Edited by Markéta Janebová, Michaela Čakányová, and Joseph Emonds

Language Use and Linguistic Structure

Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2023

OLOMOUC MODERN LANGUAGE SERIES VOL. 10



Language Use and Linguistic Structure

Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2023

Edited by Markéta Janebová, Michaela Čakányová, and Joseph Emonds

Palacký University Olomouc

2024

OLOMOUC MODERN LANGUAGE SERIES (OMLS) publishes peer-reviewed proceedings from selected conferences on linguistics and translation studies held at Palacký University Olomouc, Czech Republic.

Published so far:

- OMLS, Vol. 1: Teaching Translation and Interpreting in the 21st Century (2012)
- OMLS, Vol. 2: Tradition and Trends in Trans-Language Communication (2013)
- OMLS, Vol. 3: Language Use and Linguistic Structure. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2013 (2014)
- OMLS, Vol. 4: Complex Visibles Out There. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2014: Language Use and Linguistic Structure (2014)
- OMLS, Vol. 5: Interchange between Languages and Cultures: The Quest for Quality (2016)
- OMLS, Vol. 6: Language Use and Linguistic Structure. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2016 (2017)
- OMLS, Vol. 7: Language Use and Linguistic Structure. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2018 (2019)
- OMLS, Vol. 8: Teaching Translation vs. Training Translators. Proceedings of the Translation and Interpreting Forum Olomouc (2022)
- OMLS, Vol. 9: Language Use and Linguistic Structure. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2021 (2022)

OLOMOUC MODERN LANGUAGE SERIES Vol. 10

Language Use and Linguistic Structure

Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2023

organized by

Department of English and American Studies Faculty of Arts, Palacký University Olomouc, Czech Republic June 8–10, 2023



Edited by Markéta Janebová, Michaela Čakányová, and Joseph Emonds

Palacký University Olomouc 2024 Each of the contributions was peer-reviewed by two anonymous reviewers prior to the publication of this volume.

KATALOGIZACE V KNIZE - NÁRODNÍ KNIHOVNA ČR

Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium (2023 : Olomouc, Česko)

Language use and linguistic structure : proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2023 : organized by Department of English and American Studies Faculty of Arts, Palacký University Olomouc, Czech Republic, June 8-10, 2023 / edited by Markéta Janebová, Michaela Čakányová, and Joseph Emonds. -- First edition. -- Olomouc : Palacký University, 2024. -- 1 online zdroj. -- (Olomouc modern language series ; vol. 10) Obsahuje bibliografic a bibliografické odkazy

ISBN 978-80-244-6508-1 (online; pdf)

- * 81'1 * (062.534)
- lingvistika
- sborníky konferencí
- 81 Lingvistika. Jazyky [11]

FIRST EDITION Arrangement copyright © Markéta Janebová, Michaela Čakányová, Joseph Emonds, 2024

Introduction copyright © Markéta Janebová, Michaela Čakányová, Joseph Emonds, 2024

Papers copyright © Benedetta Baldi, Irina Burukina, Gioia Cacchioli, Michaela Čakányová, Péter Csatár, Csaba Csides, Mojmír Dočekal, Joseph Embley Emonds, Lívia Gyulai, Peter Hallman, Chang Liu, Mark Newson, Feras Saeed, Leonardo M. Savoia, Žaneta Šulíková, Krisztina Szécsényi, Tibor Szécsényi, Péter Szűcs, Enikő Tótha, Tue Trinh, 2024

Copyright © Palacký University Olomouc, 2024

ISBN 978-80-244-6508-1 (online: iPDF; available at https://anglistika.upol.cz/olinco2023proceedings/)

DOI: www.doi.org/10.5507/ff.24.24465081

Table of Contents

Alphabetical List of Authors	7
Acknowledgements	
Markéta Janebová, Michaela Čakányová, and Joseph Emonds	
Introduction	
Markéta Janebová, Michaela Čakányová, and Joseph Emonds	
Part I. Explorations in Morphology and Syntax	
Deriving Rationale Clauses: Infinitives and Imperatives	
A Note on Verum Focus in Tigrinya	
Gioia Cacchioli	
Subjects of Verbs of Perception and Cognition in Czech	42
Michaela Cakányová	
Universal Syntactic Features of Open Categories	53
Rethinking Null Expletives in Mandarin Chinese	64
The Neutral Case System of English	
Mark Newson and Krisztina Szécsényi	
Split Inflection on Internominal Adjectives Feras Saeed	
The Case Morpho-syntax in Aromanian (Southern Albania):	
Descriptive and Theoretical Aspects	
Leonardo M. Savoia and Benedetta Baldi	
Part II. Explorations in Semantics and Pragmatics	
Few ≠ Not Many	
Peter Hallman	
Predicative and Argumental Demonstratives as Clausal Proforms in Hungarian <i>Péter Szűcs</i>	
Contrastive Uses Reconsidered: The Case of Hungarian Exophoric Demonstratives Enikő Tóth and Péter Csatár	151

A Note on Speech Act Recursion Tue Trinh	165
Part III. Explorations in Language Acquisition and Processing Word-Stress and the Minimal Word Constraint in English <i>Csaba Csides</i>	177
The Distributive and Cumulative Readings Acquisition: Experimental Evidence from Czech Mojmír Dočekal and Žaneta Šulíková	193
Determining Argument Structure Variants by Numerical Optimization Krisztina Szécsényi and Tibor Szécsényi	
Distinguishing Compositional and Non-Compositional Verbal Complexes: A Corpus-Based Approach <i>Tibor Szécsényi and Lívia Gyulai</i>	224

Deriving Rationale Clauses: Infinitives and Imperatives

Irina Burukina

Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary; HUN-REN Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics, Budapest, Hungary

irina.burukina@btk.elte.hu

Abstract: The paper examines rationale clauses in Mari (Uralic; head-final), which come in two types: infinitival clauses and imperatives. It develops a uniform semantico-syntactic analysis for both constructions based on the idea that rationale clauses contain a MoodP with a teleological modal as its head: in infinitival rationale clauses the MoodP is built on top of the non-finite TP/FinP, and in imperative rationale clauses the usual imperative modal is utilized with a shifted flavor. The research fills in a gap in the description of Uralic and contributes to the discussion of the split CP and modality in adjunct clauses by demonstrating how embedded non-finite and finite CPs can be predicated directly of the main clause

Keywords: rationale clauses, adverbial clauses, Mood, modality, infinitive, imperative

The Rationale Puzzle 1.

The paper focuses on rationale clauses in Meadow Mari, a Uralic head-final language (henceforth, Mari).¹ They come in two types. Infinitival rationale clauses are marked with the suffix lan (1). They contain either an implicit subject that is controlled by a matrix dependent (1a) or a referentially independent subject marked dative (1b). The suffix lan and the complementizer manon have null allomorphs, and either of these items (or even both at the same time) can be silent; similarly, manan can be dropped in embedded indicative and imperative clauses. The co-occurrence of the two items is also allowed, although the speakers that I consulted found some of such examples unnecessarily long. So far I have not found any correlation between the absence/presence of overt lan and manon and any other syntactic or semantic properties of the rationale dependents. Throughout the paper I mark both lan and manon as optional in the examples.

(1)	a.	[PRO _i	kudəvečə-š	pur- aš (-lan)	(manən)],
			yard-ILL	go-INF-MOD	COMP
		təj _i	pečə-m	sümər-en-at.	
		you	fence-ACC	break-pst-2sg	
		'You brok	e the fence in or	der to get into the y	vard'

You broke the fence in order to get into the yard.

Unless specified otherwise, the Mari data presented in the paper are from the Morkinsko-Sernur dialect of 1 the language. They were collected in 2020–2023 from two native speakers in individual online elicitations. The consultants are from the same age group and grew up in the Mari El republic; they are bilingual in Mari and Russian and use Mari on an everyday basis. All the judgments on the data considered in the paper were robust and confirmed multiple times.

b.	[Məlanna	kudəvečə-š	pur- aš (-lan)	(manən)],		
	we.DAT	yard-ILL	go-INF-MOD	COMP		
	təj _i	pečə-m	sümər-en-at.			
	you	fence-ACC break-PST-2SG				
	the yard.'					

The construction is not unusual from a cross-linguistic perspective: consider, for instance, infinitival rationale clauses in Russian headed by the complementizer *čtoby* and *in order to* adverbial clauses in English, all of which allow overt subjects. What makes Mari stand out is the second type of rationale clauses available in the language, namely, **embedded imperatives**. (I use the term *imperative* in a broad sense to also include jussives and cohortative-hortatives.) As exemplified in (2) in comparison to (3), such rationale clauses allow nominative subjects and require subject agreement on the main verb, and they are identical in the verbal morphology to root imperatives.

(2)	a.	[Čəla-m all-ACC	kalas-en tell-сvв	рио-Ø give-імі	manən COMP], rveze boy-p	-vlak-əm PL-ACC	per-en-na. hit-pst-1pL
		'We hit th	e boys in o	rder for y	ou to tell (u	is) everyth	ing.'	
	b.	[Rveze-vla	ak čəla	-m	kalas-en	pu-Ø-əš	št n	nanən],
		boy-pl	all-	ACC	tell-cvb	give-IM	p-3pl c	OMP
		təj-əm	per-	en-na.				
		you-ACC	hit-	pst-1pl				
		'We hit yo	u in order f	for the boy	ys to tell (u	s) everyth	ing.'	
(3)	a.	Čəla-m	kal	as-en	puo-Ø!			
		all-ACC	tell	-CVB	give-IM	P		
		'Tell us ev	verything.'		U			
	b.	(Tek)	rveze-vlal	c čəla-	m kal	as-en	pu-Ø-əšt.	
		PTCL	boy-pl	all-A	cc tel	l-cvb	give-IMP-3	PL

'The boys should tell us everything.'

Cross-linguistically embedded imperatives are not uncommon, see Kaufmann (2014) for an overview. However, their distribution is usually restricted to being embedded under speech act predicates, where they are still used in the primary directive function; see Platzack (2007) on Old Scandinavian; Pak et al. (2008) on Korean; Rus (2005) and most recently Štarkl (2023) on Slovenian; Kaufmann and Poschmann (2013) on German. Imperatives in Mari also appear in indirect speech reports to express commands; such examples lie beyond the scope of this paper and I refer the reader to Burukina (2023a) for more data. When it comes to embedded imperatives being used specifically as rationale clauses, to the best of my knowledge, this has only been reported in Chukchi by Naumov (2018). I discuss his work in section 4 and compare his analysis to my proposal.

To account in a unified way for both phenomena, i.e., the distribution of rationale infinitives and imperatives, I work up a syntactico-semantic analysis in the core of which lies the idea that rationale clauses contain a modal operator, Mod_{Rat} (Nissenbaum 2005; Grosz 2014; Dąbkowski and AnderBois 2024). The modal is structurally present as the head of MoodP (section 2). In rationale infinitives MoodP is added on top of the non-finite TP/FinP and its head is spelled out as *lan*; I outline the derivation of such clauses in section 3. In imperative rationale clauses the already present covert imperative modal

is used as Mod_{Rat} with its modal flavor shifted to teleological (see Schwager 2006; Kaufmann 2012 on Mod_{Imp}). I discuss such constructions and the attested obviation effects in section 4. Overall, the paper aims to demonstrate that all rationale clauses in Mari can be derived in the same way using the same inventory of functional heads, despite some differences in their morphosyntax.

2. Semantics and Syntax of Rationale Clauses: A General Outline

As a starting point, I argue that all rationale adjuncts contain a modal operator, in the spirit of Nissenbaum (2005) and Grosz (2014). The modal is syntactically present in the Mood head that takes the embedded propositional TP as its complement and links it to the matrix proposition. I begin this section by presenting the semantic part of the analysis, following Grosz (2014) and Dąbkowski and AnderBois (2024), and I proceed by outlining the syntactic structure.

2.1 Semantics of Rationale Clauses

Let us begin by considering the semantics of rationale clauses. I adopt the analysis proposed by Dąbkowski and AnderBois (2024) for rationale clauses in A'ingae (Amazonian). The central idea is that rationale clauses contain a teleological modal element. The modal component is inserted in the Mood head, which takes the saturated TP of the type $\langle s,t \rangle$ as its complement and facilitates turning the embedded proposition into a modifier, which can then be predicated of the main TP. The analysis of Dąbkowski and AnderBois (2024) is a modified version of an account developed by Grosz (2014) for the *um* ... *zu* rationale clauses in German. In what follows I present the gist of the approach, and I refer the reader to the original articles for the complete argumentation.

Grosz (2014) examines the distribution of certain modal particles in German rationale clauses and argues that they function as modifiers of a covert modal. He proposes that this modal has a teleological flavor and, as such, makes reference to the goals of the explicit or implicit agent in the matrix clause. Thus, sentences like *Sam took the Red Line [to get to Alewife]* are to be paraphrased as *Sam took the Red Line [for in view of his goals he had to get to Alewife]*.

Inspired by Nissenbaum's (2005) semantics for rationale clauses modeled after Hintikka's (1969) description of possible worlds, Grosz defines Mod_{Rat} as quantifying over the set of possible worlds that are compatible with or relevant to the matrix initiator's goals in the specific event expressed by the matrix predicate. Dąbkowski and AnderBois (2024) adopt his analysis with an important modification: they treat rationale clauses as modifiers of propositions and not events. Since their paper in semantic is nature, they do not focus much on the syntactic properties of rationale clauses and follow Huettner (1989) in placing these adjuncts at the TP level without much argumentation; as I show in the next subsection, the Mari data provide support for the TP-adjunction approach. The denotation of Mod_{Rat} is given in (4), adapted from Dąbkowski and AnderBois (2024).²

(4) $[Mod_{Rat}]^{a,w} = \lambda p_{st} \lambda q_{st} \forall w' [w' is compatible with the goals relevant to q: p(w')]$

2.2 Syntax of Rationale Clauses

As discussed in section 2.1, Mod_{Rat} is essentially a two-place predicate that requires two arguments of the type $\langle s,t \rangle$: one is the embedded TP (denoted as p in (4)) and the other is the main TP (denoted as q in (4)). (As I describe below, the modal combines with the embedded TP directly, and with the matrix one 'by proxy', when the whole rationale CP is turned into a predicate and is adjoined to the

² Dąbkowski and AnderBois (2024) also introduce a presupposition of existence for an individual that intentionally brings about the event described by the main clause. They do this in order to accommodate examples without an explicit matrix initiator. The presupposition can be added to the modal analysis proposed in this paper without change.

main TP). The base structure of all rationale clauses is sketched out in (5); it includes the modal Mod_{Rat} inserted in the Mood head.

(5) The structure of rationale clauses



The derivation in (5) proceeds as follows. MoodP is introduced on top of the saturated embedded TP. Mod_{Rat} (a two-place predicate) in the Mood head takes the TP as one of its arguments and requires one more propositional argument to combine with. I propose that a proposition-type element, namely, a silent minimal pronoun (PRO_{prop}), is merged in spec,MoodP; cf. Stegovec (2019) introducing a perspectival individual-type anaphor (PRO_{pers}) in spec,MoodP to combine with a directive/deontic modal Mood. This makes the MoodP saturated. It is then selected by a general non-interrogative complementizer *manon*, which is generally used in embedded infinitival, imperative, and indicative clauses. The final step in the derivation is for PRO_{prop} to move to spec,CP where it turns into an operator.³ This creates a derived one-place predicate out of the whole rationale CP, and the rationale clause can now be attached to the main TP and modify it.

As mentioned above, I side with Huettner (1989) and Dąbkowski and AnderBois (2024) and argue that rationale clauses are TP adjuncts. The interpretation of rationale clauses relative to the scope of a matrix negation supports this idea for Mari. As illustrated in (6), rationale clauses in Mari always scope above the matrix negation, regardless of whether they are positioned at the very periphery of the sentence or linearly follow a topicalized element.

 (6) a. Oksam anəkl-aš(-lan) (manən), knigam nal-ən onal. money save-INF-MOD COMP book buy-CVB NEG.PST.1PL 'In order to save the money we didn't buy the book.' RatCl > NEG

³ A reviewer asked what motivates the movement of PRO_{pers} from spec,MoodP to spec,CP. I admit that at this point the movement step remains rather speculative. Similar movement of PRO from spec,TP to spec,FinP was proposed by Landau (2015), who suggested that it was triggered by a special uninterpretable feature [uD] on Fin. Alternatively, one may suggest that the movement, i.e., the internal merge, of PRO_{pers} does not need to be independently motivated (for a discussion of internal merge see Chomsky et al. (2023)); however, without it the derivation would crash, as the embedded CP would remain fully saturated and argument-like and would not be able to combine with the matrix TP.

b. Urok-lan jamdəlalt-aš(-lan) (manən), knigam nal-ən onal.
 class-DAT prepare-INF-MOD COMP book buy-CVB NEG.PST.1PL Not available: 'We did not buy the book to prepare for the class.' NEG > RatCl Only: 'In order to prepare for the class, we did not buy the book.' RatCl > NEG

c.	Me	urok-lan	jamdəlalt-aš(-lan)	(manən),				
	we	class-DAT	prepare-INF-MOD	COMP				
	knigam	nal-ən	onal.					
	book	buy-сvв	NEG.PST.1PL					
	Not available: 'We did not buy the book to prepare for the class.' NEG > RatCl							
	Only: 'In	order to prep	pare for the class, we d	lid not buy the book.' RatCl > NEG				

Syntactically, NegP in Mari is inserted between vP/VoiceP and TP and typically takes the highest scope (Georgieva et al. 2021). Thus, for a rationale clause to scope over the matrix negation it has to be merged above the NegP, at the TP level. Under the compositional semantics approach, at that stage a modifier can be a predicate of propositions (naturally combining with the matrix TP). However, it is very unlikely to be a predicate of events: the event(uality) variable has to be existentially closed before the negation is merged, to get the desired interpretation "there is no such event e" and not "there is an event that is not e".

3. Deriving Rationale Infinitives

The derivation of infinitival rationale clauses with referentially independent subjects proceeds straightforwardly as described in section 2, with the fully saturated TP being placed in the complement position of the modal Mood. The derivation of rationale infinitives with a controlled subject deserves more attention, as it is not immediately clear whether the embedded TP should be treated as a proposition ($\langle s, t \rangle$) or rather a predicate ($\langle e, \langle s, t \rangle \rangle$); see Landau (2015) and references therein on obligatory control (OC) as predication. In what follows I will show that rationale TPs instantiate non-obligatory control (NOC) and are propositional. I will limit the discussion to two diagnostics commonly applied to distinguish between OC and NOC: the availability of PRO_{arb} and the [+human] restriction on the controller.

The availability of PRO_{arb} proves that control in Mari rationale clauses is non-obligatory in at least some contexts. This is shown in (7): in the absence of an initiator in the main clause the silent embedded subject can receive an arbitrary reading.

(7)	[PRO _{arb}	una-m	vašlij-aš(-lan)	(manən)]			
		guest-ACC	receive-INF-MOD	COMP			
	üstel	tidə	pölem-əšte	šog-a.			
	table	this	room-INE	stand-NPST.3SG			
	'The table stands in this room in order to receive guests.'						

This observation alone is not sufficient to claim that Mari rationale clauses always instantiate NOC. As discussed in detail by Landau (2021), non-finite clauses of the same semantic type (e.g., rationale or purpose) can sometimes allow both NOC and OC. The following fact, however, strongly suggests that obligatory control is indeed excluded in Mari infinitival adjuncts. Cross-linguistically NOC is distinguished from OC by the obligatory humanness of the controller in the former (Chomsky 1981).⁴ When it comes to rationale clauses, it is not an easy task to come up with a scenario that would be appropriate for a [-human] subject and a rationale dependent. A plausible context in English is that with an inanimate subject and the nature/evolution as an implicit initiator: *Flowers produce pollen in order to reproduce* (Landau 2021: 40). However, the speakers that I consulted found parallel examples in Mari (8) to be extremely awkward and not acceptable. (Note that placing the rationale clause after the matrix subject does not improve the sentences; such options are not illustrated in (8), due to the limitation of space.)

- (8) a. *[PRO_i šarl-aš(-lan) (manən)] peledəš_i šərkam kolt-a. expand-INF-MOD COMP flower pollen give.out-NPST.3SG Intended: 'The flowers produce pollen in order to propagate.'
 - b. *[PRO_i kislorod-əm lukt-aš(-lan) (manən)] kuškəl_i užarge. oxygen-ACC emit-INF-MOD COMP plant green Intended: 'The plants are green in order to produce oxygen.'

Taking into account the availability of PRO_{arb} and the ban on [-human] controllers, I conclude that OC is impossible in infinitival rationale clauses in Mari. I assume that TPs with an NOC PRO are fully saturated.⁵ They are of the same semantic type as infinitival TPs with a referentially independent subject and imperatives and fit into the structure in (5) without modification.

4. Deriving Rationale Imperatives

4.1 Shifting the Modal

Let us now turn our attention to the imperative rationale clauses. I argue that they share the basic structure with rationale infinitives, as outlined in (5). Recall that rationale infinitives contain Mod_{Rat} , inserted in the Mood head and optionally spelled out as *lan.*⁶ For rationale imperatives it is reasonable to propose that the modal is an inherently present Mod_{Imp} , whose modal flavor has been shifted to teleological.

I assume that imperatives are formed with a modal operator (Mod_{Imp}) that is comparable in its interpretation to the modal *should*; see primarily Schwager (2006), later published as Kaufmann

⁴ A reviewer pointed out that some OC contexts appear to resist an inanimate controller: consider, for instance, the ungrammatical **The volcano tried to explode* and **Sunlight manages to irritate my roommate* (I am grateful to the reviewer for these examples). However, examples with *try/manage* in the main clause and an inanimate controller are not ruled out completely; the following sentences were found online: *The car managed to move up a steep driveway, The trees try to close the damaged tissue from the outside.* One may argue that *the car* and *the trees* in such cases are being anthropomorphized, but by this logic (8) would also be expected to be acceptable, contrary to the fact.

⁵ NOC of the embedded PRO by the logophoric center may be mediated with the help of the presupposition that Dąbkowski and AnderBois (2024) propose to add to the denotation of Mod_{Rat} ; see also footnote 2. As schematized in (i), the presupposition establishes the presence of an impetus responsible for the matrix situation, even when this individual is not mentioned in the main clause.

⁽i) a. presupposition: $\exists i$. such that resp(i, q)

b. $\operatorname{resp}(a, q) \approx a$ intentionally brings it about that q

⁶ As argued by Burukina (2023b), the Mood-Mod_{Rat} in infinitival clauses in modern Mari is a result of historical reanalysis of the dative postposition *lan* into a functional head of the category V. I refer the reader to the original work for a detailed discussion.

(2012), but also Stegovec (2019) adopting a similar approach and calling the modal *directive*. Mod_{Imp} is essentially equivalent to a necessity modal and is syntactically introduced in the Mood domain.⁷

Cross-linguistically embedded imperatives are quite productive, however, their distribution is typically restricted to being embedded under speech act verbs and desiderative predicates, where they are still interpreted as directive; for an overview of imperatives used in the reported speech context see Kaufmann (2014). The only work that I am aware of that describes embedded imperatives used as rationale clauses is Naumov (2018) on Chukchi (9).

(9) Imperatives as rationale clauses in Chukchi

- a. Nota-ytə Ø-qət-y?-i inqun q-ətl?a-re-rkən. land-DAT 2/3.s/A-leave-TH-2/3sG.s COMP 2sG.s/A.IMP-mother-seek-IPFV 'You went to the tundra in order to seek for the mother'.
- b. Nota-ytə Ø-qət-y?-i ingun n-ətl?a-re-rkən.
 land-DAT 2/3.s/A-leave-TH-2/3sG.s COMP 3sG.s/A.IMP-mother-seek-IPFV
 'He went to the tundra in order to seek for the mother'.
 [Naumov 2018, 11]

Naumov does not provide a complete analysis for such sentences and only briefly talks about the source of the rationale semantics. He combines insights from Grosz (2014) and Stegovec (2019) and proposes that, just like all other imperative clauses, rationale imperatives contain a covert modal; however, unlike in root imperatives, this modal is teleological and not deontic. I continue this line of research and adopt a Mod_{Imp} approach to the Mari data.

Overt modals in many languages notoriously can acquire different flavors: e.g., *must* and *may* in English can be used as epistemic or deontic, and *can* can get a deontic, circumstantial, bouletic, or teleological flavor. I assume that the same is true for covert modals, in particular, for Mod_{Imp} (see Stegovec 2019 making a similar suggestion and Bhatt 1999 for a detailed discussion of covert modality) In root imperatives Mod_{Imp} is typically deontic. Alternatively, in rationale imperatives it has a teleological flavor and, due to its complex semantics, requires two arguments of the type <s,t> (section 2).

The derivation is schematized in (10), reproduced from (5); an imperative MoodP with $Mod_{Imp/Rat}$ forms the core of the rationale clause. The analysis accommodates the data from Mari, as well as from Chukchi.

(10) $[_{CP} PRO_{prop i} [_{C'} [_{MoodP} t_i [_{Mood'} [_{TP} DP/pro imperative] Mood=Mod_{imp}]] C=manan]]$

4.2 The Obviation Effects

Although the Chukchi data in (9) look very similar to those from Mari (2), there is a notable difference

⁷ An alternative to the modal approach is one of the minimal approaches. For instance, Portner (2004, 2007) argues that the force of imperatives comes from pragmatics and that they contain no special modal operator. Given that 2sG imperatives in Mari are morphologically unmarked, a reduced syntactic structure (up to TP or even smaller) would match such a semantic account. Whether a minimal approach better captures the distribution of root 2sG imperatives remains to be determined; however, I believe that it would struggle to accommodate embedded imperatives, which allow a complementizer and an overt subject, and root 3rd person jussives (with an overt subject and subject agreement). I leave the differences between root/embedded and 2/3 person imperatives in Mari to be examined by future research, and I am grateful to Hedde Zeijlstra for drawing my attention to this issue.

between them. Chukchi rationale imperatives do not exhibit the obviation effects; that is, the subject of a rationale clause can be coreferent with the matrix subject. This is not the case in Mari, where rationale imperatives are obviative: they allow only disjoint reference readings of the subjects (11), and an infinitival rationale clause must be used if the embedded and matrix subject share the referent (12).

(11) a		*Kudəvečə-š	puro-Ø	manən,	təj	pečəm	sümər-en-at.
		yard-ILL	go-IMP.2sc	G COMP	you	fence	break-pst-2sg
		Intended: 'Yo	u broke the fen	ce in order to	get into	the yard.	,
b).	Kudəvečə-š	pur-Ø-əšt	manən,			
		yard-ILL	go-imp-3pl	COMP			
		rveze-vlak	pečəm	sümər-en-ət.			
		boy-pl	fence	break-PST-3PL	,		
		Not available	: 'The boys bro	ke the fence in	order	to get into	the yard.'
		Only: 'The bo	oys, broke the fe	ence in order f	or then	n, to break	into the yard.'
			- 1			ĸ	
(12) a		[PRO _i	kudəvečə-š	pur-aš(-lan)		(mana	on)
		-	yard-ILL	go-INF-MOD		COMP	
		pro;	pečəm	sümər-en-at.			
		1	fence	break-pst-2s	G		
	'You broke the fence in order to get into the yard.'						
				C	•		
b).	[PRO.	kudəvečə-š	pur-aš(-lan)		(mana	on)
		L 1		1 ()		`	,

0.	li Ko	Kuuðveeð-S	pui-as(-iaii)	(manan			
		yard-ILL	go-INF-MOD	COMP			
	rveze-vlak _i	pečəm	sümər-en-ət.				
	boy-pl	fence	break-pst-3pl				
'The boys broke the fence in order to get into the yard.'							

To account for the absence of the obviation effects in Chukchi rationale imperatives, Naumov (2018) adopts Stegovec's (2019) account for obviation in terms of binding, whereby having coreferent matrix and embedded subject leads to a violation of Condition B ("a pronoun cannot be bound in its local domain"). Stegovec proposes that the modal element in obviative imperatives requires a type e (entity) dependent, the so-called "perspectival" PRO_{pers}. PRO_{pers} is syntactically introduced in the specifier position of the Mood phrase, which hosts the modal, and it is bound by the matrix subject (typically, the agent of a speech-act verb) or the discourse SPEAKER. Because PRO_{pers} is positioned within the domain of the embedded subject and c-commands it, the two cannot have the same referent, in compliance with the binding principles.

Analyzing the Chukchi data, Naumov fully adopts Grosz' (2014) semantics for Mod_{Rat} and assumes that, since Mod_{Rat} only makes an explicit reference to the matrix event, it does not have an argument that would require an individual antecedent. In other words, there is no PRO_{pers} and hence no risk of Condition B violation and no obviation effect.

While Naumov's explanation appears to work for the Chukchi material presented in his paper, I am reluctant to extend it to the Mari data. First, it predicts that the rationale imperatives are cross-linguistically non-obviative, which is clearly not the case. It might be suggested that in some languages the modal in rationale imperatives requires an event-type argument, while in some languages it requires a PRO_{pers}, however, such an explanation would unlikely find much empirical support and it would be difficult to find a meaningful way to regulate the variation. Second, binding approaches to obviation

in general have been challenged by some empirical observations. For instance, Schlenker (2005) noted that overlapping reference is subject to a locality restriction, as shown in (13a), and yet it is often allowed in normally obviative constructions; consider his examples from French, reproduced in (13), where (13b) demonstrates that the complements of 'want' typically show the obviation effects, and (13c) illustrates that nevertheless the subject of the main clause and the subject of the embedded clause can be partially coreferent.

(13) a. #Tu vous admireras. you.sG you.PL admire.FUT Intended: 'You (sg) will admire you (pl).'

b.	#Tu	voudras	que	tu	te	rases	à	7h.
	you.sg	want.FUT	that	you.sG	yourself	shave	at	7am
	Intended	l: 'You (sg)	will want	to shave your	rself at 7 ar	n.'		

c.	Tu	voudras	que	vous	vous	rasiez	à	7h.
	you.sG	want.FUT	that	you.pl	you.pl	shave	at	7am
	'You wi	ll want for y	ou (plural) to	shave at	7am.'			

An obviative clause may also contain a non-subject pronoun or a non-nominative subject pronoun coreferent with the matrix subject, as shown in (14c) and (14d) for Russian (Avrutin and Babyonyshev 1997). (14a) proves that the first person singular pronoun *menja* complies with the binding Condition B, and (14b) clearly indicates that the clausal complement of 'want' is obviative when it comes to determining the referent of its subject. If in this sentence the embedded subject cannot be co-indexed with the matrix one because it is somehow treated as belonging to the same local domain and thus violating Condition B, it remains unclear why the same restriction does not apply to the embedded object in (14c) and the embedded dative subject in (14d). (See Bailyn 2004 on dative Experiencers occupying the structural subject position, spec,TP.)

(14)	a.	#Ja I Intende	uvidel saw d: 'I saw mys	menja. me.ACC self.'			
	b.	#Ja I Intende	xoču, want.NPST d: 'I want to s	čtoby that.subj see Petja.'	ja I.nom	uvidel saw	Petju. Petja.ACC
	c.	Ja I 'I want	xoču want.NPST Petja to see r	čtoby that.suвj ne.'	Petja Petja.noм	uvidel saw	menja. me.acc
	d.	Ja I 'I want	xoču, want.NPST to feel good.	čtoby that.SUBJ	mne me.DAT	bylo was	xorošo. good

With these considerations in mind, I reject an account of the presence/absence of the obviation effects in terms of Condition B violation and instead suggest an explanation in terms of blocking by a competitor.

There are currently several blocking approaches on the market: Bouchard (1982), Farkas (1992), Schlenker (2005), Costantini (2013). What all of them have in common is their reliance on the idea that the obviation effect in subjunctive or related clauses is a result of the presence in the language of an equivalent (infinitival) construction that specializes in subject control. The formal implementations vary and at this point I remain agnostic as for which particular analysis (for instance, Farkas' blocking or Schlenker's Maximize Presupposition!) is more advantageous. Crucially, the general idea that obviation results from a competition between the two constructions does find support in the Mari and Chukchi data.

As discussed in this paper, Mari uses both imperatives and infinitives as rationale modifiers. Thus, the two constructions compete, with infinitives being preferably used in subject control contexts. In contrast, only the imperative strategy is available in Chukchi. Dr. Jessica Kantarovich, who has done extensive research on Chukchi, informed me that the use of infinitives is fairly limited in her corpus of Chukchi and that there were no sentences with an infinitival rationale/purpose modifier. The only exceptionally frequently attested examples were those where the infinitive was the complement of a modal verb, such as "to be able to" or "to be unable to". I also could not find any mention of rationale infinitives in grammars (Skorik 1961; Skorik 1977; Dunn 1999) and papers on Chukchi syntax (Nedjalkov 1994; Naumov 2018). That infinitives are not used as rationale modifiers was further confirmed to me by Dr. Maria Pupynina, who consulted with a native speaker. Thus, the absence of the obviation effects in Chukchi rationale clauses is straightforwardly explained pragmatically: unlike in Mari, there is simply no other construction available that could be used instead of an imperative when the embedded subject and the matrix one are coreferent.

5. Concluding Remarks

The paper discussed rationale clauses in Mari, which alternate between infinitives and imperatives. It presented for them a uniform syntactico-semantic analysis that relies on the idea that a rationale clause is built around a teleological modal (Mod_{Rat}) inserted in the Mood head at the clausal periphery. This account successfully captures the behavior of both infinitival and imperative rationale dependents, explains their interpretation and their distribution as modifiers of propositions. I also addressed the obviation effects attested in Mari rationale imperatives: having compared them to similar rationale clauses in Chukchi, I suggested that the blocking approach to obviation, whereby imperatives compete with infinitives, is the most advantageous.

My main goal was to draw attention to rationale clauses, especially rationale imperatives, and to open a new direction in the discussion of embedded imperatives across the world's languages. Many issues remain to be addressed in the future. The infinitive/imperative alternation attested in Mari and the fact that it can be accommodated by a single structure prove that the two types of clauses should be grouped together as "modal" and contrasted to "non-modal" indicatives. The flexibility of modal flavor in imperatives gives rise to a question of whether they should, actually, be described as imperative or rather as "unmarked modal" or "unmarked non-indicative". Notice that the imperative marker in Mari, as well as in many other languages, is null, unlike for instance, the desiderative suffix (15). Furthermore, in contrast to desideratives, imperatives have no tense distinction (thus, an imperative clause would be incompatible with the past tense verb *ale* in (15)).

(15) Te mogaj marij pölek-əm nal-ne-da (əle) you.PL which Mari present-ACC take-DES-2PL PST.3SG 'What Mari presents do/did you want to buy?' Analyzing Mari imperatives as unmarked or default modal clauses further prompts a comparison between these clauses and subjunctives in other languages; cf. Schlenker (2005) treating subjunctives in French as the default. The two types of constructions have strikingly similar distributions: both are used to express orders, commands, suggestions, and wishes, in embedded and root contexts, and as rationale/purpose modifiers. It is thus worth exploring to what extent imperatives in Mari and subjunctives in other languages share the structure, on the one hand, and how subjunctives and imperatives differ in those languages where they co-occur (e.g., in Slavic), on the other hand. I leave these questions open for future research.

Funding Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Tatiana Jefremova and Elena Vedernikova for sharing their knowledge of Mari with me. I would also like to thank the reviewers and the audiences at Olinco 2023 and the FCTC workshop, where parts of the research were presented. Many thanks to my colleagues at the HUN-REN Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics for their interest in the project. The research is supported by the Hungarian National Research, Development and Innovation Office under the grant NKFI-1 PD 146415 and by the grant ELKH SA-54/1/2021 from the HUN-REN Hungarian Research Network (formerly known as Eötvös Loránd Research Network).

Works Cited

- Avrutin, Sergey, and Maria Babyonyshev. 1997. "Obviation in Subjunctive Clauses and AGR: Evidence from Russian." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 15 (2): 229–262.
- Bailyn, John Frederick. 2004. "Generalized Inversion." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22: 1–50.
- Bhatt, Rajesh. 1999. "Covert Modality in Non-Finite Contexts." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania. Bouchard, Denis. 1982. "On the Content of Empty Categories." PhD diss., MIT.
- Burukina, Irina. 2023a. "External Merge in Spec, CP: Complementizers Projecting an Argument." Syntax 26: 85–105.
- Burukina, Irina. 2023b. "Rationale Clauses in Mari: The Power Within." Ms., Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics and Eötvös Loránd University.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. Lectures on Government and Binding. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam, T. Daniel Seely, Robert C. Berwick, Sandiway Fong, M. A. C. Huybregts, Hisatsugu Kitahara, Andrew McInnerney and Yushi Sugimoto. 2023. *Merge and the Strong Minimalist Thesis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Costantini, Francesco. 2013. "Evidence for the Competition-Based Analysis of Subjunctive Obviation from Relative and Adverbial Clause." Ms., University of Venice.
- Dąbkowski, Maksymilian, and Scott AnderBois. 2024. "Rationale and Precautioning Clauses: Insights from A'ingae." *Journal of Semantics* 40 (2–3): 391–425. https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffac012.
- Dunn, Michael J. 1999. "A Grammar of Chukchi." PhD diss., Australian National University.
- Farkas, Donka. 1992. "On Obviation." In *Lexical Matters*, edited by Ivan A. Sag and Anna Szabolcsi, 85–109. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Georgieva, Ekaterina, Martin Salzmann, and Philipp Weisser. 2021. "Negative Verb Clusters in Mari and Udmurt and Why They Require Postsyntactic Top-Down Word-Formation." *Natural Language* & *Linguistic Theory* 39 (2): 457–503.
- Grosz, Patrick. 2014. "Modal Particles in Rationale Clauses and Related Constructions." In Modes of Modality, edited by Elisabeth Leiss and Werner Abraham, 263–290. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hintikka, Jaakko. 1969. "Semantics for Propositional Attitudes." In *Models for Modalities: Selected Essays*, edited by Jaakko Hintikka, 87–111. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

- Huettner, Alison K. 1989. "Adjunct Infinitives in English." PhD diss., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2012. Interpreting Imperatives. Berlin: Springer.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2014. "Embedded Imperatives Across Languages: Too Rare to Expect, Too Frequent to Ban." Handout for Presentation at Colloquium Stony Brook, April 4, 2014.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena, and Claudia Poschmann. 2013. "Embedded Imperatives Empirical Evidence from Colloquial German." *Language* 89 (3): 619–637.
- Landau, Idan. 2015. A Two-Tiered Theory of Control. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Landau, Idan. 2021. A Selectional Theory of Adjunct Control. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Naumov, Ilya. 2018. "The First-Person Singular Imperative in Chukchi." Unpublished Manuscript. Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers. cfm?abstract id=3301210
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir. 1994. "Tense-Aspect-Mood Forms in Chukchi." Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung 47: 278–354.
- Nissenbaum, Jon. 2005. "Kissing Pedro Martinez: (Existential) Anankastic Conditionals and Rationale Clauses." *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 15 (*SALT* 15): 134–151.
- Pak, Miok, Paul Portner, and Raffaella Zanuttini. 2008. "Agreement in Promissive, Imperative, and Exhortative Clauses." *Korean Linguistics* 14: 157–175.
- Platzack, Christer. 2007. "Embedded Imperatives." In *Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar*, vol. 103, edited by Wim van der Wurff, 181–203. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Portner, Paul. 2004. "The Semantics of Imperatives Within a Theory of Clause Types." In Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT), vol. 14, edited by Robert B. Young, 235–252. Washington, DC: Linguistic Society of America.
- Portner, Paul. 2007. "Imperatives and Modals." Natural Language Semantics 15 (4): 351-383.
- Rus, Dominik. 2005. "Embedded Imperatives in Slovenian." Georgetown University Working Papers in Linguistics 4: 153–183.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2005. "The Lazy Frenchman's Approach to the Subjunctive (Speculations on Reference to Worlds, Presuppositions, and Semantic Defaults in the Analysis of Mood)." In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory. Selected Papers from 'Going Romance'*, edited by Twan Geerts, Ivo van Ginneken and Haike Jacobs, 269–309. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schwager, Magdalena. 2006. "Interpreting Imperatives." PhD diss., University of Frankfurt.
- Skorik, P. Ja. 1961. Grammatika Chukotskogo Jazyka [The Grammar of Chukchi]. Vol. 1. Leningrad: Academy of Sciences.
- Skorik, P. Ja. 1977. Grammatika Chukotskogo Jazyka [The Grammar of Chukchi]. Vol. 2. Leningrad: Academy of Sciences.
- Starkl, Ema. 2023. "Slovenian Embedded Imperatives as Covert Subjunctives." MA thesis, University of Ljubljana.
- Stegovec, Adrian. 2019. "Perspectival Control and Obviation in Directive Clauses." Natural Language Semantics 27 (1): 47–94.