Obviate me (not):
Obviation effects in Serbian main and complement clauses

Magdalena Kaufmann & Neda Todorović & Ivana Jovović

FASL 2021, MIT, May 13-16

---

1 Introduction

1.1 Classical subject obviation and Serbian

Classical subject obviation (CSO): constraint against sameness of matrix subject and embedded subject in bi-clausal structures (Picallo 1985; Ruwet 1984):

(1)   [MATRIXSUBJECT$_i$ {*want, hope, insist,…*} [EMBEDDEDSUBJECT$_{j,*i}$ … VERB$_{Subjunctive}$…]]

Typical instances involve subjunctive complements of directive or desiderative predicates:

(2)   a.   *Je veux que je parte.
          I   want that I   leave.SUBJ
          int.: 'I want to leave.'
     b.   Pierre$_i$ veut   qu'il$_{*i,j}$ parte.
          P.   wants that=he leave.SUBJ
          'Pierre wants that he ($\neq$ Pierre) leave.'   French, Ruwet 1984

(3)   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

Serbian (the variety of BCMS spoken by two of the authors) realizes clausal complements of non-factive matrix predicates as finite clauses headed by complementizer *da*:

(4)   a.   Ana je   { mislila / rekla } da pada kiša.
          Ana be.3SGPRES { thought / said } DA fell   rain.
          'Ana {thought / said } that it was raining.'
     b.   Ana je   pokušala da opere   prozore.
          Ana be.3SGPRES tried   DA wash-3SGPRES windows
          'Ana tried to wash the windows.'
     c.   Marija je   naredila Petru   da opere   prozore.
          Marija be.3SGPRES ordered Peter-DAT DA wash-3SGPRES windows
          'Marija ordered Peter to wash the windows.'
     d.   Marija je   zamolila Petra   da opere   prozore.
          Marija be.3SGPRES asked   Peter-ACC DA wash-3SGPRES windows
          'Marija asked Peter to wash the windows.'

Note that Serbian is a subject *pro*-drop language: pronominal subjects need not be realized overtly, provided their referent is salient (see Jovović 2020a; Jovović 2020b for detailed discussion):

(5) Petar nam   je   bio u poseti. Oprao nam   je   prozore.
     Petar we-DAT be.3SGPRES been in visit.   Washed we-DAT be.3SG.PRES windows.
     'Petar came to visit us. He washed our windows.'

DA-clauses under directive and desiderative predicates do not appear to be subject to CSO:

(6) a. Želim   da odem.
         want-1SGPRES da leave-1SGPRES
         'I want to leave.'
     b. Ana je naredila sebi da prestane   da misli o   tome.
         Ana is ordered self da stop-3SGPRES DA thinks about that
         'Ana order herself to stop thinking about that.'

Instead, they display sensitivity as to whether the embedded subject can be realized overtly or has to remain covert (Zec 1987; Vrzić 1996; Farkas 1992). We call this effect ***pronominal subject obviation*** (PSO):

(7) a. Petar je   želeo   da dodje   na vreme.
         Petar Aux wanted DA come.3.SG.PRES on time
         'Peter wanted to come on time.'/'Peter$_i$ wanted for him$_j$ to come on time.'
     b. Petar$_i$ je želeo   da on$_{*i,j}$ dodje na vreme.
         Petar Aux wanted DA he   come on time
         'Peter wanted that he come.'

Non-desiderative/non-directive predicates are not subject to PSO, overt and covert pronoun can refer to matrix subject *i* or another salient individual *j*:

(8) Jovana$_i$ misli   da ona$_{i,j}$ vodi   na listi.
     Jovana thinks-3SGPRES DA she   leads-3SGPRES on list
     'Jovana thinks she is leading in the competition.'

⇒ PSO does not seem to reduce to the well-known preference for covert pronouns as realizing *de se*-pronouns in attitude reports

(9)   Referential possibilities for embedded subjects:

	want-verbs		*think*-verbs	
	Matrix subject	Other individual	Matrix subject	Other individual
Covert subject	✓	✓	✓	✓
Overt subject	*	✓	✓	✓
	PSO		(no obviation expected)	
	no CSO detectable			

1.2 Roadmap

In the following, we will argue that

- Serbian DA-clauses display CSO effects after all

- PSO effects reduce to CSO + a structural ambiguity between two types of DA-clauses

- Evidence comes from person contraints in:

  – Matrix DA-clauses expressing prioritizing modality

  – Optional prioritizing modality in DA-clauses in illocutionary underspecified speech report ('say')

Our proposal

- Unify person restrictions on matrix and embedded uses as ***Generalized subject obviation*** (GSO) (Stegovec 2019; Kaufmann 2019b)

- PSO is an epiphenomenon arising from disambiguation between two possible *da*-complements of *want/tell/...*-type verbs:

  – DA$_{SL}$: no overt subjects possible, non-obviating (in fact, obligatorily controlled)

  – DA$_{Mod}$: overt subjects possible, obviating

  ⇒ for *want/tell/...*-type verbs: 'overt subject → obviating construction' (what we see: PSO)

- Develop a semantic account for the obviating behavior of DA$_{Mod}$-clauses

2 Modality and DA

2.1 Matrix DA-clauses conveying prioritizing modality

DA-clauses can appear in matrix position with directive or desiderative use (Browne and Alt 2004; Vrzić 1996), standing in for canonical imperatives to express commands or wishes:

(10)   a.   Da čita-š   ovu knjigu!
              DA read-2SGPRES this book
              'Read this book (already)!'   ✓COMMAND
       b.   Da brzo ozdravi-š!
              DA fast become.healthy-2SGPRES
              'Get well soon!'   ✓WISH

DA-clauses are ***strong directives*** (von Fintel and Iatridou 2017), they cannot replace imperatives used for disinterested advice, invitations, concessions, or acquiescence:

(11) A: Kako da   stignem   do Harlema?
          how DA arrive-1sg.pres to Harlem
          'How do I get to Harlem?'
      B: { #Da uzmeš   / Uzmi   } trasu A.
            DA take-2SGPRES / take-2SGIMP   line A
          'Take the A-train.'   ✗ADVICE

(12) a. { #Da sedneš./   Sedi. }
            DA sit-2SGPRES /   sit-IMP
          'Have a seat.'   ✗INVITATION
      b. Onda { #da ideš   / idi   } na tu   tupavu žurku.
          then { da go-2SGPRES / go-IMP } on that stupid party
          'Ok, then go to that stupid party.'   ✗CONCESSION

(13) A: Can I open the window? – B: (Go ahead),...
          { #Da otvoriš.   / Otvori.   }
            DA open-2SGPRES / open-IMP
          'Go ahead open it.   ✗ACQUIESCENCE

Matrix DA-clauses retain their prioritizing flavor in interrogatives:

(14) a. Da Vesna pročita   ovu knjigu?
          DA Vesna read.3.SG.PRES.PFV this book
          'Should Vesna read this book?'   Vrzić 1996: (2a)
      b. Da li   da Vesna pročita   ovu knjigu?
          Q-PART DA Vesna read.3.SG.PRES.PFV this book
          'Should Vesna read this book?'   Vrzić 1996: (2b)
      c. Koju knjigu da Vesna pročita?
          which book   DA Vesna read.3.SG.PRES.PFV
          'Which book should Vesna read?'   Vrzić 1996:(fn. 8:i)

2.2 Person restriction in matrix da-clauses

Directive main DA-clauses can contain second or third, but not first person subjects (showing singular):

(15) a. Da čita-š   ovu knjigu!
          DA read-2SGPRES this book
          'Read this book (already)!'
      b. Da brzo ozdravi-š!
          DA fast become.healthy-2SGPRES
          'Get well soon!'

(16) a. Da Vesna čita   ovu knjigu.
          DA Vesna read-3SGPRES this book
          roughly: 'Vesna should really read this book!', 'See to it that Vesna reads this book.'
      b. *Da čita-m   ovu knjigu!
          DA read-1SGPRES this book
          intended: 'I really have to read this book.' or 'See to it that I read this book.'

Regardless of the subject, standalone DA-clauses express prioritizing modality that has to be performative–

they cannot be used for truth-evaluable assertions about what you, Vesna, or I should do (no descriptions of what the world is like).

In unmarked ***information seeking interrogatives*** (speaker unbiased, addressee presumed to know, answer expected), the person pattern shifts: only first and third person subjects are available.

(17) Da { pročita-m   / pročita   / #pročita-š   } ovu knjigu?
      DA   read-1SGPRES / read-3SGPRES / read-2SGPRES   this book
      'Should { I / (s)he / #you } read this book?'

(18) Da { pročitamo   / pročitaju   / #pročitate   } ovu knjigu?
      DA   read-1PLPRES / read-3PLPRES / read-2PLPRES   this book
      'Should { we / they / #you } read this book?'

Second person is confined to suggestions and echo-questions (depending on interrogative form type):

(19) [Context tentative advice:] *To a fellow student struggling in the class:*

      A   da (možda) pročitaš   ovu knjigu?
      (but) DA (maybe) read-2SGPRESPFV this book
      'You should maybe read this book -?'

(20) [Contexts echo question:] *To a fellow student who mentioned what book the professor wants him to read*:

    a. Da pročitaš   OVU KNJIGU?
        DA read-2SGPRESPFV this   book?

    b. Jel   OVU KNJIGU da pročitaš?
        QPART this   book   DA read-2SGPRESPFV
        'You have to read THIS BOOK???!' (*...Pa on nije normalan.* 'He's crazy.')

(21) [Context unbiased information seeking:] *To a fellow student, wanting to find out about fellow student's reading list.*

    a. #Da li   da pročitaš   ovu knjigu?
        QPART DA read-2SGPRESPFV this book
        intended: 'Should you read this book?'

    b. Da li   treba da pročitaš   ovu knjigu?
        QPART must DA read-2SGPRESPFV this book
        'Do you have to read this book?'/'Are you required to read this book?'

Setting aside non-information seeking questions:

(22) <u>Person restriction for acceptable matrix DA-clauses conveying prioritizing modality:</u>

Environment	Blocked subjects	
Commitment	Speaker (1pExcl)	(*'I should...!')
Information seeking question	Addressee (2p)	(*'Should you...?')

This is exactly the matrix part of ***Generalized Subject Obviation*** (GSO) that Stegovec (2019) establishes for imperatives and directive subjunctives in Slovenian:

(23) Full directive paradigm with *naj*-subjunctives and inflectionally marked imperatives:

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

The paradigm is subject to GSO: matrix directives are constrained as in (24), embedded directive subjunctives or imperatives cannot be identical in reference to the matrix subject ⇒ CSO.

(24)   GSO restriction on Slovenian directives/imperatives:

Environment	Blocked subjects	
Commitment (matrix)	Speaker (1Excl)	(*'I...')
Information seeking question (matrix)	Addressee (2)	(*'you ...')
Embedded clause	Matrix subject	(*'α_i *says/orders/...* that α_i...')

The Speaker/Addressee/Matrix-Subject reflects a pattern of ***perspective sensitivity*** familiar from elsewhere in grammar:

- Epistemic modals, evidentials, 'speaker' adverbials, taste predicates,... (Speas and Tenny 2003)

  With Speaker (in declarative/commitment case)/Addressee (in information seeking question) known as ***Interrogative Flip***.

- Conjunct-disjunct agreement in Newari (verbal agreement for *self*-referring subject vs. other subjects) (Zu 2018)

Puzzle: Serbian appears to lack the embedded part of GSO (aka classical subject obviation, CSO); instead, we find PSO (pronominal subject obviation).

Core idea:

- DA-clauses are structurally ambiguous (potentially in more than one way)

- Under directive/desiderative (i.e., non-reportative) matrix verbs:

  Only in the absence of an overt subject, a parse as a non-obviating construction is available.

  The presence of an overt subject disambiguates in favor of the obviating construction.

  ⇒ resulting pattern: ***Pronominal subject obviation*** (PSO)

3 The full spectrum of embedded *da*-clauses

3.1 The syntax of embedded *da*-clauses

- Standard view: DA-complement clauses fall into two classes, *say*-type complements (da_1) and *want*-type complements (da_2)

  Ivić 1970; Browne 1986; Zec 1987; Progovac 1993b; Progovac 1993a; Progovac 1994; Vrzić 1996; Bošković 1997; Stjepanović 2004; Todorović 2012; Veselinović 2019, a.o.

- We assume that *da*-complements split more fine-grainedly into three types (similarly: Todorović and Wurmbrand 2015; Todorović and Wurmbrand 2020).

- Different types of complement clauses can differ in interpretation;

  Verbal predicates can be compatible with more than one type, constrained (at least) by semantic compatibility (a.o., Kratzer 2006; Moulton 2009; Elliott 2020 for discussion).

- Three complement types, all of which can be realized as *da*-clauses (with a verb carrying tense and person agreement):

  1. **Subjectless complements** (SL) **cannot** contain a(n overt) subject, obligatorily controlled interpretation

     (a) **DA$_{SL}$-*clauses***: *da* + present

     (DA$_{SL}$) [$_{TP}$ SUBJECT$_i$ T [$_{AspP}$ Asp [$_{VP}$ want /decide/ plan
                   [$_{MP}$ [DA+M] [$_{AspP}$ Asp [$_{VP}$ VERB$_{present}$]]]]]]

     (b) alternative realization with morphological infinitive [*–set aside in the following*]:

     (Inf)   [$_{TP}$ SUBJECT$_i$ T [$_{AspP}$ Asp [$_{VP}$ want /decide/ plan
                   [$_{MP}$ M [$_{AspP}$ Asp [$_{VP}$ VERB$_{infinitive}$]]]]]]

  2. **DA$_{Mod}$-*clauses***: express prioritizing modality, covert or overt subjects possible, restricted by generalized obviation

     (DA$_{Mod}$) [$_{TP}$ SUBJECT$_i$ T [$_{AspP}$ Asp [$_{VP}$ want /decide/ plan
                   [$_{CP}$ DA [$_{TP}$ { DP$_{*i,j}$ / pro$_{*i,j}$ } T [$_{MP}$ $\overset{Mod}{\leftleftarrows}$ [$_{AspP}$ Asp [$_{VP}$ VERB$_{present}$]]]]]]]]]

  3. **DA$_{Dec}$-*clauses***:   *overt or covert subjects, optional coreference*

     (DA$_{Dec}$) [$_{TP}$ SUBJECT$_i$ T [$_{AspP}$ Asp [$_{VP}$ say/claim/...
                   [$_{CP}$ DA [$_{TP}$ { DP$_{i,j}$/ pro$_{i,j}$ } T [$_{MP}$ M$^{epi/rep}$ [$_{AspP}$ Asp [$_{VP}$ VERB$_{present}$]]]]]]]]]

- Notes on some important questions we consider orthogonal to our argument:

  – Note 1: 'Subjectlessness'
    The exact nature of the missing subject in SL-complements is not crucial to our account (for discussion, Sundaresan 2014, Pietraszko 2021, Wurmbrand/Pesetsky flashmob, April 2021).

- Note 2: Size

  NPI-types, clitic climbing, and topicalization (Progovac 1993a) identify DA_{SL} as smaller than DA_{Mod} and DA_{Dec}; without deep commitment, we treat the former as M(od)P and both DA_{Mod} and DA_{Dec} as CPs.

- Note 3: maybe all three complement-types contain modality, we investigate solely prioritizing da^{Mod} as in DA_{Mod} (DA_{SL} may express temporal forward shift in connection with e.g. a metaphysical modal, cf. Abusch 1985; Condoravdi 2002; Abusch 2004; Wurmbrand 2014, DA_{Dec} may contain an epistemic/reportative modal, Kratzer 2006)

3.2 Tracking da^{Mod} in the interpretation

We assume that da^{Mod} expresses necessity and is **_harmonic_** to desiderative and directive matrix verbs (e.g. Portner 1997; Kratzer 2006; Moltmann 2020) $\Rightarrow$ Semantically invisible in these contexts:

(25) Mary told me that I should clean up.
  $\exists e[\text{tell}(e)$ & agent(e) = mary & patient(e) = I & content$(e) = {}^{\wedge}\square^{R(e)}$(I-clean-up)]]
  where $R(e)$: the accessibility relation determined by event e (e.g., Mary's rules)

- The contribution of da^{Mod} becomes visible in the interpretation of:

  1. Standalone DA-clauses (express prioritizing modality)

  2. Complements of *say*-verbs

- *say*-verbs are illocutionary underspecified and can report assertions (no prioritizing modality; R1), or directive utterances (prioritizing modality; R2) (Browne 1987; Vrzić 1996):

  (26) Vesna kaže   da Jovana čita   ovu knjigu.
     Vesna say-3SGPRES DA Jovana read-3SGPRESIMPFV this book
     R1: 'Vesna says that Jovana is reading this book.'
     R2: 'Vesna says that Jovana should read this book.'

  DA_{Mod}-clauses can contain overt subjects, but do not have to.

  Prediction: *even in the absence of an overt subject*, they should be banned from obviating constellations.

  This is borne out: if the embedded subject is co-referential with the matrix subject, R2 becomes unavailable:

  (27) Vesna kaže   da čita   ovu knjigu.
     Vesna say-3SGPRES DA read-3SGPRESIMPFV this book
     R1: 'Vesna$_i$ says that she$_{j,i}$ is reading this book'
     R2: 'Vesna$_i$ says that she$_{j,*i}$ should read this book.'

- How do we get a prioritizing reading with *kazati* 'say':

  The modality has to be realized in the embedded clause (da^{Mod}, or an overt modal verb).

⇒ *say*-type complements are ambiguous between (3) and a structure with DA_{Mod} (compare Vrzić 1996):

(28) $[_{TP}$ SUBJECT$_i$ T $[_{VP}$ say/think …

    a.   … $[_{CP}$ DA $[_{TP}$ { DP$_{i,j}$ / pro$_{i,j}$ } T $[_{MP}$ M$^{epi/rep}$ $[_{AspP}$ Asp $[_{VP}$ VERB$_{present}$]]]]]]]]

    b.   … $[_{CP}$ DA $[_{TP}$ { DP$_{*i,j}$ / pro$_{*i,j}$ } T $[_{MODP}$ 👻^{Mod} $[_{AspP}$ Asp $[_{VP}$ VERB$_{present}$]]]]]]]]

- Under the assumption that DA_{SL} cannot replace DA_{Mod} to encode R2 (as it would fail to contribute prioritizing modality), overt and covert subjects are predicted correctly to be constrained likewise.

  The assumption is confirmed further by the finding that the embedded DA-clause cannot be replaced by the SL-variant with the morphological infinitive in (27).

4   The semantics of the obviating prioritizing modal 👻^{Mod}

DA_{Mod}-clauses are subject to generalized obviation ⇒ we need a theory of obviation that applies both in matrix and in embedded clauses.

4.1   Theories on the market for obviating subjunctive complements

- *(Semantic) Blocking*   Farkas 1988; Schlenker 2005

  A competing construction (typically: infinitival control construction) encodes *de se* and/or presumed control over action described by embedded clause

  ⇒ chosen over semantically underspecified subjunctive clause.

  ☣ Competitor in the matrix cases? Competitor for the modal reading (R2) of *say*-complements?

- *Anti-locality* (syntax):   Picallo 1985; Kempchinsky 1986,…

  – Between subjects:

      ☣ Fails to extend from CSO to matrix cases; why sensitive to *de se* and presumed control?

  – Between left-peripheral between perspectical center and subject (Stegovec 2019):

  (29)   [[<u>PERSPOP$_i$</u> MODOP] <u>SUBJECT</u>$_{j,*i}$ … VERB$_{Subjunctive}$ …]

      ☣ Syntactic issues to determine correct binding domain to the inclusion of e.g. object clitics; why sensitive to presumed control?

      Required independently: semantics for perspective sensitive (non-descriptive) modal

- *Semantic conflict* (Kaufmann 2019b; Szabolcsi ta):

  Obviating modals (the operators that license subjunctives or imperatives) give rise to semantic conflicts when subject and perspectical center refer to the same individual ('mind-boggling meanings', Szabolcsi ta)

<u>Goal</u>: devise a meaning for 👻^{Mod} as an obviating modal.

9

4.2 Assigning obviative semantics to ⬚̂ᴹᵒᵈ

- A semantic/pragmatic account of obviation in directives (Kaufmann 2019b, suggested extension to desideratives Kaufmann 2020) [*–simplified*]:

  In contexts of felicitous use, morphological imperatives/directive subjunctives ϕ! combine at-issue and propositional meaning so that

  - A **director** (= the perspectival center), who is taken to know what is necessary in this respect, but not whether ϕ or $\neg\phi$ will happen, commits that ϕ is necessary (interrogatives: is asked to commit whether ϕ), for

  - an **instigator**, who is committed to bring about ϕ in case they learn it is necessary.

  If one individual D is **both director and instigator**, and D is presumed to be able to bring about ϕ (*presumed control*), then D is subject to the conflicting requirement that they know that ϕ will come about but also don't know whether ϕ will come about.

  $\Rightarrow$ Obviating constellations result in inherently contradictory discourse requirements for the utterance speaker/presuppositions that cannot be resolved felicitously.

- DA-clauses differ from imperatives/directive subjunctives in two ways:

  - DA-clauses are **strong directives** (no advice, invitations,...)

  - Like Romance and Hungarian subjunctives (Szabolcsi ta for recent discussion), directive subjunctives are sensitive to presumed (lack of) control (Oikonomou 2016 for Greek *na*, Adrian Stegovec, p.c., for Slovenian *naj*).

    (30) [context presumed lack of control:] *You have the alarm, I need you to wake me up:*

    > Avrio   na ksipniso   stis 6:00am.
    > Tomorrow NA wake.1SG at   6:00am.
    > 'Tomorrow I should wake up at 6:00am.'   Greek; Oikonomou 2016

    ⬚̂ᴹᵒᵈ seems to be **insensitive to presumed control**:

    (31) [context presumed lack of control:] *You have the alarm, I need you to wake me up:*

    > a.   *Da se   probudim   sutra   u 6!
    >   DA   REFL wake-1SGPRES tomorrow at 6
    >   intended: 'Tomorrow I should wake up at 6am.'
    > b.   *Da stignem   na vrijeme!
    >   DA   arrive.1SGPRES on time
    >   intended: 'See to it that I am there on time.'

    (32) Jovan želi   da (*on) bude izabran.
    > Jovan wants DA he   be   elected
    > 'Jovan wants for himself to be elected.'

- ⬚̂ᴹᵒᵈ behaves like (all?) other obviative subjunctives in that

  - Stress on subject pronouns fixes obviation effects

10

(33) Vesna$_i$ želi   da { *ona$_i$ / ONA$_i$ } dobije   nazad pare.
     Vesna want-3sg.pres DA   she   get-3SGPRES back   money
     'Vesna wants that SHE gets the money back.'

– *de re* fixes obviation in the embedded case: (tested on 'Kako biste VI rekli?', Facebook)

(34) [context *de se*] *Petar is a proud politician and he's very sure of himself. He is a candidate on the upcoming election and he recently said for the media: 'I want to win the elections'*

    a.   Petar želi da on pobedi na izborima. (0 speakers)
    b.   Peter želi da pobedi na izborima. (17 speakers)

(35) [context *de re*] *Petar is so drunk that he forgot that he was the candidate for president in the upcoming election. In such a state, he's watching TV and sees someone who he thinks is a great candidate and should win. What Peter doesn't realize is that the candidate he sees on TV is actually him.*

    a.   Petar želi da on pobedi. (13 speakers)
    b.   Peter želi da pobedi. (1 speaker)
    c.   (both bad: 4 speakers)

- Tentative proposal: $\overset{\text{Mod}}{\circlearrowleft}$== expresses the perspectival center's wishes/goals regarding (also) the actions of (presumed) others

                            (Ruwet's 'discontinuity between the will and the actions of a person'; Szabolcsi ta)

(36)   a. $\overset{\text{Mod}}{\circlearrowleft}$== is sensitive to the *perspectival center*, set to speaker (commitment), addressee (information seeking interrogative), SELF of speech or attitude report (embedded sentence).   (Stegovec 2019; Kaufmann 2019b)
   b. $\overset{\text{Mod}}{\circlearrowleft}$== is *ought-to-do*: combines with individual (subject) and property.
   c.   The grammatical subject has to *evoke 'others'* (= alternative(s) to the perspectival center).

Interpretation at a context c and a centered world of evaluation $\langle x, w \rangle$ (basic commitment case: speaker and world of context; shiftable):

(37)   a. $[\![\cdot]\!]^{c, \langle x, w \rangle}$: ordinary value
   b. $[\![\cdot]\!]_f^{c, \langle x, w \rangle}$: focus semantic value   Rooth 1985; Rooth 1992

(38) $[\![\alpha]\!]_f^{c, \langle x, w \rangle} = \{\, [\![\alpha]\!]^{c, \langle x, w \rangle} \,\}$ if α is unfocused, else:
     $[\![\alpha]\!]_f^{c, \langle x, w \rangle} = D_a$, the domain associated with a, the semantic type of α.

(39)   a. $[\![\overset{\text{Mod}}{\circlearrowleft}==]\!]^{c, \langle x, w \rangle} = \lambda e. \lambda P. \lambda x. \forall w'[R(e)(w)(w') \rightarrow P(w')(x)]$
   b. $[\![[\, \alpha \,[\, \overset{\text{Mod}}{\circlearrowleft}== e\, \phi \,]\,]\,]\!]^{c, \langle x, w \rangle}$ presupposes that
     (i) $[\![\alpha]\!]_f^{c, \langle x, w \rangle} \neq \{\, x \,\}$, and
     (ii) modal flavor R (as determined by event argument) reflects wishes/goals of x.

✓ Derives our observations about DA$_{\text{Mod}}$-clauses:

- – Strong directives intuitively express speaker wishes/goals.
- – Works for matrix and embedded DA-clauses.
- – Sensitive to perspective setting, to *de se*, and to focus.
- – Not sensitive to presumed control.

☣ Stipulative; operator references focus alternatives directly.

5 Conclusions

- Serbian displays GSO, with embedded part (CSO) masked as PSO

- PSO results from a structural ambiguity between two types of DA-complements that can occur under *want/tell/...*-type verbs:

  - – DA$_{\text{SL}}$: no overt subjects possible, non-obviating (in fact, obligatorily controlled)
  - – DA$_{\text{Mod}}$: overt subjects possible, obviating

  ⇒ for *want/tell/...*-type verbs: 'overt subject → obviating construction'

- Obviating prioritizing covert modal $\overset{\text{Mod}}{\searrow}{=}{=}$ (as appearing in DA$_{\text{Mod}}$-clauses) seems insensitive to presumed control, sensitive only to *de se/de re* and stress

  ⇒ wishes/goals about (presumed) other

6 Appendix: Related considerations

6.1 More on overt and covert subjects

- Overt subject pronouns coreferential with matrix subject show sensitivity to discourse factors under *think*-type verbs, but not under *want*-type verbs.

(40)   A: What is going on with the local elections? Do we know the results? – B: Nothing is official yet. ...

     a.   Ali sadašnji lideri$_i$ misle   da će oni$_i$ opet da pobede.
         But current leaders think-3PLPRES that will they again that win-3PLPRES
         'But the current leaders think that they will win again.'

12

b. *Ali sadašnji lideri$_i$ žele   da oni$_i$ opet pobede.
But current leaders want-3PLPRES that they again win-3PLPRES
'But the current leaders want to win again.'

(41)   A: Who is it that thinks they are a better athlete than Đoković?
        B: Jovan$_i$ misli da je on$_i$ bolji sportista od Đokovića.
        Jovan think-3SGPRES that is he better athlete than Đoković
        'Jovan thinks that he is a better athlete than Đoković.'

(42)   A: Who wants to be a better athlete than Đoković?
        B: *Jovan$_i$ želi da on$_i$ bude bolji sportista od Đokovića.
        Jovan want-3SGPRES that is he better athlete than Đoković
        'Jovan wants to be a better athlete than Đoković.'

- Stress on the matrix verb licenses overt subject pronouns under *think*-type verbs (43-a), but not under *want*-type verbs (43-b):

(43)   a. Petar$_i$ MISLI da će on$_i$ da pobedi.
        Petar think-3SGPRES that will he that win-3SGPRES.
        'Petar thinks that he will win.'
        b. *Petar$_i$ ŽELI da on$_i$ pobedi.
        Petar wants that he win-3SGPRES
        'Petar wants to win.'

- Given appropriate discourse setting (i.e., if matrix object is not a discourse topic), overt subject pronoun coreferential with matrix object in object-control environments is possible:

(44)   Jovan is celebrating a patron saint day tomorrow. His mother usually prepares everything for him, but he is all alone this year. What is he going to do about dolmas and the cake? –

        a. Jovan je ubedio   Mariju$_i$ da mu   ona$_i$ napravi   tortu.
        Jovan is persuade-PARTSGMASC Marija that him-DAT she make-3SGPRES cake
        'Jovan persuaded Marija to make a cake for him.' (I don't know about the dolmas.)

(45)   I know that Jovan is a great advisor and that his students are very successful. Did he manage to persuade Marija to finally send an abstract for FASL?
        a. Jovan je SAVJETOVAO   Mariju$_i$ da se   ona$_i$ prijavi   na FASL.
        Jovan is advised-PARTSGMASC Marija that ref.cl. she apply-3SGPRES to FASL
        'Jovan advised Marija to apply for FASL.'

- Overt subject pronoun is also possible if the matrix object is contextually understood, but not linguistically realized:

(46)   Jovan is celebrating a patron saint day tomorrow. His mother usually prepares everything for him, but he is all alone this year. What is he going to do about dolmas and the cake? Did he manage to persuade Marija to help him?
        a. Jovan je ubedio   da mu   ona napravi   tortu.
        Jovan is persuade-PARTSGMASC that him-DAT she make-3SGPRES cake

13

'Jovan persuaded Marija to make a cake for him.'

6.2 Plural

Second/third are also fine in the plural; some speakers accept 1PLINCL (1PLEXCL is ungrammatical):

(47) $^{\%}$Da čitamo   ovu knjigu!
     DA   read.1.PL.PRES this book
     'Let's read this book!'
     (not: 'We, without you, have to read this book.', 'Let's make it such that we, without you, read this book.')

Different from Slovenian, where 1P Inclusive is clearly good in the commitment case (matrix directives), but excluded in interrogatives; Stegovec (2019) for discussions.

6.3 Other directive clause types

In addition to canonical morphosyntactic imperatives, and DA-clauses, we also find so-called 'third person imperatives' with *neka*:

(48) Neka { *uradim   / *uradiš /   uradi }   to (već   jednom)!
     NEKA do-1SgPres / do-2SgPres /   do-3SgPres   (already once)!
     '(S)he should do it (finally)!' / 'See to it that (s)he does it!' / 'Let (=Allow) him/her to do it!'

6.3.1 More practical interrogatives

The DA$_{\text{Mod}}$-examples as in (49) contrast with how something is done in general, which is realized with infinitives or impersonal reflexive constructions, (50):

(49) Kako da napišem   pismo?
     how   DA write.1SG.PRES letter
     'How do I write a letter?'

(50) a. Kako napisati   pismo
          how   write.INF letter
          'How to write letter' (title of a manual or tutorial)

      b. Kako da se   napiše   pismo
          how   DA REFL write.3SG.PRES letter
          'How does one write a letter'

6.4 Apparent (?) violations of matrix GSO

6.4.1 Threats with first person singular subjects–*jel vam jasno?!*

Matrix DA-clauses can be used with 1p subject to express threats for the addressee to realize courses of events entirely under *their* control:

(51)   Da (*ja) dobijem nazad pare (jel vam jasno?)
         DA (I) get.1SGPRES back money (is.that you clear)
         'Make it such that I get my money back!'

(52)   Da pobedim   na izborima, jel   vam jasno?
         DA win.1SgPres in race,   is.that you clear
         '((Make sure that) I win in the race, is that clear?', 'You will make sure that I win that race, is that clear?'

The effect contrasts with the data on presumed lack of full control for the speaker considered in (31).
     But: no unstressed overt subject possible. ⇒ PSO without GSO after all???

(53)   Da (*ja)   pobedim na   izborima, jel   vam   jasno?
         DA I win.1SgPres in   race, is.that   you clear
         '((Make sure that) I win in the race, is that clear?', 'You will make sure that I win that race, is that clear?' (German, Japanese: unmodalized declaratives)

> Suspicion: this is DA$_{SL}$, licensed either contextually or by a covert operator different from $\square\overset{\text{Mod}}{=\!=\!=}$ and imperative.

If threats rely on DA$_{SL}$ ('wrong modality for $\square\overset{\text{Mod}}{=\!=\!=}$'), we would expect no improvement if the overt subject is stressed, matrix: at best very marginal, embedded:

(54)   Želim/Hoću   da ($^{???}$ja) dobijem nazad   pare.
         want.1SGPRES DA (I)   get.   1SGPRES back money
         'I want to get my money back.'

Slovenian does show a reduced control effect for *naj*-subjunctives (compare (30)), but does not use them for presumed full-addressee control/threats (Adrian Stegovec, p.c.):

(55)   ??Naj dobim   denar   nazaj do jutri!
       naj   get.1pSg money back   by tomorrow.
       intended: 'Make sure that I really get my money back by tomorrow!'   Slovenian

(56)   ?Naj sem jutri   prvi na seznamu!
       naj   am   tomorrow first on list
       'I better be the first one on the list tomorrow' (when dissatisified with my position on the waiting list)   Slovenian

(57)   Da sem jutri   prvi na seznamu!
         DA am   tomorrow first on list
         'I better be the first one on the list tomorrow.'   Slovenian

6.4.2   Toasts–re-examining matrix wishes: 'not settled, no control'

Upon closer inspection, matrix clauses used for wishes (no control for anyone) appear to be a mix of different constructions:

- ***Well-wishes***: as limited as with canonical morphological imperatives (Condoravdi and Lauer 2012; Kaufmann 2019a)

(58) Da brzo   ozdraviš!
     DA quickly get-well.2PSGPRES
     'Get well soon'

(59) a. #Get work done on the train!   (Condoravdi and Lauer 2012)
      b. #Get tenure!   (Kaufmann 2019a)

- Standalone conditional antecedents used as **optatives** (compare Grosz 2011)

(60) Da stignem   na vrijeme!
     DA arrive.1SG.PRES on time
     'If only I'm there on time...!'

- **Toasts**–preferably marked by an ethical dative *nama* 'for us' (which then requires an overt subject):

(61) #Da (ja) brzo ozdravim!
     intended: 'May I recover quickly'

(62) Da ti   nama   brzo   ozdraviš!
     DA you us.DAT quickly recover-2SGPRES
     'May you recover quickly (for us)'

(63) Da ja nama brzo ozdravim!
     'May I recover quickly for us'

(64) Da ti   nama   osvojiš   lutriju!
     Da you us.DAT win-2sg.pres. lottery
     'May you win the lottery for us'

(65) Da se vreme popravi!
     Da se weather get.better-3.sg.pres
     'May the weather get better'

- German also has a toasting-clause (Stefan Kaufmann, p.c.):

(66) a. Auf dass ich (uns) die Wahl   gewinne!
          to   that I   (us) the election win
          'To me winning the election!'
      b. Auf dass du   (uns) schnell gesund wirst!
          to   that you (us) quickly healthy become
          'To you recovering quickly!'
      c. Auf dass wir (*uns) die Wahl   gewinnen!
          to   that we (us)   the election win
          'To us winning the election!'

Options:

  – These contain $\overset{\text{Mod}}{\Longleftarrow}$ (hence potentially obviating), but the perspectival center is set to speaker
    + addressee ('joint wishes')

16

– [*our current guess*:] These are stand-alone purpose clauses that refer to a concomitant action of toasting. (See Arsenijević 2020 for purpose *da*). Support: ethical dative, German toasting construction.

References

Abusch, D. (1985). *On verbs and time*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Abusch, D. (2004). On the temporal composition of infinitives. In J. Guéron and J. Lecarme (Eds.), *The syntax of time*, pp. 1–34. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Arsenijević, B. (2020). Referential properties of subordinate clauses in Serbo-Croatian. In P. Kosta and T. Radeva-Bork (Eds.), *Current Developments in Slavic Linguistics: Twenty Years After*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Bošković, Ž. (1997). *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: An economy approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Browne, W. (1986). *Relative clauses in Serbo-Croatian in comparison with English*. Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics, University of Zagreb.

Browne, W. (1987). Classification of subordinate clauses in a grammar of serbo-croatian for foreign users. *The Zagreb English-Serbo-Croatian Contrastive Project, Contrastive Analysis of English and Serbo-Croatian 3*, 165–191.

Browne, W. and T. Alt (2004). *A Handbook of Bosnian, Serbian, and Croatian*. SEELRC (Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill).

Condoravdi, C. (2002). Temporal interpretation of modals: Modals for the present and for the past. In D. Beaver, S. Kaufmann, B. Clark, and L. Casillas (Eds.), *The Constuction of Meaning*, pp. 59–88. Stanford: CSLI.

Condoravdi, C. and S. Lauer (2012). Imperatives: Meaning and illocutionary function. In C. Piñon (Ed.), *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics*, Volume 9, pp. 1–21.

Darzi, A. (2008). On the vp analysis of Persian finite control constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry 39*(1), 103–116.

Elliott, P. (2020). *Elements of clausal embedding*. Ph. D. thesis, University College London, UK.

Farkas, D. (1992). On the semantics of subjunctive complements. In P. Hirschbühler and E. F. K. Koerner (Eds.), *Romance Languages*, pp. 69–104. Benjamins.

Farkas, D. F. (1988). On obligatory control. *Linguistics and Philosophy 11*, 27–58.

von Fintel, K. and S. Iatridou (2017). A modest proposal for the meaning of imperatives. In A. Arregui, M. Rivero, and A. P. Salanova (Eds.), *Modality Across Syntactic Categories*, pp. 288–319. Oxford University Press.

Grosz, P. (2011). *On the Grammar of Optative Constructions*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.

Ivić, M. (1970). O upotrebi glagolskih vremena u zavisnoj rečenici: prezent u rečenici sa veznikom da. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku XIII*(1), 43–53.

Jovović, I. (2020a). On discourse licensing of co-indexed readings of pronouns. Handout at FASL 29, Seattle, Washington.

Jovović, I. (2020b). On discourse licensing of co-indexed readings of pronouns: Serbo-Croatian strong pronouns as topic-shift anaphors.

Kaufmann, M. (2019a). Fine-tuning natural language imperatives. *Journal of Logic and Computation 29*(3). First published online, June 18, 2016.

Kaufmann, M. (2019b). Who controls who (or what)? *Proceedings of SALT 29*, 636–664.

Kaufmann, M. (2020). A semantic-pragmatic account of generalized subject obviation. Talk at LinG Colloquium Series, Göttingen University, May 20.

Kempchinsky, P. (1986). *Romance Subjunctive Clauses and Logical Form*. Ph. D. thesis, UCLA.

Kempchinsky, P. (2009). What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive? *Lingua 119*(12), 1788–1810.

Kratzer, A. (2006). Decomposing attitude verbs. Honoring Anita Mittwoch on her 80 th birthday at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem July 4, 2006.

Landau, I. (2000). *Elements of control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Studies in natural language and linguistic theory. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Landau, I. (2004). The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 22*, 811âĂŞ877.

McFadden, T. (2014). On subject reference and the cartography of clause types: A commentary on the paper by Biswas. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 32*, 115–135.

Moltmann, F. (2020). Truthmaker semantics for natural language: Attitude verbs, modals, and intensional transitive verbs. *Theoretical Linguistics 46*(3-4), 159–200.

Moulton, K. (2009). *Natural Selection and the Syntax of Clausal Complementation*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Oikonomou, D. (2016). *Covert modals in root contexts*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.

Picallo, M. C. (1985). *Opaque Domains*. Ph. D. thesis, CUNY.

Pietraszko, A. (2021). Backward control without a-movement or phi-agreement. Talk at UMass Syntax Workshop, Amherst, MA.

Portner, P. (1997). The semantics of mood, complementation, and conversational force. *Natural Language Semantics 5*, 167–212.

Progovac, L. (1993a). Locality and subjunctive-like complements in Serbo-Croatian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics 1*, 116–144.

Progovac, L. (1993b). Subjunctive: the (mis)behavior of anaphora and negative polarity. *The Linguistic Review 10*, 37–59.

Progovac, L. (1994). *Negative and positive polarity: A binding approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Progovac, L. (1996). Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the second position. In A. Halpern and A. Zwicky (Eds.), *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*, pp. 441–428. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Rooth, M. (1985). *Association with Focus*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Rooth, M. (1992). A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics 1*, 75–116.

Ruwet, N. (1984). Je veux partir/* je veux que je parte. a propos de la distribution des complétives à temps fini et des compléments à l'infinitif en français. *Cahiers de grammaire 7*, 75–138.

Schlenker, P. (2005). The lazy Frenchman's approach to the subjunctive. In T. Geerts, I. van Ginneken, and H. Jacobs (Eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2003: Selected papers from 'Going Romance' 2003, Nijmegen, 20-22 November*, pp. 269–310. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Speas, P. and C. Tenny (2003). Configurational properties of point of view roles. In A. M. DiSciullo (Ed.), *Asymmetry in Grammar*, pp. 315–343. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stegovec, A. (2019). Perspectival control and obviation in directive clauses. *Natural Language Semantics 27*(1), 47–94.

Stjepanović, S. (2004). Clitic climbing and restructuring with "finite clause" and infinitive complements. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics 12*(1-2), 173–212.

Sundaresan, S. (2014). Making sense of silence: Finiteness and the (oc) pro vs. pro distinction. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 32*, 59–85.

Szabolcsi, A. (t.a.). Obviation in Hungarian: What is its scope, and is it due to competition? Accepted for publication in *Glossa*.

Todorović, N. (2012). *The Subjunctive and Indicative da-complements in Serbian: A Syntactic-Semantic Approach*. Ph. D. thesis, Purdue University (note: Nataša Todorović).

Todorović, N. and S. Wurmbrand (2015). (in)finite possibilities of 'da': Restructuring the tense and aspect domains. Workshop on aspect in embedded clauses, ZAS, Berlin.

Todorović, N. and S. Wurmbrand (2020). Finiteness across domains. In P. Kosta and T. Radeva-Bork (Eds.), *Current Developments in Slavic Linguistics: Twenty Years After*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Veselinović, D. (2019). *The Syntax and Acquisition of Modal Verb Flavors*. Ph. D. thesis, New York University.

Vrzić, Z. (1996). Categorial status of the serbo-croatian 'modal' da. In *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*, pp. 291–312. Ann Arbor.

Wurmbrand, S. (2014). Tense and aspect in English infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry 45*(3), 403–447.

Wurmbrand, S. and D. Pesetsky (2020). Wurmbrand vs. Pesetsky linguistics flashmob. April 22, (youtube).

Zec, D. (1987). On obligatory control in clausal complements. pp. 136–168.

Zu, V. (2018). *Discourse Participants and the Structural Representation of the Context*. Ph. D. thesis, New York University.