

Testing Modern Theories of the Imperative against Chukchi Data

Ilya Naumov (Higher School of Economics); 6nlv@mail.ru

Conference on Uralic, Altaic and Paleoasiatic Languages in memory of A.P. Volodin

07.12.2018, Saint Petersburg

Modal vs. minimal approaches

- The most popular approaches to the imperative are of two types:

(i) **Modal approach** (Schwager 2006/Kaufmann 2012; a.o.)

- Imperative clauses contain a covert necessity modal operator;
- This modal operator is responsible for the meaning of the imperative;
- Imperative clauses denote modalized propositions.

(ii) **Minimal approach** (Portner 2004, 2007; and elsewhere)

- Imperative clauses contain no modal operators;
- They are properties *restricted to the addressee*;
- The function of the imperative is to update the addressee's "To-Do List".

Problematic cases

- Portner's (2004, 2007) minimal approach fails to capture two cross-linguistic observations:
 - There are languages that extend their imperative paradigms to persons other than the second (for an overview see Gusev 2013).
 - There are languages in which imperative form can appear in *embedded clauses* and in *questions* (for an overview see Gusev 2013; Kaufmann 2014).
- His account is not consistent with these facts because
 - (i) the property denoted by the imperative is restricted to the addressee (=2P);
 - (ii) imperative constitutes a separate clause type which cannot overlap with other clause types such as declaratives and interrogatives (from Sadock & Zwicky 1985).

Approaching Chukchi data

- Chukchi is a language that both
 - (i) possesses a rich morphological paradigm of the imperative;
 - (ii) allows imperative forms to be embedded and used in questions (not to be discussed today; cf. Naumov & Kozlov 2017).

The rest of the talk:

- introduce the Chukchi Imperative;
- consider its distribution and try to account for it;
- look at some non-trivial uses;
- propose an extension of the analysis;
- discuss some theoretical implications.

The imperative paradigm

- Chukchi possesses a full-fledged paradigm of the Imperative (Skorik 1977; Nedjalkov 1994. Dunn (1999) calls it Intentional):

Table №1 Imperative paradigm

Person	SG	PL
1	<i>m(ə)-</i>	<i>mən-</i>
2	<i>q(ə)-</i>	<i>q(ə)-</i>
3	<i>n(ə)-</i>	<i>n(ə)-</i>

- The forms in Table №1 possess all characteristic functions of imperative forms \Rightarrow the paradigm that they constitute is indeed the Imperative.

2p Imperative

- The second-person imperative form is used for orders/commands (=strong readings) (1) and (2) permissions (=weak readings) to the addressee.

(1) qə-qora-yərke-rkən ənqen q-ine-winretə-rkən
 2.IMP -reindeer-gather-IPFV DET 2.IMP-INV-help-IPFV
 ‘Put the reindeer, help!’

(2) ewət ra-ra-ytə-ŋ-kə qə-ɬe-rkən
 if DES-home-GO.TO-DES-LOC 2.IMP-go-IPFV
 yəm qərəm reqən m-ik-wʔe
 I.ABS NEG.FUT anything 1.SG.IMP-say-TH
 ‘If you want, go! I will not say anything.’

3p imperative

- The third person imperative form is used to direct non-locutors. It also has strong (3) and weak (4) readings.

(3) ənkʔam wetyaw-ŋaw wiin ənkə
and speak-FEM for.the.moment there

opopə qeeqən n-re-simʔu-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!’

(4) masənan ŋutku nə-wakʔo-twa-rkən ewət Ø-teɣjeŋə-rkən
let here 3.IMP-sit-be-IPFV if 2/3./A-want-IPFV
‘Let him sit here if he wants.’

1pl Imperative

- The first-person plural form is used to express invitation to the addressee(s) to perform an action together with the speaker (5).

(5) ənʝiwŋewe mən-pʔoŋ-ŋəta-mək
 aunt.NOM 1PL.IMP-mushroom-search.for-1PL.S
 ‘Aunt, let’s go for mushrooms!’

- All these occurrences can be naturally accounted for within the approach in the spirit of Kaufmann (2012). So far so good.
- But let’s look at embedded contexts!

Imperative in embedded environments

- Imperative forms in Chukchi can be used in dependent contexts. These are, among others, clauses embedded under a desire predicate *teɣjeŋək* ‘desire’ (6), and rationale clauses (7).

(6) ətʰəyə-n_i Ø-teɣjeŋə-rkən iŋqun qə_j-tejkə-yə-n orwoor
father-NOM 2/3.S/A-desire-IPFV COMP 2.IMP-fix-IRR-3SG.O sledge.NOM
‘The father desires that you should fix the sledge’.

(7) nenənə_i nota-ytə Ø-qət-yʔ-i iŋqun n_i-ətʰa-re-rkən
child.NOM land-DAT 2/3.S/A-leave-TH-2/3SG.S COMP 3.IMP-mother-see-IPFV
‘The child went to tundra in order to seek the mother’.

Desire reports more closely

- Note that (6) differs from (7) in one crucial aspect: in the former the subject of the matrix clause is not co-referent with the subject of the embedded clause.
- In case subjects are co-referent, the infinitive must be used, while the Imperative is no longer acceptable (8).

(8) a. *iyər tə_i-teyjeŋə-rkən nuteysi-k/ *iŋqun mə_i-nuteysi-k
 today 1SG.S/A-desire-IPFV go.for.roots-INF
 ‘I desire to go to tundra for roots today.’

- Nothing in Kaufmann’s (2012) predicts this restriction. Therefore, we have to say something more.

Stegovec's (2018) proposal

- **Generalization:** (9) and (10) are manifestations of the same ban on co-reference between the subject of the imp/subj and *the director* — the matrix subject in embedded contexts and the actual speaker in matrix non-interrogative contexts.
 - This ban holds only for clauses whose canonical function is that of a *directive speech act* (11).
- (11) **Directive Speech Act.** The speaker attempts to make an individual or group of individuals ensure that the non-modal content of the utterance is realized. (Stegovec 2018: 7)
- Under this definition, 2p, 3p, and 1pl inclusive imperatives discussed above are directive clauses.

Stegovec's (2018) proposal

- This ban is a syntactic restriction. The modal operator of the imp/subj takes a individual-type element (a “perspectival” *PRO*) that is bound by the director.
- The subject of the imp/subj (*pro*) cannot be co-referent with the director because it cannot be co-referent with the perspectival *PRO*. If it was co-referent with it, there would be a *Condition B* violation.

Embedded environments:

(12) She_j / *I_i said [that [*PRO*_{j/*i} OP [*pro*_i go.IMP/SUBJ]]].
≈ ‘She / *I said that I should go.’

Matrix non-interrogative environments:

(13) *Speaker_i [*PRO*_i OP [*pro*_i go.IMP/SUBJ!]].
≈ int.: ‘I should go!’

Going back to Chukchi

- Adopting Stegovec's (2018) approach, we can straightforwardly account for the fact that in Chukchi the matrix subject of the desire predicate cannot be co-referent with subject of the imperative (recall (8)).
- In the neo-Hintikkan tradition, desire reports are said to make claims about most desirable doxastic alternatives of the matrix subject. The imperative operator quantifies over those alternatives, while *PRO* encodes the source of the beliefs and desires.
- However, even this cannot be the whole story because in Chukchi:
 - the ban on co-reference is absent in rationale clauses (7);
 - 1p exclusive forms *can* be used in matrix non-interrogative environments.

When the Imperative is not quite the Imperative

- In Chukchi, the forms of the Imperative can also be used in way that does not fit Stegovec's (2018) generalization. In all of these uses the subject of the Imperative seems to be co-referent, or partially co-referent, with the director.
- Namely, the first-person singular and plural forms are licensed in non-interrogatives where they receive futurative interpretation:

(15) a. m-ajmə-γʔa-k
1SG.IMP-go.for.water-TH-1SG.S
'I will go for water!'

b. mən-ejwət-γət
1PL.IMP-bring.presents-2SG.O
'We (excl.) will bring you presents!'

- But do these utterances constitute directive speech acts?

1sg Imperative

- **Previous answers:** Yes, they do.
 - Xrakovskij & Volodin (1986: 139), Birjulin & Xrakovskij (1992: 28): the first-person singular imperative expresses “self-causation”.
 - Gusev (2013: 53): causing one-self is pragmatically odd, causation usually implies the non-identity of the causer and causee. The first-person singular imperative expresses “indirect causation” — the speaker still causes the addressee.
- The main assumption behind these approaches is that imperative clauses are always associated with directive speech acts.
- But is this assumption justified?
- **My answer:** Maybe, no.

1sg Imperative: a directive speech act?

- If they constitute directive speech acts, it remains a mystery why the restriction identified by Stegovec (2018) does not arise.
- Moreover, directives demonstrate the so-called “speaker distancing ban” — the inability of the speaker to distance herself from the directive speech act (16) (see Kaufmann 2012; Stegovec & Kaufmann 2015).

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

- In Chukchi, utterances of clauses containing the first-person singular Imperative do not demonstrate it (17).

(17) mə-waŋe-yʔa-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!’

1sg Imperative: a directive speech act?

- There is an additional argument against Gusev's (2013) view. In Chukchi, the first-person singular Imperative can be used when there is no addressee present (either actual or imaginable) (18).

[Context: A man who has just woken up and is at home alone see through the window his people are already working]

(18) n-iw-iyəm mə-sejwə-tku-yʔe-k
 ST-think-NP.1SG 1SG.IMP-go-ITER-TH-1SG.S

 kitaqun=a m-om-aw-yʔa-k
 now.then=PTCL 1SG.IMP-warm-VB-TH-1SG.S
 'I think I'll go! Now I'll warm up!'

- If clauses containing 1p forms do not constitute directive speech acts and, thus, do not have the structure proposed by Stegovec (2018), how are they licensed?

When does the deviation occur?

- Let's try to establish the conditions under which the futurative interpretation arises. We have seen that it arises with 1p forms (and obligatory for 1sg).

Try №1: The futurative interpretation arises when the speaker is part of subject.

- This is clearly not exhaustive. The futurative interpretation is allowed only with exclusive first-plural form (18).

(19) ənʝiwɨewe_i mən_(#i/j+s)-pʔoŋ-ŋəta-mək
 aunt.nom 1PL.IMP-mushroom-search.for-1PL.S
 ‘Aunt, we will go for mushrooms!’

Try №2: The futurative interpretation arises when the addressee is not part of subject.

When does the deviation occur?

- But even this is not the whole story. Clauses containing the form of the third person cannot have futurative interpretation, though their subject excludes the addressee (20).

(20) n-ekwet-γ?e-n
3.IMP-leave-3SG.S
#‘He will leave!’

Final generalization: *The futurative interpretation arises when the speaker is part of the subject and the addressee is not.*

- If we maintain Stegovec’s (2018) approach, the imperative argument of the modal operator has to control for two entities.

An event-type argument

Proposal: When imperative clauses have futurative meaning, the modal operator takes an event-type argument that refers to the speech act event.

- This event-type argument carries the information about the participants of the speech act and ensures that the subject of the imperative includes the speaker and excludes the addressee.
- This proposal explains why these clauses do not constitute directive speech acts and why there is no Condition B violation.
- An independent argument in favor of this view, comes from the properties of rationale clauses in Chukchi.

An argument from rationale clauses

- As it was shown before, in Chukchi the Imperative can be used in rationale clauses. Moreover, in this type of environments the subject of the Imperative *can* be co-referent with the matrix subject (20).

(20) nenenə_i nota-ytə Ø-qət-yʔ-i inqun n_i-ətʃa-re-rkən
child.NOM land-DAT 2/3.S/A-leave-TH-2/3SG.S COMP 3.IMP-mother-seek-IPFV
‘The child went to tundra in order to seek the mother’.

- Rationale clauses provide a teleological explanation for the matrix event. Nissenbaum (2005) and Grosz (2014) argue that they contain a modal operator that “does not make reference to an individual’s goals, but rather to the goals intrinsic to an event.” (Grosz 2014: 275).
- Our modification of Stegovec’s (2018) account makes this intuition explicit.

Conclusions

- Apart from typical and typologically common functions, imperative forms in Chukchi can have deviant uses. In particular, first-person imperative forms can have futurative interpretations.
- Building on Stegovec's (2018) approach, I have argued that these deviant uses are allowed because in Chukchi the modal imperative operator can take event-type argument.
- The consequence of the proposed analysis is that directivity is not intrinsic to the grammatical category of the imperative.
- Uses with futurative interpretations are very reminiscent of *commissives*...

References

- Condoravdi, C. and Lauer, S. (2012). Imperatives: Meaning and illocutionary force. *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics*, 9:37-58.
- Dunn, Michael. (1999). *A Grammar of Chukchi*. Ph. D. Diss., Australian National University.
- Grosz, Patrick. (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.
- Kaufmann, M. (2012). *Interpreting Imperatives*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Nedjalkov, V. (1994). Tense-aspect-mood forms in Chukchi. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 47. P. 278—354.
- Portner, P. (2004). The semantics of imperatives within a theory of clause types. *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 14, ed. by Robert B. Young, 235–252. Ithaca: CLC Publications.
- Portner, P. (2007). Imperatives and modals. *Natural Language Semantics* 15(4): 351–383.
- Skorik, P. Ja. (1977). *Grammatika Chukotskogo jazyka {The Grammar of Chukchi}*. P. 2. L.: Academy of Sciences.
- Stegovec, A. (2017). !? (Where's the ban on imperative questions?). In *Proceedings of SALT 27*, D. C. Burgdorf, J. Collard, S. Maspong, and B. Stefánsdóttir (Eds.), Ithaca, NY: Cornell Linguistics Circle.
- 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.

Acknowledgments

All Chukchi data presented in this talk was collected during two field trips to the village of Amguema (Iul'tin district, Chukotka Autonomous Okrug), jointly organized by the Moscow State University and School of Linguistics, Higher School of Economics (Moscow) in 2016–2017.

- ♥ I would like to thank my Chukchi teachers for their patience and for giving me part of their time.
- ♥ I would also like to thank the members of the Chukchi project, Fedor Golosov, Lena Pasalskaya, Alexander Podobryaev and Sergei Tatevosov for fruitful discussions and help at various stages of this research.

Acknowledgments

- This talk was prepared within the framework of the Academic Fund Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE) in 2017 — 2018 (grant №17-05-0043) and by the Russian Academic Excellence Project «5-100».