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Natural Language Semantics: Uncovering and modelling the meaning that is conventionally associated with natural language expressions.

- Modelling techniques: *philosophical and mathematical logic*
- Basis for discerning, classifying, distinguishing, understanding, . . . meanings: *philosophy*

- **Topic today:** (An aspect of) natural language imperatives
  Practical language, knowledge and belief, perspectival content, . . .
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Morphosyntactically marked sentential form types associated with command-like directive speech acts as a default:

'attempts [...] by the speaker to get the hearer to do something’, Searle (1976:11) (exclude questions)
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Canonical 2p imperatives

Morphosyntactically marked sentential form types associated with command-like directive speech acts as a default:

'attempts [...] by the speaker to get the hearer to do something’, Searle (1976:11) (exclude questions)

(1) a. Read this book! English
   b. Preber-i to knjigo! Slovenian
   read-IMP this.F.SG.ACC book.F.SG.ACC
   c. Lies dieses Buch! German
   read.IMP this book

Conventional meaning? Specifically: does it reference the speaker?
One of the (major) clause types

- Distinct sentential form types associated with prototypical functions:

  1. **declarative**
     - It’s hot inside.
     - *assertion*
  2. **interrogative**
     - Who can help?
     - *question*
  3. **imperative**
     - Open the window.
     - *command*
  4. **exclamative**
     - How nice!
     - *exclamation*
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One of the (major) clause types

- Distinct sentential form types associated with prototypical functions:

  (2) **declarative**
      It’s hot inside.

  (3) **interrogative**
      Who can help?

  (4) **imperative**
      Open the window.

  (5) **exclamative**
      How nice!

- Can all be used for other functions as well

  form, content and context jointly determine actual utterance function
Examples of imperatives in (non-)prototypical functions

(6) Get out. \textit{command}
(7) Stay away from the machine. \textit{warning}
(8) Help me with this. \textit{request}
(9) (How do I get to the station? - ) Take the bus. \textit{advice}
(10) Have a seat. \textit{invitation}
(11) Don’t be in there, please. \textit{wish}
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- **Challenge:**
  Capture versatility as interplay between (stable) semantic meaning and (varying) contextual factors.
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Examples of imperatives in (non-)prototypical functions

(6) Get out.  
(7) Stay away from the machine.  
(8) Help me with this.  
(9) (How do I get to the station? - ) Take the bus.  
(10) Have a seat.  
(11) Don’t be in there, please. 

- Common denominator: ‘The speaker singles out a particular (future or present) state of affairs (involving the addressee) as optimal.’
- Theories differ a.o. in whether the speaker plays a role in syntax/semantics of imperatives. – Yes!
Imperatives close gap between knowledge and action

**Director**
Knowledge what’s best

**Instigator**
Ability to carry it out (*know-how-to*)
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- Imperatives embedded in indirect speech
- (Canonical 2p) imperatives as part of a larger paradigm of directive clauses:  
  Include directive subjunctives (surrogate imperatives)
- Grammatical patterns of perspective sensitivity
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Imperatives as embedded 2p directives

Morpho-syntactic marking of canonical imperatives in indirect speech:

(12) Rekel (ti) je, da mu pomagaj.
said.M (2.Dat) is that 3.M.DAT help.IMP.(2)
‘He said (to you) that you should help him.’

Slovenian, Sheppard and Golden (2002)
Morpho-syntactic marking of canonical imperatives in indirect speech:

(12) Rekel (ti) je, da mu pomagaj.
    ‘He said (to you) that you should help him.’
    Slovenian, Sheppard and Golden (2002)

(13) Hans hat gesagt ruf seinen Vater an.
    ‘Hans said that you should call his father.’
    German, Schwager (2006)
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(12) Rekel (ti) je, da mu pomagaj.
said.M (2.Dat) is that 3.M.DAT help.IMP.(2)
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(13) Hans hat gesagt ruf seinen Vater an.
Hans has said call.IMP his father up
‘Hans said that you should call his father.’
%German, Schwager (2006)

(14) John said call his father.
%English, Crnič and Trinh (2009)
Imperatives as embedded 2p directives

Morpho-syntactic marking of canonical imperatives in indirect speech:

(12) Rekel (ti) je, da mu pomagaj.
    said.M (2.Dat) is that 3.M.DAT help.IMP.(2)
    ‘He said (to you) that you should help him.’

    Slovenian, Sheppard and Golden (2002)

(13) Hans hat gesagt ruf seinen Vater an.
    Hans has said call.IMP his father up
    ‘Hans said that you should call his father.’

    %German, Schwager (2006)

(14) John said call his father.
    %English, Crnič and Trinh (2009)

Also: Japanese, Korean, Mbyá, Old Scandinavian, . . .
But not: Greek, French, Italian, Serbian, . . .
Surrogate imperatives fill gaps in paradigm (directives)

- Negative imperatives

(15) Leggi! – Non {leggere, *leggi}.
read.IMP2 – not read.INF, read.IMP2
‘Read!’ – ‘Don’t read!’
Surrogate imperatives fill gaps in paradigm (directives)

- **Negative imperatives**

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

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

  ‘3rd person imperatives’, Zanuttini et al. (2012)

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

  (17) **Tebulwa: sa:ph rahe!**
  
  * Bhojpuri
  
  table-NOM clean-NOM be-IMP3Sg
  
  ‘Let the table be clean!’
Surrogate imperatives fill gaps in paradigm (directives)

- Negative imperatives

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

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

  ‘3rd person imperatives’, Zanuttini et al. (2012)

  (16) Naj pomaga!
  \text{SBJV help.3}
  ‘(S)he should help!’

  (17) Tebulwa: sa:ph rahe!
  \text{table-NOM clean-NOM be-IMP3Sg}
  ‘Let the table be clean!’

Commands to addressee see to it that?
Surrogate imperatives fill gaps in paradigm (directives)

• Negative imperatives

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

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

‘3rd person imperatives’, Zanuttini et al. (2012)

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

(17) Tebulwa: sa:ph rahe!
table-NOM clean-NOM be-IMP3Sg
‘Let the table be clean!’

Commands to addressee see to it that?
Prototypically: yes (⇒ include in imperative clausetype, ‘directives’).
Slovenian directive paradigm

*naj*-subjunctives complement imperative inflection (dual omitted):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</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>
Finding: Availability of forms is constrained
- matrix clause: by discourse function (committing/asking)
- embedded: by matrix subject ('subject obviation')
Generalized obviation

Finding: Availability of forms is constrained
- matrix clause: by discourse function (committing/asking)
- embedded: by matrix subject (‘subject obviation’)

Overall pattern of constraints: generalized (directive) obviation
Slovenian generalized obviation: matrix case

Stegovec (2019)

Commitment: ‘x should. . . !’

(18) Anyone but first person exclusive

a. *Naj pomagam! – *Naj pomagamo!
   \[ \text{SBJV help.1} \quad \text{– SBJV help.1Pl} \]

b. Pomagaj! – Pomagajte! – Pomagajmo!
   \[ \text{help.IMP.2} \quad \text{– Help.IMP.2Pl} \quad \text{– Help.IMP.1Pl(Incl)} \]

c. Naj pomaga! – Naj pomagajo!
   \[ \text{SBJV help.3} \quad \text{– SBJV help.3Pl} \]
Slovenian generalized obviation: matrix case

Stegovec (2019)

Commitment: ‘x should. . . ’ (includes canonical imperatives)

(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 questions: ‘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/(s)he should...

b. You said that I/*you/(s)he should ...

c. (S)he; said (to Z) that I/you/(s)he*; should...
(20) Anyone but attitude holder
   a. I said that *I/you/(s)he should...
   b. You said that I/*you/(s)he should ...
   c. (S)he \(i\) said (to Z) that I/you/(s)he\(i/j\) should...

(21) Adrian: ‘I should exercise more!’ – Later I remind him:
      said are.2 that more exercise.IMP.2
   b. Rekel si, da moraš več telovadit.
      said are.2 that should.2 more exercise.INF
      ‘You said that you should exercise more.’
Generalized obviation in speech reports

Stegovec (2019)

(20) Anyone but attitude holder
   a. I said that *I/you/(s)he should...  
   b. You said that I/*you/(s)he should ...  
   c. (S)he;i said (to Z) that I/you/(s)he*_{i/j} should...

(21) Adrian: ‘I should exercise more!’ – Later I remind him:
      said are.2 that more exercise.IMP.2  
   b. Rekel si, da moraš več telovadit.
      said are.2 that should.2 more exercise.INF  
      ‘You said that you should exercise more.’

‘It’s ok to tell yourself what to do (and report this); just not with
imperatives/directives!’

⇒ issue of conventional meaning
Generalized obviation is a matter of grammar

- Something about directives (imperatives, directive *naj*-clauses) blocks subjects that refer to speaker/addressee or matrix subject.
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- Something about directives (imperatives, directive *naj*-clauses) blocks subjects that refer to speaker/addressee or matrix subject.
- Purely pragmatic account is implausible (✔ self-directing)
- Speech reports: extends well-known *subject obviation*  
  
  (Kaufmann (2020a) for references & discussion)

(22)  

\[ \text{Pierre} \text{\_{i} veux [ que il}_j,\#_i \text{parte } \]  

Pierre wants that he leave.SUBJ

‘Pierre wants for him to leave.’, not: ‘Pierre wants to leave.’
Generalized obviation is a matter of grammar

• Something about directives (imperatives, directive *naj*-clauses) blocks subjects that refer to speaker/addressee or matrix subject.

• Purely pragmatic account is implausible (✔ self-directing)

• Speech reports: extends well-known subject obviation

(Kaufmann (2020a) for references & discussion)

(22) Pierre i veux que il j, # i parte
Pierre wants that he leave.SUBJ
‘Pierre wants for him to leave.’, not: ‘Pierre wants to leave.’

• ‘speaker–hearer–matrix subject’: grammar of perspective setting
  – Source for epistemic modals, evidentials, speech act adverbials, taste predicates,…
  – Japanese experiencer predicates
  – Conjunct-disjunct agreement systems, e.g. Newari (Sino-Tibetan)
Newari conjunct-disjunct agreement

Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018
Newari conjunct-disjunct agreement

Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018

- Main clause, commitment (assertion)

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

a.  

\begin{align*}
\text{Ji} & \text{ ana wan-}^{\overline{\text{a}}}.\\
1P & \text{there go-PAST.CONJ.}\\
& \text{‘I went there.’}
\end{align*}

b.  

\begin{align*}
\text{cha} & \text{ ana wan-a.}\\
you & \text{there go-PAST.DISJ}\\
& \text{‘You went there.’}
\end{align*}

c.  

\begin{align*}
\text{wa} & \text{ ana wan-a}\\
(s)he & \text{there go-PAST.DISJ}\\
& \text{‘(S)he went there.’}
\end{align*}
Newari conjunct-disjunct marking

- Main clause, commitment (assertion) CONJ for Speaker

Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018
Newari conjunct-disjunct marking

Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018

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

(24) DISJ for everyone other than addressee (2p):

a. ji ana wan-a |ā.
   I there go-PAST.DISJ Q
   ‘Did I go there?’

b. cha ana wan-ā |ā
   you there go-PAST.CONJ Q
   ‘Did you go there?’

c. wa ana wan-a |ā.
   (s)he there go-PAST.DISJ Q
   ‘Did (s)he go there?’
Newari conjunct-disjunct marking

Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018

- Main clause declarative, commitment (assertion) CONJ for Speaker
- Main clause interrogative, information seeking CONJ for Addressee
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- Main clause declarative, commitment (assertion) CONJ for Speaker
- Main clause interrogative, information seeking CONJ for Addressee
Newari conjunct-disjunct marking

Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018

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

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

a. \( \text{wõ}: [\text{wa ana wan-ā dhakā:] dhā} \)
   \((s)he (s)he there go-PAST.CONJ that said '(S)he\textsubscript{i} said that (s)he\textsubscript{i},*j went there.'\)

b. \( \text{wõ}: [\text{wa ana wan-a dhakā:] dhā} \)
   \((s)he (s)he there go-PAST.DISJ that said '(S)he\textsubscript{i} said that (s)he\textsubscript{i},*j went there.'\)
Newari conjunct-disjunct marking

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
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Interpreting directive clauses

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

- Directive meaning resides in directive modal operator **ImpOP**

\[(26) \quad [ \text{ImpOP}[ \text{SUBJECT} \ldots \text{VERB}_{\text{Subj/Imp}} ] ] \]

- Singles out ‘SUBJECT \ldots VERB’ as best
- Imposes conditions on felicitous use (presuppositions) that *can only be met if Director ≠ Instigator.*
- **Instigator:** typically **SUBJECT** (else: **Addressee**)

- **Director:** syntactically represented perspectival center

  Stegovec (2019)

\[(27) \quad [ \text{PERSPOP} \quad [ \text{ImpOP}[ \text{SUBJECT} \ldots \text{Verb}_{\text{Subj/Imp}} ] ] ] \]
Interpreting directive clauses

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

• Directive meaning resides in directive modal operator **ImpOP**

(26) \[ \text{ImpOP}[ \text{SUBJECT} \ldots \text{VERB}_{\text{Subj}/\text{Imp}} ] \]

  – Singles out ‘**SUBJECT** \ldots **VERB**’ as best
  – Imposes conditions on felicitous use (presuppositions) that *can only be met if Director ≠ Instigator*.
  – **Instigator**: typically **SUBJECT** (else: Addressee)

• **Director**: syntactically represented perspectival center

  Stegovec (2019)

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

  – value is set by grammar of perspective setting
Interpreting directive clauses

- **Director** aims to get **Instigator** to bring about specific course of events.
- Directive meaning resides in directive modal operator **ImpOP**

\[(26) \quad [\text{ImpOP} [\text{SUBJECT} \ldots \text{VERB}_{\text{Subj}/\text{Imp}} ]]\]

- Singles out ‘\text{SUBJECT} \ldots \text{VERB}’ as best
- Imposes conditions on felicitous use (presuppositions) that *can only be met if Director ≠ Instigator.*
- **Instigator**: typically **SUBJECT** (else: **Addressee**)

- **Director**: syntactically represented perspectival center

\[(27) \quad [\text{PERSPOP} [\text{ImpOP} [\text{SUBJECT} \ldots \text{Verb}_{\text{Subj}/\text{Imp}} ]]]\]

- value is set by grammar of perspective setting

- Analysis of **ImpOP** builds on performative modals

Stegovec (2019)  
Schwager (2006); Kaufmann (2012)
Two uses of declaratives with (deontic) modals . . .

- **descriptive:**
  describing what is permitted, commanded, recommended, . . .

  (28)  
  a. You should call your mother.  
   [that’s what she said]  
  b. You may take an apple.  
   [that’s what the guy in the uniform said]
Descriptive and performative modal verbs

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

- **descriptive:**
  describing what is permitted, commanded, recommended, . . .

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

- **performative:**
  issuing permissions, commands, recommendations, . . .

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

Evidence for performativity:  
Kaufmann (2012)

(30)  
  a. #That’s (not) true!
  b. # . . . but I (absolutely) don’t want you to do this.
• Modals: descriptive vs. performative is a distinction of use.  
  
  Kamp (1973); Schulz (2003)  

  Context decides: **descriptive context** vs. **performative context**
Modals and imperatives

• Modals: descriptive vs. performative is a distinction of use.
  
  Kamp (1973); Schulz (2003)

  Context decides: **descriptive context** vs. **performative context**

• Performative contexts yielding directive uses of ‘must $\phi$’:

  – Director does not already take $\phi$ for granted
    
    **Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)**

  – Instigator is considered capable of bringing about $\phi$
    
    **Decisive Modality (DM)**

  – Director is considered an authority
    
    **Epistemic Authority Condition (EAC)**

• Imperatives are never descriptive
  
  ImpOP is similar to must but presupposes that context is performative

  Stalnaker, 1978, 2002
Modals and imperatives

- Modals: descriptive vs. performative is a distinction of use.
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• Modals: descriptive vs. performative is a distinction of use. 
  
  Context decides: descriptive context vs. performative context

• Performative contexts yielding directive uses of ‘must $\phi$’:
  – Director does not already take $\phi$ for granted
    👈 Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)
  – Instigator is considered capable of bringing about $\phi$
    👈 Decisive Modality (DM)
Modals and imperatives

• Modals: descriptive vs. performative is a distinction of use.
  Kamp (1973); Schulz (2003)

  Context decides: descriptive context vs. performative context

• Performative contexts yielding directive uses of ‘must \( \phi \)’:
  – Director does not already take \( \phi \) for granted
    \( \Rightarrow \) 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)
Modals and imperatives


- Modals: descriptive vs. performative is a distinction of use.
  Kamp (1973); Schulz (2003)
  Context decides: descriptive context vs. performative context
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Modals and imperatives

- Modals: descriptive vs. performative is a distinction of use.
  Kamp (1973); Schulz (2003)
  Context decides: **descriptive context** vs. **performative context**

- Performative contexts yielding directive uses of ‘must $\phi$’:
  - **Director** does not already take $\phi$ for granted
    - **Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)**
  - **Instigator** is considered capable of bringing about $\phi$
    - **Decisive Modality (DM)**
  - Modal flavor is considered decisive
    - **Decisive Modality (DM)**
  - **Director** is considered an authority
    - **Epistemic Authority Condition (EAC)**

- Imperatives are never descriptive **ImpOP** is similar to *must* but presupposes that context is performative
  Publicly commits speaker to belief that it is mutual joint belief
  (Stalnaker, 1978, 2002)
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
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- Translate into standard modal logic with $\Box$ and $\Diamond$ indexed for epistemic and prioritizing interpretations w.r.t. a Frame $F = \langle W, B, R \rangle$, where:
  - $W$ set of all possible worlds
  - $B$ maps individual $a$ to $a$’s belief relation $B_a \subseteq W \times W$
  - $R$ the salient prioritizing modal flavor

- Derived belief relations:
  - **Mutual joint belief** $\Box^{CG}$ Stalnaker (2002)
    indexed for transitive closure of $B_S \cup B_A$ for Speaker and Addressee
Modal logic for modals and directives

- Translate into standard modal logic with □ 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
  - **Public Belief:** Individual $a$ is publicly committed to believing $p$:
    $\Box^{PB_a} p := \Box^{CG} \Box^{B_a} p$
Interpreting modals and directives in $F = \langle W, B, R \rangle$

- Prioritizing modals and imperatives (directives) are indexed for the salient prioritizing modal flavor $R$
Interpreting modals and directives in $F = \langle W, B, R \rangle$

- Prioritizing modals and imperatives (directives) are indexed for the salient prioritizing modal flavor $R$
- Translation (when $\phi \rightsquigarrow p$):
  - $[\text{must}^R \phi] \rightsquigarrow \Box^R p$
  - $[\text{ImpOP}^R \phi] \rightsquigarrow \Box^R p$

Example:
(a) You must close the door!
(b) Close the door!
- both: $\rightsquigarrow \Box^R \text{close(you, the-door)}$
- both are true at $w$ iff you close the door in all $w'$ s.t. $w'$ is $R$-accessible from $w$. 
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 \( \phi \rightsquigarrow p \)):
  
  \[
  [\text{must}^R \phi ] \rightsquigarrow \Box^R p
  \]
  
  \[
  [\text{ImpOP}^R \phi ] \rightsquigarrow \Box^R p
  \]

- Example:

  (31)  
  a. You must close the door!  
  b. Close the door!

  - both: \( \rightsquigarrow \Box^R \text{close}(\text{you, the-door}) \)
  - both are true at \( w \)  
    iff you close the door in all \( w' \) s.t. \( w' \) is \( R \)-accessible from \( w \).
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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 $\neg \phi$.
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Performative contexts

- $[ \text{must } \phi ]$: used performatively in a performative context, else, used descriptively.
- $[ \text{ImpOP } \phi ]$: presupposes that the context is performative.

Performative contexts are characterized by three conditions:

(EAC) **Epistemic Authority Condition**
Director has perfect knowledge of what is necessary w.r.t. salient prioritizing modal flavor $R$.

(EUC) **Epistemic Uncertainty Condition**
(If not for the directive utterance), Director holds possible $\phi$ and $\neg \phi$.

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

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

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

- $R$ being the decisive modality implies: Kaufmann and Kaufmann (2012)
  - 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 $q$. 

- 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:

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

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

Gist of Proof:

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

Appendix or Kaufmann (2020b).
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:

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

Gist of Proof: Appendix or Kaufmann (2020b).

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

Preview Director = Instigator:
Epistemic Authority clashes with Epistemic Uncertainty
Generalized obviation: matrix case, commitment

No first person directives:

(32) *‘I VERB_{Imp/Subj}...!’
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No first person directives:

(32) *‘I VERB_{Imp/Subj} . . . !’

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Speaker
- Speaker publicly commits to $\Box^R p$
- By Director’s Anticipation, Speaker is committed to believing that $p$ will come about
- So, Epistemic Uncertainty Condition fails
Generalized obviation: matrix case, commitment

No first person directives:

(32)  *‘I VERB\text{Imp/Subj}...!’

- 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
- So, Epistemic Uncertainty Condition fails

\$ \uparrow \text{Inconsistent presuppositions } \Rightarrow \text{speaker incurs conflicting discourse requirements} \$
Generalized obviation: embedded case

(33)  
   a. *I said that I should...  
   b. *You said that you should/V.IMP.2p ...  
   c. (S)he; said that (s)he;,*; should...
Generalized obviation: embedded case

(33)  
   a. *I said that I should...  
   b. *You said that you should/V.IMP.2p ...  
   c. (S)he; said that (s)he;,*; should...  

   • By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Matrix subject
Generalized obviation: embedded case

(33)  
   a. *I said that I should...
   b. *You said that you should/V.IMP.2p ...
   c. (S)he; said that (s)he),*; should...

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Matrix subject
- Presuppositions get anchored to the speech event described by the matrix predicate

van der Sandt (1992)
Generalized obviation: embedded case

(33)  
  a. *I said that I should...  
  b. *You said that you should/V.IMP.2p ...  
  c. (S)he; said that (s)he j;,*; should...

- By grammar of perspective setting: Director = Matrix subject
- Presuppositions get anchored to the speech event described by the matrix predicate

\[ \text{Inconsistent presuppositions cannot be resolved} \]
Generalized obviation: matrix case questions

No 2p-imperatives/directives in information seeking interrogatives:
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No 2p-imperatives/directives in information seeking interrogatives:
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- 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
Generalized obviation: matrix case questions

No 2p-imperatives/directives in information seeking interrogatives:

(34) *'VERB_{Imp/Subj} you...?' (**‘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

\[\text{Inconsistent presuppositions } \Rightarrow \text{ speaker incurs conflicting discourse requirements}\]
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Tampering with perspective enables 2p-directives in questions (Instigator = Addressee).

• Rising intonation: (Portner, 2010; Rudin, 2018)

(35) Hilf ihm (vielleicht)?
help him (maybe)
‘Help him (maybe)?’ 'rising imperative', Suggestion

• No standard information seeking question:
Director = Speaker+Addressee (Distributed Knowledge)

• Director ≠ Instigator ⟷ No Director’s Anticipation
Tampering with perspective enables 2p directives in questions (Instigator = Addressee).
Tampering with perspective enables 2p directives in questions (Instigator = Addressee).

- Scope Marking ($\approx$ embedding, Director=Thinker)
  Stegovec (2017) for Slovenian, Oikonomou (2016) for Greek

(36) Schema: What does your mother think? What buy.2pIMP?
Tampering with perspective enables 2p directives in questions
(Instigator = Addressee).

- Newari rhetorical questions: like declaratives
  
  \[ (37) \]
  
  a. \( \text{jī anā wān-ā?} \)
  
  ‘Did I go there?’ (=Of course I did not.)
  
  b. \( \text{cha anā wān-a} \)
  
  ‘Did you go there?’ (=Of course you did not.)
Alleviating generalized obviation 3: Rhetorical Questions

Tampering with perspective enables 2p directives in questions (Instigator = Addressee).

- Newari rhetorical questions: like declaratives
  
  (37)  
  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.)

- By grammar of perspective setting, Director = Speaker
Tampering with perspective enables 2p directives in questions (Instigator = Addressee).

- Newari rhetorical questions: like declaratives
- By grammar of perspective setting, Director = Speaker
Alleviating generalized obviation 3: Rhetorical Questions

Tampering with perspective enables 2p directives in questions (Instigator = Addressee).

- Newari rhetorical questions: like declaratives
- By grammar of perspective setting, Director = Speaker
- Imperatives in rhetorical (wh)-questions:
  Sperber & Wilson 1988: Omotic (Southern Ethiopia);
  Kaufmann & Poschmann 2011: %German

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

- Directives encode that there is a gap between perspective holder (knowledge of what’s best) and instigator (ability to act)
- Semantics of directives (including canonical imperatives) references perspective holder (by assumption/for convenience: syntactically represented)
- Evidence: generalized obviation as sensitivity to independently motivated grammar of perspective
- Account with modal semantics + presuppositions
- Predictions for standard subject obviation, promis(siv)es, ...

(Kaufmann, 2020a)

- Grammar of perspective: commitment covers descriptive/directive

(Schmitz, 2020)

- **To do:** shifted indexicality as an alternative to perspectival operator?

(Stegovec and Kaufmann, 2015)

*Thanks for zooming in!*
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Director’s Anticipation

(39) **Director’s Anticipation**: If director $d$ is publicly committed to believing that instigator $a$ believes that $p \in \Delta$ is $R$-necessary, then $d$ is publicly committed to believing that $p$ will come true:

$$\Box^{PB_d} \Box^{B_a} \Box^{R} p \rightarrow \Box^{PB_d} p$$

(40)

a. $\Box^{PB_d} \Box^{B_a} \Box^{R} p$  
   **Assumption**

b. $\Box^{PB_d} (\Box^{B_a} \Box^{R} p \rightarrow \text{TRY}(a, p))$  
   **Decisive Modality**

c. $\Box^{PB_d} \Box^{B_a} \Box^{R} p \rightarrow \Box^{PB_d} \text{TRY}(a, p)$  
   **K**

d. $\Box^{PB_d} \text{TRY}(a, p)$  
   1, 3, **MP**

e. $\Box^{PB_d} p$  
   presumed control (decision problem)
(41) a. □^{PB_d} □^R p
   b. □^{PB_d} □^{B_d} □^R p
   c. □^{PB_d} p
   d. □^{PB_d} (◊^{PB_d} p \land ◊^{PB_d} \neg p)
   e. \neg □^{PB_d} p
   f. □^{PB_d} p \land \neg □^{PB_d} p

Committing utterance by d

Def. of PB
b, Director’s Anticipation
EUC
d, System K
c,e: ⚫
Conflict: Information Seeking Question

(42) a. \( \Box^R p, \Box^R \neg p \) 

b. \( \Box^{PBs}(\Box^R p \lor \Box^R \neg p) \) 

c. \( \Box^{PBs}(\Box^R p \leftrightarrow \Box^{BA} \Box^R p) \land \Box^{PBs}(\Diamond^{BA} p \land \Diamond^{BA} \neg p) \) EAC, EUC

d. \( \Box^{PBs}(\Box^R p \land \Box^{BA} \Box^R p \land \Diamond^{BA} \neg p) \lor (\Box^R \neg p \land \Box^{BA} \Box^R \neg p \land \Diamond^{BA} p) \) 

b,c; EAC
Subjects of morphosyntactic canonical imperatives

English subjects in morphosyntactic canonical imperatives:

(43)  
   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

(44)  
   a. Maître’d, someone seat the guests.  
   b. #Maître’d, one of your underlings seat the guests.

(45) Rain! Don’t rain!
Subjects of morphosyntactic canonical imperatives

English subjects in morphosyntactic canonical imperatives:

(43)  
   a. \{\emptyset, You\} read the book!  
   b. Nobody \{\emptyset, 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

(44)  
   a. Maître’d, someone seat the guests.  
   b. #Maître’d, one of your underlings seat the guests.

(45)  Rain! Don’t rain!

(46)  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)  
\begin{align*} 
&\text{a. } \{\emptyset, \text{You}\} \text{ read the book!} \\
&\text{b. Nobody } \{\emptyset, \text{of you}\} \text{ move!} \\
&\text{c. Kids, Sebastian open the door and Tobias put away the toys.} 
\end{align*}

Subject referent cannot be disjoint from an existing addressee:


(40)  
\begin{align*} 
&\text{a. Maitre’d, someone seat the guests.} \\
&\text{b. } \#\text{Maitre’d, one of your underlings seat the guests.} 
\end{align*}

(41) Rain! Don’t rain!

(43) German generalization: Kaufmann 2012

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

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

(45)  a. Get tenure!  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 $p$. 
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!  

New proposal: Canonical morphosyntactic 2p-imperatives $p!$ in English presuppose:
If it is possible that some agent controls $p$, then the addressee controls $p$. 

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 $p$.
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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:
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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!               

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, \(\approx\) object control)
- Slovenian: utterance addressee
- English: B or utterance addressee

(48) [Context: Peters visa is about to expire. His good friend Mary tells him:]
I talked to a lawyer yesterday, and he said marry my sister.

(49) [Context: Mary has lost her wallet. She tells her husband:]
I talked to John, and he said call his bank.

- German: B has to be utterance addressee (Kaufmann & Poschmann 2011)
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)
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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  
  Explanation: embedded directive (or desiderative) subjunctives signal gap between epistemic authority and control of events

Pak et al. (2008)  
Zanuttini et al. (2012)