

Tracking presumed control

Magdalena Kaufmann, University of Connecticut
magdalena.kaufmann@uconn.edu

Agency and Intentions in Language 2, Jan 12-14, 2022

Language to guide action

- Most languages mark clausal form types that seem designated for directive speech acts (Sadock and Zwicky, 1985; Aikhenvald, 2010)

Language to guide action

- Most languages mark clausal form types that seem designated for directive speech acts (Sadock and Zwicky, 1985; Aikhenvald, 2010)
 - Imperatives (canonical morphosyntactic imperatives)

Language to guide action

- Most languages mark clausal form types that seem designated for directive speech acts (Sadock and Zwicky, 1985; Aikhenvald, 2010)
 - Imperatives (canonical morphosyntactic imperatives)
 - Further directives: surrogate imperatives (subjunctives, infinitivals, participles, ...)

Language to guide action

- Most languages mark clausal form types that seem designated for directive speech acts (Sadock and Zwicky, 1985; Aikhenvald, 2010)
 - Imperatives (canonical morphosyntactic imperatives)
 - Further directives: surrogate imperatives (subjunctives, infinitivals, participles, ...)
- Intuition: agency & intention matter

Language to guide action

- Most languages mark clausal form types that seem designated for directive speech acts (Sadock and Zwicky, 1985; Aikhenvald, 2010)
 - Imperatives (canonical morphosyntactic imperatives)
 - Further directives: surrogate imperatives (subjunctives, infinitivals, participles, ...)
- Intuition: agency & intention matter
- Semantic challenge: what is encoded in these forms?
Syntactic challenge: how is it encoded?

Language to guide action

- Most languages mark clausal form types that seem designated for directive speech acts (Sadock and Zwicky, 1985; Aikhenvald, 2010)
 - Imperatives (canonical morphosyntactic imperatives)
 - Further directives: surrogate imperatives (subjunctives, infinitivals, participles, ...)
- Intuition: agency & intention matter
- Semantic challenge: what is encoded in these forms?
Syntactic challenge: how is it encoded?
- Emerging consensus: compositional build up of imperative meanings (e.g. Zanuttini et al., 2012; Isac, 2015)
- This talk: trying to learn specifically from...
 - A particular crosslinguistically stable non-canonical functions ('wishes')
 - Surrogate imperatives

Outline

Canonical Morphosyntactic Imperatives (CMIs)

Imperatives convey special modality

A closer look at surrogate imperatives (type 2)

Canonical morphosyntactic imperatives (CMIs)

Marked by special verbal inflection, verbal position, absence of overt subject, sentence final particles, . . . (e.g. Aikhenvald, 2010)

- | | | | |
|-----|----|---|----------|
| (1) | a. | Read this book! | English |
| | b. | Kono hon-o yom-e!
this book-ACC read-IMP | Japanese |
| | c. | I chayk-ul ilk-ela.
this book-ACC read-IMP | Korean |
| | d. | Lies dieses Buch!
read.IMP this book | German |
| | e. | Pročitaj ovu knjigu!
read.IMP this book | Serbian |

CMI complication (type 1 surrogate imperatives)

- In some languages, the markers of positive CMIs are incompatible with negation, e.g. infinitivals or subjunctives step in

(2)	a.	Lies! – Lies nicht!	German
		read.IMP2 – read.IMP2 not	
	b.	Leggi! – Non {leggere, *leggi} .	Italian
		read.IMP2 – not read.INF, read.IMP2	
		'Read!' – 'Don't read!'	

CMI complication (type 1 surrogate imperatives)

- In some languages, the markers of positive CMIs are incompatible with negation, e.g. infinitivals or subjunctives step in

(2)	a.	Lies! – Lies nicht!	German
		read.IMP2 – read.IMP2 not	
	b.	Leggi! – Non {leggere, *leggi} .	Italian
		read.IMP2 – not read.INF, read.IMP2	
		'Read!' – 'Don't read!'	

- Same functional profile: positive and negative answer to 'Should I read?'
⇒ For semantic-pragmatic purposes, type 1 surrogate imperatives belong to CMIs

CMI complication (type 1 surrogate imperatives)

- In some languages, the markers of positive CMIs are incompatible with negation, e.g. infinitivals or subjunctives step in

(2)	a.	Lies! – Lies nicht!	German
		read.IMP2 – read.IMP2 not	
	b.	Leggi! – Non {leggere, *leggi} .	Italian
		read.IMP2 – not read.INF, read.IMP2	
		'Read!' – 'Don't read!'	

- Same functional profile: positive and negative answer to 'Should I read?'
⇒ For semantic-pragmatic purposes, type 1 surrogate imperatives belong to CMIs
- Syntactic phenomenon (provides crucial information about compositional encoding)

(Zanuttini, 1997; Zeiljstra, 2006; Isac, 2015, a.o.)

CMIs in prototypical use (command)

(3) [Speaker S to addressee A:] Close the door!

CMLs in prototypical use (command)

(3) [Speaker S to addressee A:] Close the door!

- (Intuitively:) When uttering (3) as a command, Speaker S conveys:

CMI in prototypical use (command)

(3) [Speaker S to addressee A:] Close the door!

- (Intuitively:) When uttering (3) as a command, Speaker S conveys:
 - S wants that A closes the door (**preference**)

CMLs in prototypical use (command)

(3) [Speaker S to addressee A:] Close the door!

- (Intuitively:) When uttering (3) as a command, Speaker S conveys:
 - S wants that A closes the door (**preference**)
 - S thinks A can bring it about that the door is closed (**presumed control**)

CMLs in prototypical use (command)

(3) [Speaker S to addressee A:] Close the door!

- (Intuitively:) When uttering (3) as a command, Speaker S conveys:
 - S wants that A closes the door (**preference**)
 - S thinks A can bring it about that the door is closed (**presumed control**)
 - S thinks A wouldn't necessarily close the door if not for S's utterance (**epistemic uncertainty**)

CMLs in prototypical use (command)

(3) [Speaker S to addressee A:] Close the door!

- (Intuitively:) When uttering (3) as a command, Speaker S conveys:
 - S wants that A closes the door (**preference**)
 - S thinks A can bring it about that the door is closed (**presumed control**)
 - S thinks A wouldn't necessarily close the door if not for S's utterance (**epistemic uncertainty**)
 - S thinks that (if nothing unforeseen interferes), in response to S's utterance, A will try to bring it about that the door gets closed (**decisiveness**)

CMLs in prototypical use (command)

(3) [Speaker S to addressee A:] Close the door!

- (Intuitively:) When uttering (3) as a command, Speaker S conveys:
 - S wants that A closes the door (**preference**)
 - S thinks A can bring it about that the door is closed (**presumed control**)
 - S thinks A wouldn't necessarily close the door if not for S's utterance (**epistemic uncertainty**)
 - S thinks that (if nothing unforeseen interferes), in response to S's utterance, A will try to bring it about that the door gets closed (**decisiveness**)
- Theories of imperatives differ widely in which of these they take to be conventionally encoded (semantics) and how others can be derived pragmatically
(Overviews Han, 2011; Portner, 2016; Fox, 2015; Charlow, 2014b; Kaufmann, 2021)

CMIIs are functionally promiscuous

CMIIs are functionally promiscuous

- (Disinterested) advice (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
 - (4) A: How do I get to Harlem? – B: Take the A-train.

CMIIs are functionally promiscuous

- (Disinterested) advice (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
(4) A: How do I get to Harlem? – B: Take the A-train.
- Invitation/'Permission' (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
(5) Have a seat.

CMIIs are functionally promiscuous

- (Disinterested) advice (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)

(4) A: How do I get to Harlem? – B: Take the A-train.

- Invitation/'Permission' (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)

(5) Have a seat.

- Acquiescence (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)

von Fintel and Iatridou 2017

(6) A: I'm cold, can I close the window? – B: Sure, (go ahead), close it.

CMI are functionally promiscuous

- (Disinterested) advice (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
(4) A: How do I get to Harlem? – B: Take the A-train.
- Invitation/'Permission' (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
(5) Have a seat.
- Acquiescence (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
von Fintel and Iatridou 2017
(6) A: I'm cold, can I close the window? – B: Sure, (go ahead), close it.
- Imperative wishes/Settled wishes (no control; A can be absent)
(7) Please be rich!

CMI are functionally promiscuous

- (Disinterested) advice (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
(4) A: How do I get to Harlem? – B: Take the A-train.
- Invitation/'Permission' (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
(5) Have a seat.
- Acquiescence (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
von Fintel and Iatridou 2017
(6) A: I'm cold, can I close the window? – B: Sure, (go ahead), close it.
- Imperative wishes/Settled wishes (no control; A can be absent)
(7) Please be rich!
- ✗Assertions #That's (not) true; #S made an assertion.

CMI are functionally promiscuous

- (Disinterested) advice (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
(4) A: How do I get to Harlem? – B: Take the A-train.
- Invitation/'Permission' (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
(5) Have a seat.
- Acquiescence (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)
von Fintel and Iatridou 2017
(6) A: I'm cold, can I close the window? – B: Sure, (go ahead), close it.
- Imperative wishes/Settled wishes (no control; A can be absent)
(7) Please be rich!
- ✗Assertions #That's (not) true; #S made an assertion.

CMI's are functionally promiscuous

- (Disinterested) advice (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)

(4) A: How do I get to Harlem? – B: Take the A-train.

- Invitation/'Permission' (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)

(5) Have a seat.

- Acquiescence (no speaker preference, ✓neutral)

von Fintel and Iatridou 2017

(6) A: I'm cold, can I close the window? – B: Sure, (go ahead), close it.

- Imperative wishes/Settled wishes (no control; A can be absent)

(7) Please be rich!

- ✗Assertions #That's (not) true; #S made an assertion.

Crosslinguistically recurring spectrum

(e.g. Davies, 1986; Schwager, 2006; Kaufmann, 2012; Aikhenvald, 2010; von Fintel and Iatridou, 2017; Kaufmann and Tamura, 2020)

Theoretical takes

- Imperatives denote *action terms*

kristen segerberg 1989; Barker 2012

Theoretical takes

- Imperatives denote *action terms*

kristen seegerberg 1989; Barker 2012

- Imperatives denote *properties* (possibly plus use conditions)

Hausser 1980; Portner 2005, 2007; von Stechow and Trudgill 2017,...

Theoretical takes

- Imperatives denote *action terms*

kristen seegerberg 1989; Barker 2012

- Imperatives denote *properties* (possibly plus use conditions)

Hausser 1980; Portner 2005, 2007; von Stechow and Trudgill 2017,...

- Imperatives express (a certain kind of) *preferences*.

Bierwisch 1980; Condoravdi and Lauer 2012; Starr 2020,...

Theoretical takes

- Imperatives denote *action terms*
krister segerberg 1989; Barker 2012
- Imperatives denote *properties* (possibly plus use conditions)
Hausser 1980; Portner 2005, 2007; von Stechow and Trudgill 2017,...
- Imperatives express (a certain kind of) *preferences*.
Bierwisch 1980; Condoravdi and Lauer 2012; Starr 2020,...
- Imperatives express *modal* propositions, but come with extra conditions on felicitous use (presuppositions)
Schwager 2006; Kaufmann 2012; Crnič and Trinh 2009; Grosz 2009; Oikonomou 2016; Francis t.a.,...

Theoretical takes

- Imperatives denote *action terms*
kristen segerberg 1989; Barker 2012
- Imperatives denote *properties* (possibly plus use conditions)
Hausser 1980; Portner 2005, 2007; von Stechow and Trudgill 2017,...
- Imperatives express (a certain kind of) *preferences*.
Bierwisch 1980; Condoravdi and Lauer 2012; Starr 2020,...
- Imperatives express *modal* propositions, but come with extra conditions on felicitous use (presuppositions)
Schwager 2006; Kaufmann 2012; Crnič and Trinh 2009; Grosz 2009; Oikonomou 2016; Francis t.a.,...
- Combinations of sorts:
quantifiers over worlds (Han, 1999), future contingencies (Eckardt, 2011),
properties of plan sets (Charlow, 2014a), modal properties (Roberts, 2015),...

Wish imperatives are interesting. . .

- Remain a problem for all existing theories

Wish imperatives are interesting. . .

- Remain a problem for all existing theories
- Could help us tease apart different types of directives

Wish imperatives are interesting. . .

- Remain a problem for all existing theories
- Could help us tease apart different types of directives
- (Very naively:) 'quasi-intentions' (-?)

Wish imperatives don't come for free

'[...] *only if it is taken for granted that speaker and addressee have no influence on the realization of the content.*'

Condoravdi & Lauer 2012

- Settledness works

(skeptic: Dan Harris, p.c./?)

- (8)
- Please have the keys with you!
 - Please don't have broken another vase!
 - Please be rich!

Wish imperatives don't come for free

'[...] *only if it is taken for granted that speaker and addressee have no influence on the realization of the content.*' Condoravdi & Lauer 2012

- Settledness works (skeptic: Dan Harris, p.c./?)

- (8)
- Please have the keys with you!
 - Please don't have broken another vase!
 - Please be rich!

- Absence of perceived influence is not sufficient: limited inventory of well-wishes

- (9)
- Get well soon!
 - Have a good life!
 - Get work done on the train! Command, #Wish
 - [non-committee member after filing:] Get tenure! Command, #Wish

Wish imperatives don't come for free

'[...] *only if it is taken for granted that speaker and addressee have no influence on the realization of the content.*' Condoravdi & Lauer 2012

- Settledness works (skeptical: Dan Harris, p.c./?)

- (8)
- Please have the keys with you!
 - Please don't have broken another vase!
 - Please be rich!

- Absence of perceived influence is not sufficient: limited inventory of well-wishes

- (9)
- Get well soon!
 - Have a good life!
 - Get work done on the train! Command, #Wish
 - [non-committee member after filing:] Get tenure! Command, #Wish

- Absence of addressee works (soliloquy with imagined addressee; with and without settledness):

- (10)
- Please jump!!!! [Watching anxious friend on diving board from afar]
 - Please be there!

- (11) Please don't be dead, Ginny! J. K. Rowling

Outline

Canonical Morphosyntactic Imperatives (CMIs)

Imperatives convey special modality

A closer look at surrogate imperatives (type 2)

Practical imperatives express relational prioritizing modality

prioritizing: deontic, bouletic, teleological; Portner (2007)

- Speaker (= **director**) singles out one course of events/states of affairs as preferable according to the contextually relevant set of criteria (**modal flavor**)...

Practical imperatives express relational prioritizing modality

prioritizing: deontic, bouletic, teleological; Portner (2007)

- Speaker (= **director**) singles out one course of events/states of affairs as preferable according to the contextually relevant set of criteria (**modal flavor**)...
- [**practical cases** = everything other than wishes]
... for the addressee (= **instigator**) to bring about [**presumed control**].

CMI subjects are second person

CMI subjects are second person subjects that can remain covert

(Aikhenvald, 2010)

- (12) Geh (du) hinein.
go.IMP (you) in
'(You) go in!'

German

- (13) a. Wash yourself.
b. Everyone₁ raise { his₁ / your₁ } hand.

- (14) Geh da mal keiner hinein.
Go.IMP2Sg there QPart nobody in
'Nobody (of you) go in.'

- (15) a. {Omae ga, *kare ga } ugok-e
you NOM he NOM move-IMP
'YOU move.' / int. 'HE move'
b. { Dare ka , Minna ga } ugok-e
Somebody everybody move-IMP
'Somebody / everybody (of you) move!'

Japanese

(Kaufmann and Tamura, 2020)

CMI subjects are second person

CMI subjects are second person subjects that can remain covert

(Aikhenvald, 2010)

- (12) Geh (du) hinein.
go.IMP (you) in
'(You) go in!'

German

- (13) a. Wash yourself.
b. Everyone₁ raise { his₁ / your₁ } hand.

- (14) Geh da mal keiner hinein.
Go.IMP2Sg there QPart nobody in
'Nobody (of you) go in.'

- (15) a. {Omae ga, *kare ga } ugok-e
you NOM he NOM move-IMP
'YOU move.' / int. 'HE move'
b. { Dare ka , Minna ga } ugok- e
Somebody everybody move-IMP
'Somebody / everybody (of you) move!'

Japanese

(Kaufmann and Tamura, 2020)

- Evidence for clause-type specific representation of addressee

(Zanuttini, 2008; Isac, 2015)

CMI subjects are second person

CMI subjects are second person subjects that can remain covert

(Aikhenvald, 2010)

- (12) Geh (du) hinein.
go.IMP (you) in
'(You) go in!'

German

- (13) a. Wash yourself.
b. Everyone₁ raise { his₁ / your₁ } hand.

- (14) Geh da mal keiner hinein.
Go.IMP2Sg there QPart nobody in
'Nobody (of you) go in.'

- (15) a. {Omae ga, *kare ga } ugok-e
you NOM he NOM move-IMP
'YOU move.' / int. 'HE move'
b. { Dare ka , Minna ga } ugok- e
Somebody everybody move-IMP
'Somebody / everybody (of you) move!'

Japanese

(Kaufmann and Tamura, 2020)

- Evidence for clause-type specific representation of addressee

(Zanuttini, 2008; Isac, 2015)

- Quantify over (sub)set of addressees

(Kaufmann, 2012)

Presumed control does not come from the core proposition

Building on data with *want*, Szabolcsi (2004, 2010); Goncharov (2020)

- (16) Accidentally bump into him. *coercion*
≈ 'bump into him and pretend it happened accidentally'
- (17) Don't accidentally amputate the healthy leg.
≈ 'Prevent an accident of amputating the healthy leg'

Positive polarity items (*someone*) track absence of (presumed) control:

- (18) a. I don't want to shoot anyone.
b. I don't want to shoot someone.
- (19) a. Don't shoot anyone!
✓avoid intentional evil, ✓prevent accident
- b. Don't shoot someone!
✗avoid intentional evil, ✓prevent accident

Declaratives with (deontic) modals can be...

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

(20) You have to call your mother. *[that's what she said]*

Declaratives with (deontic) modals can be...

- **descriptive:**

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

(20) You have to call your mother. [*that's what she said*]

- **performative:**

issuing permissions, commands, recommendations,...

(21) You must clean up your desk now!

Evidence for performativity:

Kaufmann 2012

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

Declaratives with (deontic) modals can be...

- **descriptive:**

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

(20) You have to call your mother. [*that's what she said*]

- **performative:**

issuing permissions, commands, recommendations,...

(21) You must clean up your desk now!

Evidence for performativity:

Kaufmann 2012

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

Declaratives with (deontic) modals can be...

- **descriptive:**

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

(20) You have to call your mother. [*that's what she said*]

- **performative:**

issuing permissions, commands, recommendations,...

(21) You must clean up your desk now!

Evidence for performativity:

Kaufmann 2012

(22) a. #That's (not) true! [*That's not true*-test]

b. #... but I (absolutely) don't want you to do this. [Distancing
Ban]

- Modals are used descriptively or performatively depending on the context

Kamp 1973; Schulz 2003

Imperative clauses contain a modal operator ImpOP(\approx *must/should*)

but are **felicitous only in contexts for performative modality**

Interpreting modals and directives

- Prioritizing modals and imperatives are indexed for the contextually salient prioritizing modal flavor R

Interpreting modals and directives

- Prioritizing modals and imperatives are indexed for the contextually salient prioritizing modal flavor R

- (23)
- a. You must close the door!
 - b. Close the door!

Interpreting modals and directives

- Prioritizing modals and imperatives are indexed for the contextually salient prioritizing modal flavor R

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

– both translate to: \square^R close(you,the-door)

Interpreting modals and directives

- Prioritizing modals and imperatives are indexed for the contextually salient prioritizing modal flavor R

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

- both translate to: $\Box^R \text{close}(\text{you}, \text{the-door})$
- the proposition expressed in a context c is true at a world w iff the addressee $_c$ closes the door in all w' s.t. w' is R_c -accessible from w .

- Modals '*must* ϕ '
is used performatively in a **performative context**, else, it is used descriptively.

- Modals '*must* ϕ '
is used performatively in a **performative context**, else, it is used descriptively.
- Imperative 'ImpOP ϕ '
presupposes that the context is performative (by uttering an imperative, the speaker is publicly committed to believing that their context has the required properties).

Performative contexts for 2p modals and imperatives

- EAC and EUC are mutual joint belief:

Performative contexts for 2p modals and imperatives

- EAC and EUC are mutual joint belief:

(EAC) Epistemic Authority Condition

Director (= Speaker) has perfect knowledge of what is necessary w.r.t. salient prioritizing modal flavor R .

Performative contexts for 2p modals and imperatives

- EAC and EUC are mutual joint belief:

(EAC) **Epistemic Authority Condition**

Director (= Speaker) has perfect knowledge of what is necessary w.r.t. salient prioritizing modal flavor R .

(EUC) **Epistemic Uncertainty Condition**

(If not for their current utterance), Director (= Speaker) holds possible ϕ and $\neg\phi$.

Performative contexts for 2p modals and imperatives

- EAC and EUC are mutual joint belief:

(EAC) **Epistemic Authority Condition**

Director (= Speaker) has perfect knowledge of what is necessary w.r.t. salient prioritizing modal flavor R .

(EUC) **Epistemic Uncertainty Condition**

(If not for their current utterance), Director (= Speaker) holds possible ϕ and $\neg\phi$.

- and the context is either

Performative contexts for 2p modals and imperatives

- EAC and EUC are mutual joint belief:

(EAC) **Epistemic Authority Condition**

Director (= Speaker) has perfect knowledge of what is necessary w.r.t. salient prioritizing modal flavor R .

(EUC) **Epistemic Uncertainty Condition**

(If not for their current utterance), Director (= Speaker) holds possible ϕ and $\neg\phi$.

- and the context is either
 - **practical**: it the QUD is a decision problem for the Addressee (= **Instigator**) and contextually salient modal flavor R is **decisive**,
(*to be unpacked*)

Performative contexts for 2p modals and imperatives

- EAC and EUC are mutual joint belief:

(EAC) Epistemic Authority Condition

Director (= Speaker) has perfect knowledge of what is necessary w.r.t. salient prioritizing modal flavor R .

(EUC) Epistemic Uncertainty Condition

(If not for their current utterance), Director (= Speaker) holds possible ϕ and $\neg\phi$.

- and the context is either
 - **practical**: it the QUD is a decision problem for the Addressee (= **Instigator**) and contextually salient modal flavor R is **decisive**,
(to be unpacked)
 - or **expressive**: R encodes the Director's (Speaker's) **effective preferences** (realistic, consistent, Condoravdi and Lauer 2012) and at least one of
(Soliloquy) Speaker is talking to themselves (addressee merely imagined), or
(Settledness) It is mutual joint belief that the prejacent of the imperative is settled

Decisive Modality (DM) (hallmark of practical contexts)

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

Decisive Modality (DM) (hallmark of practical contexts)

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

Decisive Modality (DM) (hallmark of practical contexts)

- Given context set CS (the set of worlds compatible with mutual joint belief) and a salient partition Δ on CS , a modal flavor R is **decisive** iff it constitutes the contextually agreed upon criteria to choose the preferred cell.
- Δ is a decision problem for an **Instigator** α iff for all $q \in \Delta$, $\text{try}(\alpha, q) \cap CS \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{control}(\alpha, q)$, where $\text{control}(\alpha, q) := \text{try}(\alpha, q) \rightarrow \text{cause}(\alpha, q)$
- R being the **decisive modality** in a context c implies:
 - If $\Box^R q$, no participant in c effectively prefers $\neg q$.
 - If Δ is a decision problem for participant α , α tries to find out if $\Box^R q$ for any $q \in \Delta$.
 - If participant α learns that $\Box^R q$ for $q \in \Delta$, α tries to realize q .

Kaufmann and Kaufmann 2012

Note: CONTROL is closely related to RESP

From (Farkas, 1988, p. 36):

'Let us define the responsibility relation as a two-place relation, $RESP(i,s)$, holding between an individual i and a situation s just in case i brings s about, i.e., just in case s is the result of some act performed by i with the intention of bringing it about.'

CMI's are functionally inhomogeneous (practical part)

- Close the door.

practical, R = the speaker's orders

CMI's are functionally inhomogeneous (practical part)

- Close the door.

practical, $R =$ the speaker's orders

CMI's are functionally inhomogeneous (practical part)

- Close the door. practical, R = the speaker's orders
- A: How do I get to Harlem? – B: Take the A-train. practical, R = the addressee's goals
(Disinterested) Advice: no speaker preference (ok: neutral)

CMI's are functionally inhomogeneous (practical part)

- Close the door. practical, R = the speaker's orders
- A: How do I get to Harlem? – B: Take the A-train. practical, R = the addressee's goals
(Disinterested) Advice: no speaker preference (ok: neutral)
- Have a seat. practical, R = the addressee's desires
Invitation: no speaker preference (ok: neutral)
For details, Kaufmann 2012. Alternative: R = speaker's preferences + possibility, Oikonomou 2016

CMI's are functionally inhomogeneous (practical part)

- Close the door. practical, R = the speaker's orders
- A: How do I get to Harlem? – B: Take the A-train. practical, R = the addressee's goals
(Disinterested) Advice: no speaker preference (ok: neutral)
- Have a seat. practical, R = the addressee's desires
Invitation: no speaker preference (ok: neutral)
For details, Kaufmann 2012. Alternative: R = speaker's preferences + possibility, Oikonomou 2016
- A: I'm cold, can I close the window? – B: Sure, (go ahead), close it.
practical, R = the addressee's goals
(Disinterested) Advice: no speaker preference (ok: neutral)

CMIIs are functionally inhomogeneous (expressive part)

CMIIs are functionally inhomogeneous (expressive part)

- Please be rich! expressive, settled, R = the speaker's effective preferences
 Imperative wishes/Settled wishes: no control (note: A can be absent)

CMIIs are functionally inhomogeneous (expressive part)

- Please be rich! expressive, settled, R = the speaker's effective preferences
 Imperative wishes/Settled wishes: no control (note: A can be absent)
- Please jump!!!! expressive, not settled, soliloquy R = the speaker's effective preferences

CMIIs are functionally inhomogeneous (expressive part)

- Please be rich! expressive, settled, R = the speaker's effective preferences
 Imperative wishes/Settled wishes: no control (note: A can be absent)
- Please jump!!!! expressive, not settled, soliloquy R = the speaker's effective preferences
- Speakers become publicly committed to believing the proposition expressed, but not an **assertion** at speech act level (Stalnaker, 1978; Kaufmann, 2019a).

Favorable predictions

- (Practical) imperatives are alternative-sensitive, QUD = set of possible courses of action

Favorable predictions

- (Practical) imperatives are alternative-sensitive, QUD = set of possible courses of action
 - Works in conditionals, makes predictions about their discourse behavior (Kaufmann and Kaufmann, 2021)
- (24)
- a. If you are interested in the topic, attend the talk.
 - b. If you want to learn more about the topic, attend the talk.

Favorable predictions

- (Practical) imperatives are alternative-sensitive, QUD = set of possible courses of action
- Works in conditionals, makes predictions about their discourse behavior (Kaufmann and Kaufmann, 2021)

- (24) a. If you are interested in the topic, attend the talk.
b. If you want to learn more about the topic, attend the talk.

- After generalizing over Director/Instigator (not necessarily actual speaker/addressee), it works for embedded imperatives (Kaufmann, 2012)

- (25) Rekel (ti) je, da mu pomagaj.
said.M (2.DAT) is that 3.M.DAT help.IMP.(2)
'He_i said (to you) that you should help him_{i,k}.'

Slovenian, Sheppard and Golden (2002)

Favorable predictions: obviative modality

- Director = instigator amounts in contradictory commitments: knows and doesn't know that p will happen, (Kaufmann, 2019b)
⇒ Lack of first person imperatives (Quer, 2006; Kempchinsky, 2009)

Favorable predictions: obviative modality

- Director = instigator amounts in contradictory commitments: knows and doesn't know that p will happen, (Kaufmann, 2019b)
⇒ Lack of first person imperatives (Quer, 2006; Kempchinsky, 2009)
- Generalizing director to perspectival center:

Declaratives/directives (commitment)	speaker
Information seeking questions	addressee
Speech/attitude reports	matrix subject

Favorable predictions: obviative modality

- Director = instigator amounts in contradictory commitments: knows and doesn't know that p will happen, (Kaufmann, 2019b)
⇒ Lack of first person imperatives (Quer, 2006; Kempchinsky, 2009)
- Generalizing director to perspectival center:

Declaratives/directives (commitment)	speaker
Information seeking questions	addressee
Speech/attitude reports	matrix subject

⇒ Semantic account of obviation effects, sensitive to presumed control (**mind-boggling meanings**, Szabolcsi 2021; Ruwet 1984, epistemic domain: Constantini 2016)

- (26) Rekel (ti) je, da mu pomagaj.
said.M (2.DAT) is that 3.M.DAT help.IMP.(2)
'He_i said (to you) that you should help him_{i,k}.'
Slovenian, Sheppard and Golden (2002)

- (27) [in front of my bookshelf, time for me to jump to action:]
a. #Naj bodo knjige oragnizirane po abecedi.
SUBJ be books organized by alphabet
'These books should really get organized in alphabetical order.'

Doubts about the disjunction

- Why would this disjunctive meaning (practical vs. expressive) be crosslinguistically stable?

Doubts about the disjunction

- Why would this disjunctive meaning (practical vs. expressive) be crosslinguistically stable?
 - Hope from Greek: Oikonomou (2016) (5.3.1.): true imperatives are not used for wishes like *Get well soon!* (*na-* or *as-*subjunctives instead)

Doubts about the disjunction

- Why would this disjunctive meaning (practical vs. expressive) be crosslinguistically stable?
 - Hope from Greek: Oikonomou (2016) (5.3.1.): true imperatives are not used for wishes like *Get well soon!* (*na-* or *as-*subjunctives instead)
 - Revision: imperative wishes after all (Despina Oikonomou, email May 2018)

(28) [Context: me, after waiting for hours in front of the locked house, seeing my husband approaching, still out of earshot]

- a. ah ehe ta klidja mazi su...
ah have.IMP the keys with you...
'Please have the keys with you!!!'

- Fails to capture the particular flavor of wish-imperatives (to come)

Doubts about the disjunction

- Why would this disjunctive meaning (practical vs. expressive) be crosslinguistically stable?
 - Hope from Greek: Oikonomou (2016) (5.3.1.): true imperatives are not used for wishes like *Get well soon!* (*na-* or *as-*subjunctives instead)
 - Revision: imperative wishes after all (Despina Oikonomou, email May 2018)

(28) [Context: me, after waiting for hours in front of the locked house, seeing my husband approaching, still out of earshot]

- a. ah ehe ta klidja mazi su...
ah have.IMP the keys with you...
'Please have the keys with you!!!'

- Fails to capture the particular flavor of wish-imperatives (to come)

Doubts about the disjunction

- Why would this disjunctive meaning (practical vs. expressive) be crosslinguistically stable?
 - Hope from Greek: Oikonomou (2016) (5.3.1.): true imperatives are not used for wishes like *Get well soon!* (*na-* or *as-*subjunctives instead)
 - Revision: imperative wishes after all (Despina Oikonomou, email May 2018)

(28) [Context: me, after waiting for hours in front of the locked house, seeing my husband approaching, still out of earshot]

- a. ah ehe ta klidja mazi su...
ah have.IMP the keys with you...
'Please have the keys with you!!!'

- Fails to capture the particular flavor of wish-imperatives (*to come*)
- Without Decisive Modality, there is no presumed control, obviation effects should be lacking (*to be checked better*)

Wish-imperatives are 'practical optatives'

- *'I define optative utterance as an utterance that expresses a wish, regret, hope or desire without containing a lexical item that means wish, regret, hope or desire'.* (Grosz, 2011, p.5)

Wish-imperatives are 'practical optatives'

- *'I define optative utterance as an utterance that expresses a wish, regret, hope or desire without containing a lexical item that means wish, regret, hope or desire'.* (Grosz, 2011, p.5)
- Main clause conditional antecedents (crosslinguistically frequent):

(29)	a.	If only he comes in time!	indicative optative
	b.	If only he had come in time!	subjunctive optative

Outline

Canonical Morphosyntactic Imperatives (CMIs)

Imperatives convey special modality

A closer look at surrogate imperatives (type 2)

Surrogate imperatives (type 2)

In many languages, main clause infinitivals, subjunctives, participles can serve some/slightly different functions associated with imperatives:

Surrogate imperatives (type 2)

In many languages, main clause infinitivals, subjunctives, participles can serve some/slightly different functions associated with imperatives:

- Generic instructions

Surrogate imperatives (type 2)

In many languages, main clause infinitivals, subjunctives, participles can serve some/slightly different functions associated with imperatives:

- Generic instructions
- **Strong directives** (command, *advice, *acquiescence, *invitation, *wish, . . .)
von Fintel and Iatridou 2017
E.g. participles: Rooryck and Postma 2007; Heinold 2012

Surrogate imperatives (type 2)

In many languages, main clause infinitivals, subjunctives, participles can serve some/slightly different functions associated with imperatives:

- Generic instructions
- **Strong directives** (command, *advice, *acquiescence, *invitation, *wish, . . .)
von Fintel and Iatridou 2017
E.g. participles: Rooryck and Postma 2007; Heinold 2012
- Non-second person subjects

(32) (her 77a,b)

a. Katharise to trapezi!

clean.IMP2 the table

b. Na katharisis to trapezi.

SUBJ.PRT clean.PRES.2P the table

'Clean the table.'

(33) Na paro ton Niko telefono?

SUBJ.PRT take.1Sg the Nick telephone

'Could/Should I call Nick?', 'Is it ok if i call Nick?'

p. 92

(34) Na paro ena telefono?

SUBJ.PRT take.PRES.1Sg a phone

'Could I make a call?'

fn. 6, p. 93, iv

Surrogate imperatives (type 2)

- Clauses with dependent marking serve as directives

Surrogate imperatives (type 2)

- Clauses with dependent marking serve as directives
- Convergence in literature:
Can be bound by same modal operator/licensing relation with modal feature as occurs in imperatives (a.o. Isac, 2015; Stegovec, 2019; Oikonomou, 2016)

Surrogate imperatives (type 2)

- Clauses with dependent marking serve as directives
- Convergence in literature:
Can be bound by same modal operator/licensing relation with modal feature as occurs in imperatives (a.o. Isac, 2015; Stegovec, 2019; Oikonomou, 2016)
- Embedded subjunctives: modality is anaphoric ('harmonic') to speech event in main clause (Portner, 2003; Kratzer, 2006; Moulton, 2009; Moltmann, 2020, a.o.)

Subjunctive surrogate imperatives: 3p puzzle

True morphosyntactic imperatives have 2p(-ish) subjects, but subjunctives allow for any person value:

(setting aside exhortatives, 1pPI)

- View 1: Surrogate imperatives always place *See to it that...*-obligations on the addressee

(Zanuttini 2008 building on English, Bhojpuri, Italian; Isac 2015)

Subjunctive surrogate imperatives: 3p puzzle

True morphosyntactic imperatives have 2p(-ish) subjects, but subjunctives allow for any person value:

(setting aside exhortatives, 1pPI)

- View 1: Surrogate imperatives always place *See to it that...*-obligations on the addressee

(Zanuttini 2008 building on English, Bhojpuri, Italian; Isac 2015)

- View 2: *See to it that...*-obligations on the addressee tend to arise, but are not part of conventional meaning

(Stegovec 2019 for Slovenian)

It depends on the language: Romanian *să*/Slovenian *naj*

- Choice of action, A in control:

(35) [Context: Teacher to assistant teacher about a rambling student]
'He should really shut up!'/ 'See to it that he shuts up!'; ✓*naj*/✓*să*

It depends on the language: Romanian *să*/Slovenian *naj*

- Choice of action, A in control:

(35) [Context: Teacher to assistant teacher about a rambling student]
'He should really shut up!'/ 'See to it that he shuts up!'; ✓*naj*/✓*să*

- Choice of action, both A and S lack control: (after Ninan 2005 for *must*)

(36) Ma **naj** spremeni ta papež že enkrat svoj pogled na
but NAJ change this pope already one self's view on
kontracepcijo!
contraception
'This pope should really change his view on contraception.'
(not: 'See to it that this pope changes his view on contraception.')

Practical, but Instigator (= the Pope) is a non-participant

(37) [Context: We are watching a rambling politician]

a. El **să** tacă din gură
he SUBJ.PRT shut.up.3Sg of mouth
'See to it that he shuts up.'
(not: 'He should really shut up.')

It depends on the language: Romanian *să*/Slovenian *naj*

- Choice of action, A in control:

(35) [Context: Teacher to assistant teacher about a rambling student]
'He should really shut up!'/ 'See to it that he shuts up!'; ✓*naj*/✓*să*

- Choice of action, both A and S lack control: (after Ninan 2005 for *must*)

(36) Ma **naj** spremeni ta papež že enkrat svoj pogled na
but NAJ change this pope already one self's view on
kontracepcijo!
contraception
'This pope should really change his view on contraception.'
(not: 'See to it that this pope changes his view on contraception.')

Practical, but Instigator (= the Pope) is a non-participant

(37) [Context: We are watching a rambling politician]

a. El **să** tacă din gură
he SUBJ.PRT shut.up.3Sg of mouth
'See to it that he shuts up.'
(not: 'He should really shut up.')

It depends on the language: Romanian *să*/Slovenian *naj*

- Choice of action, A in control:

(35) [Context: Teacher to assistant teacher about a rambling student]
'He should really shut up!'/ 'See to it that he shuts up!'; ✓ *naj*/✓ *să*


- Choice of action, both A and S lack control: (after Ninan 2005 for *must*)

(36) Ma **naj** spremeni ta papež že enkrat svoj pogled na
but NAJ change this pope already one self's view on
kontracepcijo!
contraception
'This pope should really change his view on contraception.'
(not: 'See to it that this pope changes his view on contraception.')

Practical, but Instigator (= the Pope) is a non-participant

(37) [Context: We are watching a rambling politician]

- a. El **să** tacă din gură
he SUBJ.PRT shut.up.3Sg of mouth
'See to it that he shuts up.'
(not: 'He should really shut up.')

Focus on Romanian₁ with *să*= *see to it that* (Daniela Isac; Donka Farkas, p.c.) vs. Romanian₂ (Simona Herdan (p.c.), who confirmed split with further speakers). 

What happens in second person?

- *See to it that*-subjunctives behave like imperatives:

(38) Romanian *să*:

- Inchide ușa!
open.IMP.2Sg door
'Open the door!'
- Să-nchizi ușa
SUBJ.PRT open.SUBJ.2P door
'Open the door'/'you should open the door'

What happens in second person?

- *See to it that*-subjunctives behave like imperatives:

(38) Romanian *să*:

- a. Inhide ușa!
open.IMP.2Sg door
'Open the door!'
- b. Să-nchizi ușa
SUBJ.PRT open.SUBJ.2P door
'Open the door'/'you should open the door'

- *Isac*: more indirect, adds politeness to commands, no detectable difference for invitations or permissions

What happens in second person?

- *See to it that*-subjunctives behave like imperatives:

(38) Romanian *să*:

a. Inhide ușa!
open.IMP.2Sg door
'Open the door!'

b. Să-nchizi ușa
SUBJ.PRT open.SUBJ.2P door
'Open the door'/'you should open the door'

- Isac: more indirect, adds politeness to commands, no detectable difference for invitations or permissions
- Oikonomou observes non-immediacy effect for Greek *na*-subjunctives

What happens in second person?

- *See to it that*-subjunctives behave like imperatives:

(38) Romanian *să*:

- a. Inhide ușa!
open.IMP.2Sg door
'Open the door!'
- b. Să-nchizi ușa
SUBJ.PRT open.SUBJ.2P door
'Open the door'/'you should open the door'

- Isac: more indirect, adds politeness to commands, no detectable difference for invitations or permissions
- Oikonomou observes non-immediacy effect for Greek *na*-subjunctives
- Slovenian 2p *naj*: infelicitous; Stegovec (2019): blocked by imperatives

să -subjunctives and imperatives come apart on wishes

- (39) a. Te rog fii acolo!
please be.Imp2Sg there
'Please be there!!' (✓about future, ✓settled wish)
- b. Te rog să fii acolo
please SUBJ.PRT be.Subj2Sg there
'Please be there!!' (✓about the future, ✗settled wish)

Slovenian: both imperative and *naj*-subjunctives (2p blocked) can be wishes

- (40) O, naj bo prosim pametan!
O, NAJ be.3Sg please smart
'Please let him be smart!'
- (41) O, prosim bodi pametan!
O please be.2SgImp smart
'Please be smart!'

First person subjects: Romanian *să*-subjunctives

First person subjunctives indicate that the addressee is taken to be in control (Isac, 2015, p. 173)

- (42)
- a. ?Eu *să* stau lângă uşă
I SBJ.PRT stay.SUBJ.1Sg near door
'Have me stay by the door!'
 - b. Eu *să* fiu asezat lângă uşă
I SBJ.PRT be.SUBJ.1Sg placed near door
'Place me by the door!'/ 'See to it that I'm placed by the door!'
 - c. Eu *să* cad în picioare!
I SBJ.PRT fall.SUBJ.1SG in feet
'Make me fall on my feet!'

Romanian să

- Data so far confirm Isac's assumption that Romanian directive să-subjunctives **hardwire Addressee = Instigator** (\approx practical imperatives)

Instigator parameter Romanian *să* vs. Slovenian *naj*

To be implemented with anaphoric presuppositions, e.g. (van der Sandt, 1992; Asher and Lascarides, 2003)

(48) Slovenian surrogate imperative *naj*

- a. presupposes $EAC \wedge EUC \wedge$
(expressive or
practical for Instigator x : $x = ?$)
- b. at-issue: $\Box^R p$

(49) Romanian surrogate imperative *să*

- a. presupposes $EAC \wedge EUC \wedge$
practical for Instigator x : $x = ? \wedge (x = A \text{ or } x = S)$
- b. at-issue: $\Box^R p$

(choice of participant S/A: whoever is not the director)

The challenge from settled wishes is up

- Speaker is felt to have an intention, but clearly no plan –
Unless wishing counts as a plan!?

The challenge from settled wishes is up

- Speaker is felt to have an intention, but clearly no plan – Unless wishing counts as a plan!?
- Abuse of practical language to the realm of mere desire? – But why can't we abuse Romanian *see to to it that*-subjunctives?

Summary and to-dos

- Family of directive constructions: close gap between source of selection (knowledge) and control of events

Summary and to-dos

- Family of directive constructions: close gap between source of selection (knowledge) and control of events
- Built compositionally, components differ – inventory, points of variation?

Summary and to-dos

- Family of directive constructions: close gap between source of selection (knowledge) and control of events
- Built compositionally, components differ – inventory, points of variation?
- Wishes have a practical component but not all directives work

Summary and to-dos

- Family of directive constructions: close gap between source of selection (knowledge) and control of events
- Built compositionally, components differ – inventory, points of variation?
- Wishes have a practical component but not all directives work
- Compare surrogate imperatives with their embedded counterparts under different types of predicates

Summary and to-dos

- Family of directive constructions: close gap between source of selection (knowledge) and control of events
- Built compositionally, components differ – inventory, points of variation?
- Wishes have a practical component but not all directives work
- Compare surrogate imperatives with their embedded counterparts under different types of predicates

- MANY THANKS to you all!
For help with data special thanks to: Despina Oikonomou (Greek), Jakob Lenardič, Adrian Stegovec (Slovenian), Donka Farkas, Simona Herdan, Daniela Isac (Romanian).
This work was partially supported by NSF grant #2116972 “Research on conditional and modal language”.

References I

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2010. *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York.
- Asher, Nicholas and Alex Lascarides. 2003. *Logics of Conversation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Barker, Chris. 2012. Imperatives denote actions. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 16*.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1980. Semantic structure and illocutionary force. In Searle, John, editor, *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*, pages 1–35. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Charlow, Nate. 2014a. Logic and semantics for imperatives. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 43: 617–664.
- Charlow, Nate. 2014b. The meaning of imperatives. *Philosophy Compass*, 9:540555.
- Condoravdi, Cleo and Sven Lauer. 2012. Imperatives: Meaning and illocutionary function. In Piñon, Christopher, editor, *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics*, volume 9, pages 1–21.
- Constantini, Francesco. 2016. Subject obviation as a semantic failure: a preliminary account. *Annali di Ca'Foscari. Serie occidentale*, 50:109–131.
- Crnič, Luka and Tue Trinh. 2009. Embedding imperatives in English. In Riester, Arndt and Torgrim Solstad, editors, *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 13*, pages 113–127. University of Stuttgart.
- Davies, Eirlys. 1986. *The English Imperative*. Croom Helm, London.
- Eckardt, Regine. 2011. Imperatives as future plans. In Reich, Ingo, editor, *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 2010*. Universität des Saarlandes.
- Farkas, Donka F. 1988. On obligatory control. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 11:27–58.
- von Fintel, Kai and Sabine Iatridou. 2017. A modest proposal for the meaning of imperatives. In Arregui, Ana, Marisa Rivero, and Andrés Pablo Salanova, editors, *Modality Across Syntactic Categories*, pages 288–319. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Fox, Chris. 2015. The semantics of imperatives. In Lappin, Shalom and Chris Fox, editors, *Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory (2nd ed)*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford and Malden MA, second edition.

References II

- Francis, Naomi. t.a. Imperatives under *even*. In Baird, Maggie, Duygu Göksu, and Jonathan Pesetsky, editors, *Proceedings of the North East Linguistics Society (NELS) 49*, Amherst, MA. GLSA.
- Goncharov, Julie. 2020. Dynamic presupposition of 'want' and polarity sensitivity. *Proceedings of SALT*, 30.
- Grosz, Patrick. 2009. German particles, modality, and the semantics of imperatives. In Lima, S, K Mullin, and B Smith, editors, *The Proceedings of NELS 39*, Amherst, MA. GLSA.
- Grosz, Patrick. 2011. *On the Grammar of Optative Constructions*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- Han, Chung-hye. 1999. Deontic modality, lexical aspect and the semantics of imperatives. In of Korea, The Linguistic Society, editor, *Linguistics in the morning calm*, volume 4. Hanshin Publications, Seoul.
- Han, Chung-hye. 2011. Imperatives. In Portner, Paul, Claudia Maienborn, and Klaus von Heusinger, editors, *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hausser, Roland. 1980. Surface compositionality and the semantics of mood. In Searle, John, Ferenc Kiefer, and Manfred Bierwisch, editors, *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*, volume II, pages 71–95. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Heinold, Simone. 2012. Gut durchlesen! Der deutsche Imperativ und seine funktionalen Synonyme. Ein Vergleich mit dem Finnischen. *Deutsche Sprache*.
- Isac, Daniela. 2015. *The Morphosyntax of Imperatives*. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Kamp, Hans. 1973. Free choice permission. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 74:57–74.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2012. *Interpreting Imperatives*. Springer, Berlin.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2019a. Fine-tuning natural language imperatives. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 29(3). First published online, June 18, 2016.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2019b. Who controls who (or what)? *Proceedings of SALT*, 29:636–664.

References III

- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2021. Imperatives. In Gutzmann, Daniel, Lisa Matthewson, Cécile Meier, Hotze Rullmann, and Thomas Ede Zimmermann, editors, *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Semantics*, pages 1–42. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena and Stefan Kaufmann. 2012. Epistemic particles and performativity. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 22*, pages 208–225.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena and Stefan Kaufmann. 2021. Iffy endorsements. *Journal of Semantics*.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena and Sanae Tamura. 2020. Japanese modality - possibility and necessity: prioritizing, epistemic, and dynamic. In Jacobsen, Wesley and Yukinori Takubo, editors, *The Handbook of Japanese Semantics and Pragmatics*. Moulton de Gruyter.
- Kempchinsky, Paula. 2009. What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive? *Lingua*, 119(12):1788–1810.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2006. Decomposing attitude verbs. Honoring Anita Mittwoch on her 80 th birthday at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem July 4, 2006.
- Moltmann, Friederike. 2020. Truthmaker semantics for natural language: Attitude verbs, modals, and intensional transitive verbs. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 46(3-4):159–200.
- Moulton, Keir. 2009. *Natural Selection and the Syntax of Clausal Complementation*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Ninan, Dilip. 2005. Two puzzles about deontic necessity. In Gajewski, J, V Hacquard, B Nickel, and S Yalcin, editors, *New Work on Modality*, pages 149–178. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, Cambridge, MA.
- Oikonomou, Despina. 2016. *Covert modals in root contexts*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- Portner, Paul. 2003. The semantics of mood. In Cheng, Lisa and Rint Sybesma, editors, *The Second Glot International State-of-the-Article Book*. de Gruyter, Berlin and New York.
- Portner, Paul. 2005. The semantics of imperatives within a theory of clause types. In Watanabe, Kazuha and Robert B. Young, editors, *Proceedings of SALT 14*. CLC Publications, New York.
- Portner, Paul. 2007. Imperatives and modals. *Natural Language Semantics*, 15:351–383.
- Portner, Paul. 2016. Imperatives. In Aloni, Maria and Paul Dekker, editors, *Cambridge Handbook of Formal Semantics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

References IV

- Quer, Josep. 2006. Context shift and indexical variables in sign languages. In Georgala, E and J Howell, editors, *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 15*, pages 152–168. CLC Publications, Ithaca, NY.
- Roberts, Craige. 2015. Conditional plans and imperatives: a semantics and pragmatics for imperative mood. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Amsterdam Colloquium*.
- Rooryck, Johan and Gertjan Postma. 2007. On participial imperatives. In van der Wurff, Wim, editor, *Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar*, pages 273–296. Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Ruwet, Nicolas. 1984. Je veux partir/* je veux que je parte. a propos de la distribution des complétives à temps fini et des compléments à l'infinifit en français. *Cahiers de grammaire*, 7: 75–138.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. and Arnold M. Zwicky. 1985. Speech act distinctions in syntax. In Shopen, T, editor, *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, volume I, pages 155–196. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- van der Sandt, Rob. 1992. Presupposition projection as anaphora resolution. *Journal of Semantics*, 9:333–377.
- Schulz, Kathrin. 2003. You may read it now or later: A case study on the paradox of free choice permission. Master's thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- Schwager, Magdalena. 2006. *Interpreting Imperatives*. PhD thesis, University of Frankfurt.
- kristen segerberg. 1989. Bringing it about. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 18:327–347.
- Sheppard, Milena Milojević and Marija Golden. 2002. (Negative) Imperatives in Slovene. In Barbiers, Sjef, Frits Beukema, and Wim van der Wurff, editors, *Modality and its Interaction with the Verbal System*, volume 47 of *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*, pages 245–260. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 1978. Assertion. In Cole, Peter, editor, *Syntax and Semantics 9*, pages 315–332. Academic Press, New York.
- Starr, Will. 2020. A preference semantics for imperatives. 13. *Semantics & Pragmatics*.

References V

- Stegovec, Adrian. 2019. Perspectival control and obviation in directive clauses. *Natural Language Semantics*, 27(1):47–94.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2004. Positive polarity-negative polarity. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 22:409–452.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2010. Infinitives vs. subjunctives: What do we learn from obviation and from exemptions from obviation. Ms. NYU.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2021. Obviation in Hungarian: what is its scope, and is it due to competition? *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 6(1):57.1–28.
- Zanuttini, Rafaela. 1997. *Negation and Clausal Structure*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 2008. Encoding the addressee in the syntax: evidence from English imperative subjects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 26(1):185–218.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella, Miok Pak, and Paul Portner. 2012. A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 30:1231–1274.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2006. The ban on true negative imperatives. In Bonami, Olivier and Patricia Cabredo Hofherr, editors, *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 6*, pages 405–424.