What is it to be a 1sg Imperative?[1]

Ilya Naumov, HSE, Moscow; 6nv@mail.ru

IATL-34, Ben Gurion University of Negev

8-9 October 2018

1 Setting the stage

1.1 1sg imperative in the big picture

- The canonical (though not the only one) function of the imperative is that of a command directed to the addressee. This is reflected in the fact that in most languages imperative paradigms are restricted to the second person.

- Some languages extend their imperative paradigms to other persons. The rarest person number-combination is the *first-person singular imperative* (Gusev 2013: 54-56).

- Even if a language possesses this form, its distribution is rather constrained:
  - Kuzmenkov (2001) for Mongolian;
  - Malchukov (2001) for Even;
  - Aikhenvald (2010: 73-74) for Manumbu;
  - Oikonomou (2016: 167-168) for Greek;
  - Stegovec (2017, 2018) for Slovenian.

- 1sg imperative is generally banned in root non-interrogative environments and can be used only in questions (cf. (1a) and (1b) from Slovenian)[2].

  (1) a. *Naj mu   pomagam!   b. Naj   mu   pomagam?
         SUB 3.M.DAT   help.1   SUB 3.M.DAT   help.1
         int.: 'I should help him!'   'Should I help him?'

  (Stegovec 2017: 159)

- In principle, it can appear in non-interrogative clauses but only when two conditions are met: (i) a clause must be embedded; (ii) the subject of the imperative must not be coreferent with the matrix subject (2).

  (2) Rekla { je   / *sem },   da   naj   si   pomaga-m
      said.F AUX.3   AUX.1   that SUB   REFL.DAT   help-1
      'She / *I said that I should help myself.'

  (Stegovec 2018: 5)

- The fact that the imperative can be questioned and embedded is unexpected under the traditional view, according to which the imperative is a special clause type (see Zwicky and Sadock 1985; a.o.).

---

[2] It should be noted that in these examples the form of the "subjunctive" is used. This fact does not influence my point. Throughout this talk I will assume, following Oikonomou (2016); Stegovec (2018), that imperative and subjunctive clauses have similar syntactic and semantic properties.

Question: Why is the 1sg imperative licensed in questions and embedded clauses with disjoint reference but banned in root non-interrogatives and embedded clauses with conjoint reference?

1.2 Stegovec's (2018) proposal[3]

- The restriction in (2) is what is known under the term *subject obviation* — a ban on coreference between the matrix subject and the embedded subject (Picallo 1985; Quer 2006).

- This constraint should be viewed more broadly. Namely, what we observe in (1a) can be described in a similar manner: the subject of the imperative and the actual speaker cannot be coreferent.

Generalization: (1) and (2) are manifestations of the same ban on coreference between the subject of the imperative and the *attitude holder* — the matrix subject in embedded contexts and the actual speaker in root non-interrogative contexts or theaddressee in interrogatives.

- This ban results from *Condition B* requirement. Imperatives involve a special kind of modal operator that takes a type *e* element (a "perspectival" *PRO*) that refers to the attitude holder.

  Embedded clauses:
  (3) She$_j$ / *I$_i$ said [that [$PRO_{j/*i}$ $OP_{f(j/*i),g(j/*i)}$ [pro_i GO.IMP/SUBJ]]].
  ≈ She / *I said that I should go.

  Unembedded non-interrogative clauses:
  (4) *SPEAKER$_i$ [PRO_i $OP_{f(i),g(i)}$ [pro_i GO.IMP/SUBJ!]].
  ≈ Intend.: I should go!

  Unembedded interrogative clauses:
  (5) ADDRESSEE$_i$ [PRO_i $OP_{f(i),g(i)}$ [[pro_j GO.IMP/SUBJ?]]
  ≈ Should I go?!

- This operator combines with "centered" conversational backgrounds of type *<e,cb>* restricted to an individual whose is the source of the modality:
  (6) $[[OP]]^c = \lambda f. \lambda g. \lambda p. \lambda x. \lambda w (\forall w' \in O(f_x, g_x, w))[p(w')]$
  a. f_x is the body of information available to *x* in *w*.
  b. g_x are criteria to decide between worlds compliant with f_x endorsed by *x*.

- This analysis accounts for the "speaker distancing ban" — the inability of the speaker of a directive clause to distance herself from a directive speech act (7) (see Kaufmann 2012; Condoravdi & Lauer 2012; Stegovec & Kaufmann 2015).

  (7) Go away! #But I don't want you to.

1.3 Running ahead

- I will consider data from the Chukchi language (Chukotka-Kamchatkan). It has a productive 1sg imperative form (marked by the prefix *m(ə)-*), which can be used not only in interrogatives but also in *non*-interrogatives:

  (8) a. **m**-uswitku-ɣʔe-k   b. **m**-uswitku-ɣʔe-k
      1sg.imp-go.for.water-th-1sg.s   **1sg.imp**-chop-th-1sg.s
      'Should I chop the wood?'   'I will chop the wood!'

- Moreover, this form, as other imperative forms, can embed in several environments. These are, among others, *clauses embedded under desire predicates* (9) and *rationale clauses*(10).

  (9) ətɬəɣə-n   ∅-teɣʔjeŋə-rkən iŋqun **mə**-tejkə-ɣʔe-n   orwoor
      father-nom.sg 2/3.s/a-want-ipfv comp **1sg.imp**-fix-th-3sg.o   sledge
      'The father wants that I should fix the sledge.'

  (10) nota-ɣtə   tə-ɬqətə-k   iŋqun **m**-ətɬʔa-re-rkən
      land-dat   1sg.s/a-leave-1sg.s comp **1sg.imp**-mother-seek-ipfv
      'I went to tundra in order to seek for the mother.'

Puzzle: When the Imperative is embedded under a desire predicate, like in (9), we observe subject obviation. The subject of the Imperative cannot co-refer with the matrix subject (11).

  (11) *tə$_i$-teɣʔjeŋə-rkən   iŋqun   **mə**$_i$-tejkə-ɣʔe-n   orwoor
      1sg.s/a-want-ipfv   comp   **1sg.imp**-fix-th-3sg.o
  sledge
      Int.: 'I want to fix the sledge.'

- In contrast, there is no subject obviation in (8b) and (10). The subject of the Imperative clause is coreferent with the speaker in (8b) and the matrix subject in (10), respectively.

- Moreover, after uttering a clause containing the 1sg imperative, the speaker can distance herself from the speech act by adding that she does not want the realization of the proposition (12).

  (12) **mə**-waŋe-ɣʔa-k   ətrʔes   tə-ʔenqe-rkən
      1sg.imp-sew-th-1sg.s   but   1sg.s/a-not.want-ipfv
      'I will sew, though, I don't want to!'

Summary: In Chukchi clauses containing the 1sg imperative form do not demonstrate subject obviation and allow distancing for their authors.

The rest of the talk:

- Chuckhi data more thoroughly (Section 2).
- Background on desire reports and rationale clauses (Section 3).
- Proposal (Section 4).
- Conclusions and prospects (Section 5).

2 Chukchi data[4]

2.1 Imperative paradigm

- Chukchi is an endangered language spoken in the far North-East of Russia. It has agglutinative morphology, productive verbal and noun incorporation, and a complex system of verbal forms. Chukchi has vowel harmony largely based on height.

- Chukchi possesses a full-fledged synthetic paradigm of the Imperative.

  Table №1. Chukchi Imperative paradigm

Person	SG	PL
1	**m(ə)-**	**mən-**
2	**q(ə)-**	**q(ə)-**
3	**n(ə)-**	**n(ə)-**

- Traditionally, prefixes are considered as cumulative morphemes combining mood with person (see, e.g., Nedjalkov 1994; Dunn 1999). We are interested in the form in the grey cell.

2.2 Semantics of the imperative forms

- The second person imperative form is used for orders (13) and requests (14) directed to the addressee.

  (13) **qə**-qora-ɣərke-rkən   ənqen   **q**-ine-winretə-rkən
       2.imp-reindeer-gather-ipfv   det   **2.imp**-inv-help-ipfv
       'Put the reindeer, help!'

  (14) telʲopkaqaj   anə   **qə**-ɣəwjek-w-i
       T.-dim   well   **2.imp**-wake.up-irr-2/3sg.s
       'Well, Telyopka, wake up!'

- The third person imperative form is used to direct individuals distinct from the participants of the speech act. It also has strong (15) and weak (16) uses.

  (15) ənkʔam   wetɣaw-ŋaw   wiin   ənkə
       and   speak-fem   for.the.moment   there

       opopə   qeeqən   **n**-re-simɣʔu-n-ŋeŋ-ɣʔe-n
       better   a.little.more   **3.imp**-des-think.over-des-get-th-irr.2/3sg.s
       'Let the chatterbox think a little bit more about it!'

  (16) masənan ŋutku   **nə**-wakʔo-twa-rkən   ewət   ∅-teɣʔjeŋə-rkən
       let   here   **3.imp**-sit-be-ipfv   if   2/3./a-want-ipfv
       'Let him sit here if he wants.'

- The first-person plural form is used to express invitation to the addressee(s) to perform an action together with the speaker (17).

(17) ənjiwŋewe   **mən**-pʔoŋ-ŋəta-mək
     aunt.nom   **1pl.imp**-mushroom-search.for-1pl.s
     'Aunt, let's go for mushrooms!'

- This form allows for an *exclusive interpretation* (18)! Stegovec's (2018) analysis predicts that it cannot be possible.

(18) **mən**-ejwət-mək
     1pl.imp-bring.presents-1pl.s
     'We'll bring presents!'

2.3 The distribution of the 1sg Imperative form

- In Chukchi the 1sg Imperative form can be used in questions about permission or obligation (19) (see Naumov & Kozlov 2017 for more data and analysis).

(19) a. **m**-uswitku-ɣʔe-k?   b. iwke   **mə**-qepɬ-uwiswetə-k
     1sg.imp-chop-th-1sg.s   ptcl   **1sg.imp**-ball-play-1sg.s
     'Should I chop the wood?'   'May I play the ball?'

- This form is also very productive in non-interrogatives. Nedjalkov (1994) claims that "it is the principal means of expressing the future action of the speaker". In this function it competes with the future form and yields the inference that the denoted action will take place immediately (cf. (20a) and (20b).

(20) a. tə-**r**-ajmə-ɣʔa   b. **m**-ajmə-ɣʔa-k
     1sg.s/a-**fut**-go.for.water-th   **1sg.imp**-go.for.water-th-1sg.s
     'I will go for water.'   'I will go for water (immediately)!'

- Imperative forms in Chukchi, including the first-person singular, can be embedded in a number of environments. These are, among others, *speech reports* (21), *clauses embedded under desire predicates* (22), and *rationale clauses* (23).

(21) ənan   ɣəm   ∅-in-ik-wʔ-i   iŋqun
     he.ins   I   2/3.s/a-inv-say-th-2/3sg.s   comp

     mə-n-siit-ewə-n   mimɬ
     1sg.imp-tr-heat-vb-3sg.o   water
     'He said that I should heat the water.'

(22) *tə$_i$-teɣʔjeŋə-rkən   iŋqun   **mə$_i$**-tejkə-ɣʔe-n   orwoor
     1sg.s/a-want-ipfv   comp   **1sg.imp**-fix-th-3sg.o
     sledge
     Int.: 'I want to fix the sledge.'

(23) nota-ɣtə   tə$_i$-ɬqətə-k   iŋqun   **m$_i$**-ətɬʔa-re-rkən
     land-dat   1sg.s/a-leave-1sg.s   comp   **1sg.imp**-mother-seek-ipfv
     'I went to tundra in order to seek for the mother.'

Question: Why is the subject obviation observed in desire reports and absent in rationale clauses? In the next Section, I will say more about their syntax and semantics.

3 Desire reports and rationale clauses

3.1 Desire reports

- In the neo-Hintikkan tradition, desire predicates are treated as quantifiers over doxastic alternatives of the subject ordered by a bouletic ordering source (the lexical entry is adapted from von Fintel (1999)):

  (24) [[want]] = $\lambda\,p\,\lambda\,x\,\lambda\,w.\ \forall\,w' \in \text{BEST}_{\text{desire}}(\text{DOX}(x,w))\!: p(w')$

- Kratzer (2006, 2013) and Moulton (2009) develop an alternative analysis according to which the modal meaning comes from covert modals located in the left-periphery of the embedded clause.

- In the spirit of Hacquard (2006, 2010), attitudes are treated as predicates of eventualities:

  (25) [[want]] = $\lambda\,s\,\lambda\,w.\ \text{want}(s)(w)$

- Modals are said to take event-type arguments relativized to the eventuality described by the attitude verb.

- Bogal-Allbritten (2016, 2017) has recently shown empirical evidence from Navajo in favor of this view on attitude ascriptions. Consider a semantics for a desiderative modal she provides[5]:

  (26) $[[\varnothing_{\text{des}}]] = \lambda\,\text{p}.\,\lambda\,\text{s}.\,\lambda\,\text{w}.\ \forall\,w'\!: w' \in \text{des}(s)(w).p(w')$

  <div align="right">from Bogal-Allbritten (2017: 10)</div>

3.2 Rationale clauses

- Rationale clauses provide a teleological explanation for the matrix event. They differ from purpose clauses in that the embedded subject is coreferent with the matrix subject, not the matrix object.

- Nissenbaum (2005a, 2005b) and Grosz (2014) argue that rationale clauses contain a null modal operator.

  (27) Varitek took the A train to go to Harlem.
      LF: [Varitek took the A train [to $\varnothing_{\text{rat}}$ *PRO* go to Harlem]].

- They both share the intuition that the accessibility relation of this modal "does not make reference to an individual's goals, but rather to the goals intrinsic to an event." (Grosz 2014: 275).

  (28) $[[\varnothing_{\text{rat}}]] = \lambda\,p\,\lambda\,e\,\lambda\,w.\ \forall\,w'\!: w'$ is compatible with the goals relevant to e: $p(w')$

  <div align="right">(adapted from Grosz 2014: 275)</div>

---

[5] Bogal-Allbritten (2017) acknowledges that this semantics is simplified. Namely, it ignores the fact that desires are belief-based.

- They differ in how they analyze rationale clauses. Nissenbaum (2005a, 2005b) propose that rationale clauses are predicates of event, while Grosz (2014) implies that they are propositions (possibly further turned into event properties).

4. Proposal

4.1 The nature of the modal operator

- I adopt a modal approach to imperative semantics. Specifically, I assume that imperatives contain a covert modal operator sitting at one of the highest levels of the syntactic structure (Kaufmann 2012; Oikonomou 2016; a.o.).

- Following Kratzer (2006, 2013); Moulton (2009), I assume that the modal meaning of attitude ascriptions comes from covert modals located in the left-periphery of the embedded clause.

- Following Nissenbaum (2005a, 2005b) and Grosz (2014), I assume that rationale clauses contain covert modals which give rise to the semantics of goal-orientedness.

- Imperative modals are suitable candidates for these roles!

Proposal: in Chukchi the Imperative modal is responsible for establishing desiderative modality when embedded under *teɣʔjeŋək* 'want' and teleological modality when used in rationale clauses.

Implementation: The modal operator of the Imperative clauses can take different conversational backgrounds:

(29) a. $[[x$ 'want' $\varnothing_{\text{imp}}\ \phi]]$ →   the modal base of $\varnothing_{\text{imp}}$ is *doxastic*;
                                              the ordering source of $\varnothing_{\text{imp}}$ is *bouletic*.

    b. $[[e$ '(in order) to' $\varnothing_{\text{imp}}\ \phi]]$ →   the modal base of $\varnothing_{\text{imp}}$ is *circumstantial*;
                                              the ordering source $\varnothing_{\text{imp}}$ is *teleological*.

4.2 Teleological and bouletic Imperative: what's the difference?

- In line with Stegovec (2018), I assume that the modal operator in imperative clauses combines with "centered" conversational backgrounds.

- But the imperative modal in Chukchi can have different conversational backgrounds. How does this centering come about?

Proposal: Conversational backgrounds are relativized to an individual when the imperative is embedded under *teɣʔjeŋək* 'want' and to an event when the imperative is used in rationale clauses.

(30) a. $[[x$ 'want' $[\text{Imp}_{f,g}\ \phi]]]$ → $f_{\text{dox}}(x),\ g_{\text{boul}}(x)$ (where f and g are of type $<e,cb>$)

    b. $[[e$ ['(in order) to' $\text{Imp}_{f,g}\ \phi]]]$ → $f_{\text{circ}}(e),\ g_{\text{tel}}(e)$ (where f and g are of type $<v,cb>$)

- In (30a) the modal takes an individual-type *PRO* that refers to the matrix subject, while in (30b) — an event-type *PRO* that refers to the matrix event.

- From a semantic point of view, it captures the need of the modal to be relativized to the source of desires or to the source of goals.

- From a syntactic point of view, it explains why the subject obviation effect is observed only in 'want'-attitudes.

4.3 Root contexts

- It was stated in Section 2 that the 1sg Imperative in Chukchi is productive in root non-interrogative contexts (31).

  (31) **m**-ajmə-ɣʔa-k
  1sg.imp-go.for.water-th-1sg.s
  'I will go for water (immediately)!'

- If the modal operator in root non-interrogatives encoded desiderative modality, it would provoke *Condition B* violation and make the sentence unacceptable.

- Moreover, this form does not demonstrate a ban on "speaker distancing" (32).

  (32) **mə**-waŋe-ɣʔa-k   ətrʔes   tə-ʔenqe-rkən
  1sg.imp-sew-th-1sg.s   but   1sg.s/a-not.want-ipfv
  'I will sew, though, I don't want to!'

Proposal: in root non-interrogative clauses containing verbs with 1sg imperative morphology, the modal operator always takes a circumstantial modal base and a teleological ordering source. These clauses convey goal-oriented modality.

- In these environments, the imperative modal takes an event-type *PRO* that refers to the speech act event. This the reason why there is no *Condition B* violation and the reason why the 1sg Imperative is licensed in root non-interrogatives.

- This is not something special about the 1sg Imperative. This is something special about the modal operator.

- It has already been shown in subsection 2.2 that the 1pl form allows an exclusive interpretation (recall (18)). Interestingly, the second person form is licensed in interrogatives (33).

  (33) **qə**-reqə-ɣ-i?
  2.imp-what.to.do-irr-2/3sg.s
  'What should you do?'

- Within the current approach, these facts are not surprising at all.

5 Conclusions and open ends

- As opposed to imperatives in languages discussed so far, the Chukchi Imperative does not require subject obviation.

8

- In particular, clauses containing the 1sg imperative form are licensed in root non-interrogative contexts and allow distancing for their authors.

- I have argued that the availability of the 1sg Imperative in root non-interrogatives and the absence of the speaker distancing ban is due to the fact that the null argument of the modal operator in imperative clauses can have an event antecedent.

- The semantic type of this argument is determined by conversational backgrounds the modal takes. The nature of conversational backgrounds is determined by the environment in which the Imperative occurs.

- Chukchi provides empirical evidence suggesting that covert imperative modals can take various conversational backgrounds (contra Condoravdi & Lauer 2012; Oikonomou 2016). In this respect, covert imperative modals do not differ from their overt counterparts.

- There are languages in which the 1sg imperative is also allowed in root non-interrogative contexts (see, e.g., Curnow 1997: 243–50 for Awa Pit data). My analysis predicts that in these languages imperatives can be used in rationale/purpose clauses. This needs to be checked.

Open questions and possible answers:

(i)   - Why does the 1sg Imperative have futurate semantics when appear in root non-interrogatives?

         - I would tie it to modality encoded and to the fact that the temporal perspective is the time of the utterance.

(ii)   - How is the 1sg Imperative form in Chukchi related to what Zanuttini et al. (2012) call "promissive" in Korean?

(34) Cemsim-ul sa-**ma**
     lunch-ACC buy-PRM
     'I will buy lunch.'

(from Zanuttini et al. 2012: 3)

- Probably, only indirectly. The 1sg Imperative in Chukchi is not obligatorily associated with promissive speech acts:

(35) otsoj   nə-miɣsiret-iɣəm
     long   st-work-np.1sg
     wətku   iɣət   **mə**-saj-o-ɣʔa-k
     only   now   **1sg.imp**-tea-eat-th-1sg.s
     'I've been working so long. Only now I'll drink tea!'

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2010). Imperatives and commands. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Bogal-Allbritten, E. (2016). Building meaning in Navajo. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Bogal-Albritten, E. (2017). Basic pieces, complex meanings: Building attitudes in Navajo and beyond. Invited talk at the Workshop on polysemy and coercion of clause embedding predicates. 39th Annual Meeting of DGfS. Saarbrücken, Germany.

Condoravdi, C. & Lauer, S. (2012). Imperatives: Meaning and illocutionary force. Empirical issues in syntax and semantics, 9:37-58.

Curnow, T. J. (1997). A grammar of Awa Pit. PhD dissertation, ANU.

Dunn, M. (1999). A Grammar of Chukchi. Ph. D. Diss., Australian National University.

Nedjalkov, V. (1994). Tense-aspect-mood forms in Chukchi. Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung 47. P. 278—354.

Grosz, P. (2014). Modal Particles in Rationale Clauses and Related Constructions. In Modes of Modality, ed. E. Leiss and W. Abraham. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 263-290.

Gusev, V. (2013). Tipologija imperativa {The Typology of the Imperative}. M.: Jazyki Slavjanskoj kultury.

von Fintel, Kai. (1999). NPI-Licensing, Strawson-Entailment, and Context Dependency", Journal of Semantics 16

Hacquard, V. (2006). Aspects of modality. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Hacquard, V. (2010). On the event-relativity of modal auxiliaries. Natural Language Semantics 18(1). 79–114.

Kaufmann, M. (2012). Interpreting Imperatives. Dordrecht: Springer.

Kratzer, A. (2006). Decomposing Attitude Verbs. Talk given in honor of Anita Mittwoch. The Hebrew University Jerusalem.

Kratzer, A. (2013). Modality and the semantics of embedding. Slides from presentation at the Amsterdam Colloquium, December 2013.

Kuzmenkov, E. (2001). Imperative verb forms in Mongolian. In Typology of Imperative Constructions, ed. Xrakovskij, V. S. Munich: Lincom, 98–105.

Moulton, K. (2009) Natural Selection and the Syntax of Clausal Complementation, Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Naumov & Kozlov. (2017). Can and should we use Chukchee Imperative in questions?. Talk given at Fourteenth Conference on Typology and Grammar for Young Scholars. St. Petersburg, Russia.

Nedjalkov, V. (1994). Tense-aspect-mood forms in Chukchi. Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung 47. P. 278—354.

Nissenbaum, J. (2005a). Kissing Pedro Martinez: (Existential) Anankastic conditionals and rationale clauses. In Proceedings of SALT 15, 134–151. Ithaca NY: Cornell University.

Nissenbaum, J. (2005b). States, events and VP structure: Evidence from purposive adjuncts. Handout for NELS 36, UMass/Amherst, October 28–30.

Oikonomou, D. (2016). Covert modals in root contexts. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Sadock, J. and A. Zwicky. (1985). Speech act distinctions in syntax. In Language Typology.

Stegovec, A. (2018). Obvia et impera! a case for 'perspectival control' in directive clauses. ms.

Stegovec, A. and Kaufmann, M. (2015). Slovenian imperatives: You can't always embed what you want. In Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung, volume 19, pages 620-637.

Zanuttini, R., Pak, M., and Portner, P. (2012). A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory, 30(4): 1231-1274.