.IMP2 / that read.2.Pfv this book ‘Read this book, maybe?’
Rising directives

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

(30) a. Help him (maybe)?

b. Pomagaj?

'Should you help him?'

c. {Pročitaj / Da pročitaš} ovu knjigu?

‘Read this book, maybe?’

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

- 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
Interpreting directives

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

  ≈Searle 1976
Interpreting directives

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

- Directive meaning resides in directive modal operator \( \text{ImpOP} \):
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{c}
  \text{PERSPOP} [ \text{ImpOP} [ \text{SUBJECT} \ldots \text{Verb}_{\text{Subj}/\text{Imp}} ] ]
  \end{array}
  \]

≈Searle 1976
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:
  \[
  \text{[ PERSPOP } [ \text{ImpOP} [ \text{SUBJECT} \ldots \text{Verb}_{\text{Subj}/\text{Imp}} ] ] ]
  \]

- Directive operator ImpOP
  - ≈ must, should:
    - singles out ‘**SUBJECT** \ldots \text{Verb}_{\text{Subj}/\text{Imp}}’ 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: 

  *Director* aims to get *Instigator* to bring about a specific course of events.

• Directive meaning resides in directive modal operator ImpOP:

  \[ \text{PERSPOP} \ [ \text{ImpOP} \ [ \text{SUBJECT} \ldots \text{Verb}_{\text{Subj/Imp}} ] ] \]

• Directive operator ImpOP
  
  – \( \approx \) *must, should*:
    
    singles out ‘\text{SUBJECT} \ldots \text{Verb}_{\text{Subj/Imp}}’ as best course of events
  
  – imposes conditions on felicitious contexts of use (presuppositions)
    that *can only be met if Director \( \neq \) Instigator.*

• Extends semantics that is independently motivated for canonical 2p imperatives

  Schwager 2006; Kaufmann 2012
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]
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]
• Modals: descriptive and performative is a distinction of use, not semantics.  
  Kamp 1973; Schulz 2003
  Context decides: descriptive context vs. performative context
• 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:
Modals: descriptive and performative is a distinction of use, not semantics.

Context decides: descriptive context vs. performative context

Directive speech acts ‘must φ’ occur in performative contexts:

- Director does not take φ for granted independently of their utterance
  
  $\Rightarrow$ *Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)*
Performative and descriptive modals

- 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 φ’ occur in performative contexts:
  - Director does not take φ for granted independently of their utterance
    - Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)
  - Instigator is considered capable of bringing about φ
    - Decisive Modality (DM)
• 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
    $\Rightarrow$ Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)
  – Instigator is considered capable of bringing about $\phi$
    $\Rightarrow$ Decisive Modality (DM)
  – Modal flavor is considered decisive
    $\Rightarrow$ Decisive Modality (DM)
Performative and descriptive modals

- 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
    $\Rightarrow$ Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)
  - Instigator is considered capable of bringing about $\phi$
    $\Rightarrow$ Decisive Modality (DM)
  - Modal flavor is considered decisive
    $\Rightarrow$ Decisive Modality (DM)
  - Director is considered an authority
    $\Rightarrow$ Epistemic Authority Condition (EAC)
Performative and descriptive modals

- 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
    $\implies$ Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)
  - Instigator is considered capable of bringing about $\phi$
    $\implies$ Decisive Modality (DM)
  - Modal flavor is considered decisive
    $\implies$ Decisive Modality (DM)
  - Director is considered an authority
    $\implies$ 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 □ and ◊ 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 □ and ◊ 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 $\Box^{CG}$
    - indexed for transitive closure of $B_S \cup B_A$ for Speaker and Addressee

Stalnaker 2002
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** $\Box^{CG}$
    indexed for transitive closure of $B_S \cup B_A$ for Speaker and Addressee
  - **Public Belief**: Individual $a$ is publicly committed to believing $p$:
    $\Box^{PB_a} p := \Box^{CG} \Box B_a p$

Magdalena Kaufmann (UConn)
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$^R \phi$’ translates to $\Box^R p$
  - Imperative LF: $[\text{ImpOP}^R \phi]$ 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 $p$):
  
  \[
  \text{'must}^R \phi' \quad \text{translates to } \Box^R p
  \]
  
  imperative LF: $[\text{ImpOP}^R \phi] \quad \text{translates to } \Box^R p$

- Example:

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

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

Magdalena Kaufmann (UConn)
Performative contexts

- *must* \( \phi \)
  - is used performatively in a **performative context**, else, it can be used descriptively.
Performative contexts


- **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

- **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

- **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


- **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

- **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

- **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)*

  **$\Rightarrow$** 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 $q \in \Delta$, control($\alpha$, $q$), where control($\alpha$, $q$) := try($\alpha$, $q$) $\rightarrow$ cause($\alpha$, $q$)

- $R$ 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.
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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:

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

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**).
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Generalized obviation: matrix case, commitment

No first person directives:

(35)  *‘I should...!’

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

\( \text{Inconsistent presuppositions } \Rightarrow \text{ speaker incurs conflicting discourse requirements} \)
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\textsubscript{i} said that (s)he\textsubscript{j},*\textsubscript{i} 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$_i$ said that (s)he$_j$,*$_i$ should...

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Matrix subject
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Classical subject obviation:

(36)  
  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...

- 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_i said that (s)he_j,*_i 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
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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
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Alleviating generalized obviation

- No presumed control for subject:
  Grammatical subject (= Director) ≠ Instigator
  No Director’s Anticipation!

- Tampering with perspective setting (questions):
  - Rising intonation: *Help him (maybe)?*
    Director = Speaker+Addressee (Distributed Knowledge)
  - Scope Marking (≈ 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)


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

Oikonomou 2016

Here: ImpOP

\[
[ \text{SUBJ} \{ \text{want, hope, insist, ... } \} [ \text{PerspOP} \text{ ImpOP}[\text{SUBJ},*; \text{ ... \ V} \text{ERB\text{Subjunctive} \text{ ...}}]]]
\]

- 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?
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\[
[ \text{Subj}_i \{ \text{want, hope, insist, ...} \} [ \text{PerspOP} \text{ImpOP}[\text{Subj}_j, * \text{ ... Verb}_{\text{Subjunctive}}\text{...}]]]
\]

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

✓ Weaker desire for course of events not under control is non-obviative Kempchinski 2009 after Ruwet

(40)

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. *Je \textit{veux} que je parte.
      \quad ‘I want that I leave.SBJ.’
  \item b. Je \textit{voudrais} bien que je puisse enfin être autorisé à partir.
      \quad ‘I would certainly want that I should(SBJ) finally be authorized to leave.’
\end{itemize}
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- 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?

\[
\text{SUBJ}_i \{\text{want, hope, insist,} \ldots\} [\text{PerspOP}\text{ImpOP}[\text{SUBJ}_j, *i \ldots \text{VERB}_{\text{subjunctive}}\ldots]]
\]

- 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)

- ImpOP may not be only operator licensing obviating subjunctives
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Promising involves identity between Director and Instigator and is an outlier in mood-marking:

- **Korean:** special promissive clause type  
  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
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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!*
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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:

$$\square^{PB_d} \square^B a \square^R p \rightarrow \square^{PB_d} p$$

(42) a. $\square^{PB_d} \square^B a \square^R p$  
    Assumption
b. $\square^{PB_d} (\square^B a \square^R p \rightarrow \text{try}(a, p))$  
    Decisive Modality
c. $\square^{PB_d} \square^B a \square^R p \rightarrow \square^{PB_d} \text{try}(a, p)$  
    K
d. $\square^{PB_d} \text{try}(a, p)$  
    1, 3, MP
e. $\square^{PB_d} p$  
    presumed control (decision problem)
Conflict: Commitment Case

(43)  

a. \(\Box^{PB_d} \Box^R p\)  
   Committing utterance by \(d\)  
   Def. of \(PB\)  

b. \(\Box^{PB_d} \Box^B_d \Box^R p\)  
   b, Director’s Anticipation  
   EUC  

c. \(\Box^{PB_d} p\)  
   d, System K  

d. \(\Box^{PB_d} (\Diamond^{PB_d} p \land \Diamond^{PB_d} \neg p)\)  

e. \(\neg \Box^{PB_d} p\)  

e.  

f. \(\Box^{PB_d} p \land \neg \Box^{PB_d} p\)  
   c,e: \(i\)
(44) a. \(\{\Box^R p, \Box^R \neg p\}\) Semantic answers
b. \(\Box^{PB_S}(\Box^R p \lor \Box^R \neg p)\) Interrogative commitment
c. \(\Box^{PB_S}(\Box^R p \leftrightarrow \Box^{BA} \Box^R p) \land \Box^{PB_S}(\Diamond^{BA} p \land \Diamond^{BA} \neg p)\) EAC, EUC
d. \(\Box^{PB_S}((\Box^R p \land \Box^{BA} \Box^R p \land \Diamond^{BA} \neg p) \lor (\Box^R \neg p \land \Box^{BA} \Box^R \neg p \land \Diamond^{BA} p))\) 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. \{∅, You\} read the book!
     b. Nobody \{∅, 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. \{∅, You\} read the book!
b. Nobody \{∅, of you\} move!
c. Kids, Sebastian open the door and Tobias put away the toys.

Subject referent cannot be disjoint from an existing addressee:


(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! \quad \text{Wish}
 b. Please have the keys with you! \quad \text{Wish}
 c. Please don’t have broken another vase! \quad \text{Wish}

(45) a. \#Get tenure! \quad \text{Command, \#Wish}
 b. Get work done on the train! \quad \text{Command, \#Wish}

New proposal: Canonical morphosyntactic 2p-imperatives $p!$ in English presuppose:
If it is possible that some agent controls $p$, then the addressee controls $p$. 
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New proposal: Canonical morphosyntactic 2p-imperatives $p!$ in English presuppose:
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! Command, #Wish  
(b)  Get work done on the train! Command, #Wish

New proposal: Canonical morphosyntactic 2p-imperatives $p!$ in English presuppose:

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!  
  b. Please have the keys with you! 
  c. Please don’t have broken another vase! 

(45)  
  a. #Get tenure! 
  b. Get work done on the train! 

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

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

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, ≈ 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_i da e_i/*k dodje.  
   Ana forced M. that (she) come
(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. ’

azt construction is impossible with infinitive complements:

(56) *János; az-t akarja velünk jön-ni.
     János that-ACC wants with us come-INF

Fn 6: mere presence of az is insufficient:

(57) János; az-t akarja, hogy ei jöjjön velünk.
     János that-ACC wants that (he; ) 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)