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Directive speech acts are ‘attempts [...] by the speaker to get the hearer to do something’

Canonical (morphosyntactically marked 2p) imperatives are sentential form types associated with directive speech acts as a default

(1)

a. Read this book!

b. Kono hon-o yom-e!
   this book-ACC read-IMP

c. I chayk-ul ilk-ela.
   this book-ACC read-IMP

d. Lies dieses Buch!
   read.IMP this book

e. Preberi to knjigo!
   read.IMP this.F.SG.ACC book.F.SG.ACC

Focus in literature: addressee-orientedness; today: speaker.
Directive participation for *Read this book!*

‘attempts […] by the speaker to get the hearer to do something’

(2) Canonical imperative ‘ϕ!’ (with prejacent ϕ):

Zanuttini 2008, Alcazar & Saltarelli 2014

a. Speaker as director
   – selects and promotes the course of events described by ϕ

b. Addressee as instigator
   – sees to it that (or, causes) the course of events described by ϕ

Farkas 1988, 1992; Belnap, Perloff & Xu 2001

c. Addressee as referent of (covert, agentive) subject of ϕ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Disocurse Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigator</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Person table for canonical imperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Discourse Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigator</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Compositionally

- Post-compositionally
  - Table model, Farkas & Bruce 2009;
    - Use conditions, Portner 2007;
    - . . .

Preview: At least some speech act related aspects feed into semantic computation.
## Person table for canonical imperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Discourse Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigator</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Subject] =_1 Addressee =_2 Instigator

Accounts differ regarding which of =_1/2 are encoded grammatically

### Preview:
- Grammatical constraints on Instigator and Subject are language dependent
- Languages studied: neither Instigator nor Subject is fully determined by grammar
Person table for canonical imperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Discourse Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigator</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Director...

- **Not encoded**

- **Plays a role in conventional semantics**

- **Relevant syntactically?**
  - No evidence: Isac 2015
  - Yes: Alcazar & Saltarelli 2014, Stegovec 2018

Preview: Director active compositionally; this data: need not be in syntax
Person table for canonical imperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Discourse Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigator</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With recent literature:
Insights from embedded imperatives and other directives (‘surrogate imperatives’).
Evidence 1: Embedded imperatives

Morpho-syntactic marking of canonical imperatives in indirect speech:

(3) Rekel (ti) je, da mu pomagaj. Slovenian
Say.M (2.Dat) is that 3.M.DAT help.IMP.(2) Sheppard & Golden 2002
‘He said (to you) that you should help him.’

(4) 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.’

(5) John said call his father. %English
Crnic & Trinh 2009

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

But not: Greek, French, Italian, Serbian, . . .
Evidence 2: Other directives - Type I

Type I surrogates fill gaps in imperative/directive paradigms:

- **Negative imperatives**
  - (6) 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, Pak & Portner 2012
  - (7) Naj pomaga!  
    SBJV help.3  
    ‘(S)he should help!’

  - (8) Tebulwa: sa:ph rahe!  
    table-NOM clean-NOM be-IMP3Sg  
    ‘Let the table be clean!’
Evidence 2: Other directives - Type II

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

(9) Greek:

a. Trekse tora amesos!  
run.IMP now immediately

b. Na treksis tora amesos!  
SBJV run now immediately

‘Run right now!’  
commands, invitations, advice,...

Oikonomou 2016:(59a,b)

(10) Slovenian

a. Pojdi levo!  
go.IMP left

b. Da mi greš levo!  
that 1.DAT go.2 left

‘Go left!’  
only command(-like);

 daunting directive (von Fintel & Iatridou 2017)

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

**Finding:** Distribution of forms is constrained
- main clause: by function (committing/asking)
- embedded: by subject obviation
Commitment: ‘\(x\) should...!’

(11) 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 \(x\) . . . ?’

(12) 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
(13) Anyone but attitude holder

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

(14) *Rekel si, da več telovadi.

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

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

(Stegovec 2018)
Directive obviation in indirect speech

(13) Anyone but attitude holder

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

(14) *Rekel si_i, da več telovadi_j.

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

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

(15) Rekel si_i, da moraš_j več telovadit.

   said.M are.2 that should.2 more exercise.INF
   ‘You; said that you; should exercise more.’
Directive obviation is a matter of grammar

- Something about directives (imperatives, directive *naj*-clauses) blocks subjects that refer to speaker/addressee or attitude holder.
- Purely pragmatic account is implausible: self-directing can happen and can be reported.
- Similar patterns:
  - **Interrogative flip** (assertion/question) in dependence of epistemic modals, evidentials, speech act adverbials, . . .
    - Speas & Tenny 2003; Faller 2002, . . .
  - Japanese experiencer predicates (Kuno 1987, McCready 2007, . . .)
  - Subject obviation with subjunctives under verbs of directing and desiring
  - Conjunct-disjunct agreement systems
  - . . .
Compare 1: Standard subject obviation

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

\[ \text{SUBJ}_i \{ \text{want, hope, insist, . . .} \} \left[ \text{SUBJ}_i \ldots \text{VERB}_{\text{Subjunctive}} \ldots \right] \]

(16) a. Je veux partir.
   I want leave.INF
   ‘I want to leave.’

b. *Je veux que je parte.
   I want that I leave.SUBJ

- Third way: – Semantic incompatibility?
  Extend semantic account for directive obviation as following
Overall pattern of perspectival obviation resembles *conjunct-disjunct agreement*, e.g. Newari (Sino-Tibetan):

Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018

- Main clause, commitment (assertion):

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

  a. *ji* ana wan-ā.
     1P.ABS there go-PST.CONJ.
     ‘I went there.’

  b. *cha* ana wan-a.
     you.ABS there go-PST.DISJ
     ‘You went there.’

  c. *wa* ana wan-a
     (s)he.ABS there go-PST.DISJ
     ‘(S)he went there.’

Compare 2: Conjunct-Disjunct Marking

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

Hale 1980, Wechsler 2018, Zu 2018

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

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

  a. ji ana wan-a $\vbar$. \\
  l.ABS there go-PST.DISJ Q \\
  ‘Did I go there?’

  b. cha ana wan-\(\overline{a}\) $\vbar$. \\
  you.ABS there go-PST.CONJ Q \\
  ‘Did you go there?’

  c. wā ana wan-a $\vbar$. \\
  (s)he.ABS there go-PST.DISJ Q \\
  ‘Did (s)he go there?’

Compare 2: Conjunct-Disjunct Marking

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

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

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

  a. \(\text{wō}: [\text{wa ana wan-ā dhakā}:] dhā\)
     \((s)\text{he.ERG (s)he there go-PST.CONJ that said}\)
     \(\text{‘(S)he}_i\text{ said that (s)he}_i,∗_j\text{ went there.’}\)

  b. \(\text{wō}: [\text{wa ana wan-a dhakā}:] dhā\)
     \((s)\text{he.ERG (s)he there go-PST.DISJ that said}\)
     \(\text{‘(S)he}_i\text{ said that (s)he}_i,∗_j\text{ went there.’}\)
Compare 2: Conjunct-Disjunct Marking

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

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

Additionally, in Newari: subject of conjunct sentence has to control the event intentionally. (Zu 2015)
Director is represented syntactically: **perspectival PRO**


Perspectival PRO is bound by speech act operator (Commit, Question; Pearson 2015) or matrix predicate.

Binding domain of subject contains perspectival PRO

⇒ Directive 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:

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

Alternative (this talk): Semantic infelicity (independent of Condition B).
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Newari rhetorical questions behave like declaratives Hale 1980:(100), Zu 2018

(20) a. ji ana wan-ā?
   I there go-PST.CONJ
   ‘Did I go there?’ (=Of course I did not.)

b. cha ana wan-a
   you there go-PST.DISJ
   ‘Did you go there?’ (=Of course you did not.)

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

   Wilson & Sperber 1988: Omotic (Southern Ethiopia);
   Kaufmann & Poschmann 2013: %German

(21) Wo stell den Blumentopf (schon) hin?
    where put.IMP the flower.pot DISCPart VERBPart
    ‘Come on, where should you put that flower pot? (It’s obvious.)’

Suggests: rhetorical questions keep the speaker as the perspectival center.
Contextual factors and scope marking questions

can shift information seeking questions to non-addressee perspective

Scope marking questions: Dayal 1994

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

Slovenian
Stegovec 2017

(23) a. Ti na fas avrio?
what SUBJ eat.2 tomorrow?
‘What could you eat tomorrow?’ (deciding together)

Greek
Oikonomou 2016:34

b. Ti gnomi ehi i mama? Na pas sto parti?
What opinion has the mom SUBJ go.2 at-the party
‘Whats your moms opinion? Can/Should you go to the party?’
Rising directives

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

(24) 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 tune calls off speaker commitment, imperative content placed on the Table

- Perspectival center -?
Obviation effects are alleviated in the absence of control
Ruwet 1989, Farkas 1988, 1992; Szabolcsi 2010

Non-agentive complements,

(25) Je veux que je sois très amusant ce soir.
I want for me to be quite amusing tonight. Ruwet 1989:(68a)

Dependence on others (including focus on low subject),...
Szabolcsi 2010:4

(26) Je veux que tu partes et que je reste.
I want for you to go and for me to stay. Ruwet 1989:(49)
Lack of control in commitment directives

- Directive Greek *na*-subjunctives obviate; (27) acceptable if speaker lacks control over when they wake up:
  
  \[(27) \text{Avrio} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{ksipniso stis} \quad 6:00\text{am.}
  \]
  
  Tomorrow $\text{NA}$ wake.1Sg at 6:00am.
  ‘Tomorrow I should wake up at 6:00am.’

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

- Directives (imperatives & directive subjunctives):
  - used by Director D to influence actions of Agent $\alpha$ to verify prejacent $\phi$

  ➤ directive speech act

- Canonical imperative in directive use:
  - Director = utterance speaker
  - Agent $\alpha$ = utterance addressee

- Directive speech acts are useful only if
  - D does not take $\phi$ for granted
    ➤ Epistemic Uncertainty Condition (EUC)
  - D possesses authority
    ➤ Epistemic Authority Condition (EAC)
    + Decisive Modality (DM)

- For starters: matrix imperatives in directive uses.
Descriptive and performative modal verbs

Kamp 1973

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

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

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

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

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

Evidence for performativity: Kaufmann 2012

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

Imperatives are similar to declaratives with performative modals:

(31) Clean up your desk now!
≈ You must clean up your desk now!

\[\text{no distancing by } S: \#‘\ldots\text{but I absolutely don’t want you to do this.’}\]

\[\text{no natural rejection for } A: ‘\text{That’s not true.’}\]

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

Kamp 1973, Schulz 2003
Context decides if modalized declaratives are used descriptively (descriptive context) or performatively (performative context).

Imperatives contain an operator $OP_{Imp}$ similar to must:

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

Assumptions:
Imperatives carry presuppositions that constrain their felicitous use to performative contexts.
Modal logic for modals and directives

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

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

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

Derived belief relations:

- **Mutual joint belief $\Box^{CG}$**
  - indexed for transitive closure of $B_S \cup B_A$ for Speaker and Addressee
  - Stalnaker 2002

- **Public Belief**: Individual $a$ is publicly committed to believing $p$:
  $$\Box^{PB_a} p := \Box^{CG} \Box^{B_a} p$$

(32) If $\phi$ translates to $p$,
  a. $\text{must}^R \phi$ translates to $\Box^R p$
  b. imperative $\phi^R!$ (also: $\text{OP}_{Imp}^R \phi$) translates to $\Box^R p$
Performative contexts


(33) $\square^R \text{close(you, the-door)}$

a. You have to close the door!
b. Close the door!

Characterization of performative contexts:

(DM) Decisive Modality

(EAC) Epistemic Authority Condition

(EUC) Epistemic Uncertainty Condition
Decisive Modality (DM)

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

- $\Delta$ is a decision problem for an agent $\alpha$ iff for all $q \in \Delta$, $\text{control}(\alpha, q)$, where $\text{control}(\alpha, q) := \text{try}(\alpha, q) \rightarrow \text{cause}(\alpha, q)$

  Kaufmann & Kaufmann 2012

- $R$ being the decisive modality implies:
  - If $\Box^R q$, no participant has an effective preference against $q$.  
    Condoravdi & Lauer 2012
  - 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 $q$. 
(EAC) Authority Condition
S has perfect knowledge of R:
For any $p \in \Delta$: $\square^R p \leftrightarrow \square^B \square^R p$.

(EUC) Epistemic Uncertainty Condition
In uttering Modal $p$ or $p!$, S holds possible both $p$ and $\neg p$.
$\Diamond^B p \land \Diamond^B \neg p$
Generalizing to directives

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

- **Director** has epistemic authority (EAC) and uncertainty (EUC)
  
  \((\text{Matrix, committed directives: Speaker})\)

- **Instigator** is in control if \(\Delta\) is a decision problem
  
  \((\text{Matrix, committed directives: Addressee})\)

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

- Reported speech: binding of presuppositions to parameters of reported event.

- Directive speakers become publicly committed to believing that EAC, EUC, and DM are mutual joint belief.
Directive obviation as a clash in discourse commitments

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

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

**Proof:**

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

(34)   Director = Instigator = Actual speaker
   a. *Naj pomagam.
      *I should help
   b. *no designated 1pExcl imperative verb forms

(35)   Director = Instigator = Matrix subject referent
         (speaker in reported event)
   a. *I said that I should . . .
   b. *You said that you should/V.IMP.2p . . .
   c. (S)he; said that (s)he, *i should . . .

1  □^{PB_D} □^R p
   Committing utterance (Gunlogson 2003, Farkas & Bruce 2009, a.o.)

2  □^{PB_D} □^{BD} □^R p
   (Def. of PB/EAC)

3  □^{PB_D} p
   (Director’s Anticipation)

4  ◊^{PB_D} p \land ◊^{PB_D} \neg p
   (EUC)

5  □^{PB_D} p \land \neg □^{PB_D}
   (3,4; \xi)
(36) Matrix interrogative: Director = Instigator = Actual Addressee

a. *Should you go...? 

1. \{\Box^R p, \neg \Box^R p\}  
   (or strengthened to \{\Box^R p, \Box^R \neg p\})

2. \Box^{PS} (\Box^R p \lor \neg \Box^R p)  
   Interrogative speaker commitment

3. \Box^{PS} ((\Box^R p \land \Box^{BD} p) \lor \neg \Box^R p)  
   EAC (and K)

4. \Box^{PS} ((\Box^R p \land \Box^{BD} p \land \neg \Box^{BD} p) \lor \neg \Box^R p)  
   EUC (and K)

5. Unstrengthened, S committed to negative answer; strengthened: both answers impose conflicting commitments)
Rising directives

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

Portner 2018, Rudin 2018

(37) a. Help him (maybe)?
    b. Pomagaj? Slovenian

‘Should you help him?’

Proposal:

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

(38) a. \( R^{DBS,A} := B^S \cap B^A \) Fagin & al. 1995
    b. \( \Box^{DBS,A} \Box^R p \leftrightarrow \Box^R p \)

- Instigator = A (≠ S+A)
  - No Director’s Anticipation (so, no obviation)
Outline

1 Introduction

2 Directive obviation as evidence for a perspectival center

3 Contextual assumptions affect obviation effects

4 Directive obviation as a semantic conflict

5 Subjects and Instigators
   - Subjects
   - Wish-Imperatives

6 Conclusions etc.
Back to directive participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Discourse Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instigator</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

English subjects in morphosyntactic canonical imperatives:

(39) a. \{\emptyset, 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 addresseee:


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

(41) Rain! Don’t rain!

(42) English 2p imperative subjects:
   When construed as a quantifier, if there is a non-empty set of addressees, the domain of the imperative subject contains at least one of them.
Subjects of morphosyntactic canonical imperatives

English subjects in morphosyntactic canonical imperatives:

(39)  
   a. \{∅, 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).
Absence of (perceived) addressee control

can allow for Wish-readings


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

but not always

Condoravdi & Lauer 2012

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

‘[…] only if it is taken for granted that speaker and addressee have no influence on the realization of the content.’ Condoravdi & Lauer 2012 – (45a)?

‘wish-imperatives are possible only under settledness’ Kaufmann 2016 – (44a)?
Wish-imperatives

(44)  
  a. Get well soon!  
  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.)
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Conclusions

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

- Korean has a promissive clause type that serves to commit the speaker to carrying out an action. Pak, Portner, Zanuttini 2008
  - Anti-obviation form: Director = Instigator

- Promissives are rare

- \textit{promise}: should select subjunctive but selects indicative, problematic for theories of mood selection. Zanuttini, Pak & Portner 2012
  - Suggestion: \textit{promise} describes an anti-obviation speech act, embedded directive subjunctives signal gap between epistemic authority and control

- Maybe promissives are rare because there is no need to signal non-descriptivity for one’s own actions? (committing to the truth of a future statement under one’s control can happen with a declarative)
Thank you... 
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Canonical imperatives differ cross-linguistically in who ends up being the addressee under embedding:

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

Referent of embedded imperative Subject?
- Korean, Japanese: B (matrix indirect object, \( \approx \) object control)
- Slovenian: utterance addressee
- English: B or utterance addressee

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

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

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


References VII


Adrian Stegovec. Perspectival control and obviation in directive clauses. Natural Language Semantics, t.a.


Anna Szabolcsi. Infinitives vs. subjunctives: What do we learn from obviation and from exemptions from obviation. Ms. NYU, 2010.


