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Reportatives in imperatives

- In declarative sentences, **evidentials** encode the information source for a given claim.

- In interrogatives, languages often allow only a subset of evidentials. (Aikhenvald, 2004)
  - Nonetheless, the range of interpretations of evidentials in interrogatives across languages have given vital analytical insights (e.g. Murray (2011), Murray (2010), Lim (2010))

- In **imperatives**, most languages disallow all evidentials, with only reportative evidentials widely attested:

  (1) Kumuha ka **daw** ng tinapay.
      take.AGT.TRIG you.DIR Rep INDIR bread
      ‘Take some bread (**she says*/they say**)!’ [Tagalog]
§1 Reportatives in declaratives

Reportatives lack an overt reporter

- Reportative evidentials express information which is second-hand (or third-hand).
- Unlike verbs of saying and quotative particles, however, they do not allow for the reporter to be made explicit (e.g. as an argument or via agreement):

(2) **Scenario:** I was talking to my friend Luis earlier about the Xtáabay (a mythical woman who seduces and attacks drunk men in the jungle) and now tell you:

Chowak *bin* u *tso’ots-el* u *pool* le *ixtáabay=o’*. long *REP A3* hair-*REL A3* head *DEF Xtáabay=DISTAL* ‘I was told (by Luis) that the Xtáabay’s hair is long.’ [Yucatec Maya]
Reportatives in declaratives

Reportatives lack an overt reporter

- Reportative evidentials express information which is second-hand (or third-hand).
- Unlike verbs of saying and quotative particles, however, they do not allow for the reporter to be made explicit (e.g. as an argument or via agreement):

\[(2) \text{ Scenario: I was talking to my friend Luis earlier about the Xtáabay (a mythical woman who seduces and attacks drunk men in the jungle) and now tell you:} \]

*Chowak\bin\{leti’/Luis\} u tso’ots-el u pool le long REP him/Luis A3 hair-REL A3 head DEF ixtáabay=o’.
Xtáabay=DISTAL
Intended *‘I was told by him/Luis that the Xtáabay’s hair is long.’ [Yucatec Maya]
§1 Reportatives in declaratives

Reportatives lack an overt reporter

- Reportative evidentials express information which is second-hand (or third-hand).
- Unlike verbs of saying and quotative particles, however, they do not allow for the reporter to be made explicit (e.g. as an argument or via agreement):

(2) **Scenario:** I was talking to my friend Luis earlier about the Xtáabay (a mythical woman who seduces and attacks drunk men in the jungle) and now tell you:

*Chowak u bin u tso’ots-el u pool le ixtáabay=o’.

Intended *’I was told by him/her that the Xtáabay’s hair is long.’

[Yucatec Maya]
§1 Reportatives in declaratives

Reportatives lack an overt reporter

- Reportative evidentials express information which is second-hand (or third-hand).
- Unlike verbs of saying and quotative particles, however, they do not allow for the reporter to be made explicit (e.g. as an argument or via agreement):

\[(2)\]  
**Scenario:** I was talking to my friend Luis earlier about the Xtáabay (a mythical woman who seduces and attacks drunk men in the jungle) and now tell you:

* Luis=e’t chowak bin u tso’ots-el u pool le Luis=Top long  Rep A3 hair-REL A3 head DEF
ixtáabay=o’.
Xtáabay=DISTAL

Intended *‘As for Luis, I was told by him that the Xtáabay’s hair is long.’*  

[Yucatec Maya]
§1 Reportatives in declaratives

Reportatives have apparently anaphoric uses

- **Rep** don’t license ‘reporter’ arguments, but they allow for (apparently) anaphoric uses, (3) (e.g. Murray (2010), Schwager (2010))

- **Rep** do not require a salient reporter, allowing for ‘hearsay’ uses with the reporter unspecified, (4).

(3) **Scenario:** We are inside a windowless building. I just got off the phone with my friend Mary who is outside and tell you:

Umuulan **daw**.

rain.IMPF Rep

‘It’s raining outside, Mary says.’  [Tagalog]

(4) **Scenario:** We are talking our opinions about a local politician.

Matapat **daw** siya.

honest Rep DIR.3SG

‘He’s honest, I heard.’ (alt. ‘He’s honest, they say.’)  [Tagalog]
§1 Reportatives in declaratives

Scope proposition deniable in declaratives

- Reportatives (Rep) are typically used as though the speaker believes the scope proposition possibly or likely true (e.g. Faller (2007)).
- Rep allow the scope proposition to be explicitly denied with sufficient perspective shifting, (5) (e.g. AnderBois (2014)).

(5)  

a. Scenario: We are talking our opinions about a local politician. Matapat daw siya, pero hindi naman iyon totoo. honest Rep Dir.3sg but Neg CONTR that true ‘He’s honest, they say, but it’s not really true.’ [Tagalog]

b. Scenario: We are talking about a recent exam.
   i. Ma’ bin t-in máans-(aj)-e eeksaamen=o’ NEG Rep PfV-A1 pass-STATUS-DEF exam=DISTAL ‘I didn’t pass the exam reportedly, ...’
   ii. ...ba’ale’ t-u jaaj-il=e’ t-in máans-aj. ... but Prep-A3 true-REL=Top PfV-A1 pass-STATUS ‘... but actually I passed.’ [Yucatec Maya]
§1 Imperatives

Imperatives defined

- Imperatives are a major syntactic sentence type across languages
- Although imperatives are often most associated with directive speech acts like commands, ...
- ... they are consistently polyfunctional cross-linguistically: (see Aikhenvald (2010), Condoravdi & Lauer (2012) for recent overviews)
§1 Imperatives

Imperatives defined

- Imperatives are a major syntactic sentence type across languages
- Although imperatives are often most associated with directive speech acts like commands, ...
- ... they are consistently polyfunctional cross-linguistically:
  (see Aikhenvald (2010), Condoravdi & Lauer (2012) for recent overviews)

(6) Imperative speech acts:
  a. Stand at attention! \(\sim\) COMMAND
  b. Please, don’t be rain! \(\sim\) WISH
  c. Have a cookie. \(\sim\) OFFER
  d. Take the train that leaves in 10 minutes. \(\sim\) ADVICE
§1 Imperatives

Imperatives w/ reportatives

- \( \text{IMP}_\text{REP} \) like (7) little discussed in previous literature:

(7) **Context:** A family member offers advice to a teenager
Maligo  \( \text{ka} \)  na \( \text{raw} \) bathe.\( \text{IMPER} \ \text{DIR.2SG} \) now \( \text{REP} \)
‘Take a bath *(s/he says).*’  

Two informal semantic characterizations of \( \text{IMP}_\text{REP} \):

**Imperative by proxy:** \( \text{IMP}_\text{REP} \) ‘not just ‘hearsay’ — it implies a command to do something on someone else’s order’
(Aikhenvald, 2010, p. 138)

**Neutral report:** \( \text{IMP}_\text{REP} \) ‘not an imperative on behalf of a third party, but rather an entirely neutral report of an imperative’ (Schwager, 2010, p. 8) (see also Thomas (2014), Korotkova (2015), Korotkova (2016))
Imperatives w/ reportatives

- $\text{IMP}_{\text{REP}}$ like (7) little discussed in previous literature:

  (7) **Context:** A family member offers advice to a teenager
  Maligo ka na raw bathe.$\text{IMPER} \text{ DIR.2SG now } \text{REP}$
  ‘Take a bath *(s/he says).*’

- Two **slightly more formal** reworkings of these characterizations:

  **Imperative by proxy:** $\text{IMP}_{\text{REP}}$ contribute the same primary meaning/CCP as other imperatives.

  **Neutral report:** $\text{IMP}_{\text{REP}}$ contribute informational updates with reportative or quotative contents.
§1 This talk

- **Today:** Argue that $\text{IMP_{REP}}$ – at least in Tagalog and Yucatec Maya – best fit the *imperative by proxy* characterization, a pattern which calls for an illocutionary account.

Road map:

§2 examines the illocutionary effects of $\text{IMP_{REP}}$ in discourse including the range of responses they elicit;

§3 looks at two different types of ‘weakening’ claimed to happen in $\text{IMP_{REP}}$;

§4 develops an illocutionary analysis of $\text{IMP_{REP}}$ extending AnderBois (2014)’s scoreboard semantics for reportatives in declaratives;

§5 concludes with implications for the typology of evidentials.
§1 Language background

- Naturally occurring examples and context-relative felicity judgment data from two languages:

**Yucatec Maya (Mayan, Mexico)**
- Reportative *bin* part of a small set of clitics which occur at the end of any prosodic word

**Tagalog (Austronesian, Philippines)**
- Reportative *daw/raw* part of a set of 18 second position discourse particles (Schachter & Otanes (1972))
§2 Illocutionary force of Imp<sub>Rep</sub>

**Imp<sub>Rep</sub>** are polyfunctional

- As the name ‘imperative by proxy’ suggests, Imp<sub>Rep</sub> can be used to issue commands to the addressee:

(8) **Order Scenario:** Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling:

\[
\text{Uk’ } \text{bin } a \text{ wo’och k’eyem=o’} \\
\text{drink. IMPER REP your meal pozole-DISTAL} \\
\text{‘Drink your pozole (she orders)!'}
\]  

[Yucatec Maya]
§2 Illocutionary force of $\text{Imp}_{\text{Rep}}$

$\text{Imp}_{\text{Rep}}$ are polyfunctional

- As the name ‘imperative by proxy’ suggests, $\text{Imp}_{\text{Rep}}$ can be used to issue commands to the addressee:

  (8) **Order Scenario:** Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling:
  
  Uk’ **bin** a wo’och k’eyem=o’ drink.\text{Imper Rep} your meal \text{pozole-Distal} ‘Drink your pozole (**she orders**)!’  
  
  [Yucatec Maya]

- While Aikhenvald (2010) focuses exclusively on command uses, recalling the polyfunctionality above, we find that $\text{Imp}_{\text{Rep}}$ can be used in other imperative speech acts:

  (9) **Advice Scenario:** Your stomach hurts and I am on the phone with our Mom asking for advice. I tell you:
  
  Uk’ **bin** a wo’och k’eyem=o’ drink.\text{Imper Rep} your meal \text{pozole-Distal} ‘Drink your pozole (**she says**)!’  
  
  [Yucatec Maya]
§2  Illocutionary force of $\text{Imp}_\text{Rep}$

$\text{Imp}_\text{Rep}$ are polyfunctional

- As the name ‘imperative by proxy’ suggests, $\text{Imp}_\text{Rep}$ can be used to issue commands to the addressee:

  (8) **Order Scenario:** Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling:
  
  Uk’ **bin** a wo’och k’eyem=ö’
  drink.$\text{Imper Rep}$ your meal  pozole-DISTAL
  ‘Drink your pozole *(she orders)!’
  
  [Yucatec Maya]

- While Aikhenvald (2010) focuses exclusively on command uses, recalling the polyfunctionality above, we find that $\text{Imp}_\text{Rep}$ can be used in other imperative speech acts:

  (10) **Offer Scenario:** A child’s mother has told them they should offer cake to guests. The child says to a guest:
  
  Jaant **bin** le paastel=a’
  eat.$\text{Imper Rep}$ DEF cake=DISTAL
  ‘Eat this cake *(Mom told me to offer it)!’
  
  [Yucatec Maya]
§2 Illocutionary force of $\text{Imp}_{\text{Rep}}$

$\text{Imp}_{\text{Rep}}$ are polyfunctional

- As the name ‘imperative by proxy’ suggests, $\text{Imp}_{\text{Rep}}$ can be used to issue commands to the addressee:

(8) **Order Scenario:** Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling:

```
Uk’ bin a wo’och k’eyem=o’
drink.\text{Imper} \text{Rep} your meal \text{pozole-DISTAL}

‘Drink your pozole *(she orders)*’
```

[Yucatec Maya]

- While Aikhenvald (2010) focuses exclusively on command uses, recalling the polyfunctionality above, we find that $\text{Imp}_{\text{Rep}}$ can be used in other imperative speech acts:

(11) **Well-wish scenario:** My friend wants me to tell you to take care. I say to you:

```
Kaláant-a-baj bin!
care.for-A2-Refl \text{Rep}

‘Take care *(s/he says)*’
```

[Yucatec Maya]
§2 Illocutionary force of Imp<sub>Rep</sub>

**Imp<sub>Rep</sub>** are polyfunctional

- As the name ‘imperative by proxy’ suggests, **Imp<sub>Rep</sub>** can be used to issue commands to the addressee:

  (8) **Order Scenario:** Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling:

  \[\text{Uk'} \ \text{bin a wo’och k’eyem=o’} \ \text{drink.}\text{Imper Rep your meal pozole-DISTAL} \]

  ‘Drink your pozole (she orders)!’

  [Yucatec Maya]

- While Aikhenvald (2010) focuses exclusively on command uses, recalling the polyfunctionality above, we find that **Imp<sub>Rep</sub>** can be used in other imperative speech acts:

  (12) **Optative:** A friend told me to wish you well. I say:

  \[\text{K’aa xi’ik bin tech uts} \ \text{IRR go.Subj Rep Dat.B2sg good} \]

  ‘May you be well (my friend wishes)!’

  [Yucatec Maya]
§2 Illocutionary force of Imp<sub>Rep</sub>

**Imp<sub>Rep</sub> are polyfunctional**

- As the name ‘imperative by proxy’ suggests, Imp<sub>Rep</sub> can be used to issue commands to the addressee:

  (8) **Order Scenario:** Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling:
  
  Uk’ **bin** a wo’och k’eyem=o’
  
  drink.IMP<sub>Rep</sub> your meal pozole-DISTAL
  
  ‘Drink your pozole *(she orders)*!’

  [Yucatec Maya]

- While Aikhenvald (2010) focuses exclusively on command uses, recalling the polyfunctionality above, we find that Imp<sub>Rep</sub> can be used in other imperative speech acts:

  (13) **Exhortative:** My friend told us Ko’ox *janal!* ‘Let’s eat!’ . You didn’t hear what was said and so I repeat for you:

  
  Ko’ox **bin** *janal.*
  
  come.HORT REP eat

  ‘Let’s eat *(she says)*.’

  [Yucatec Maya]
§2  Illocutionary force of Imp$_{\text{Rep}}$

Imp$_{\text{Rep}}$ are polyfunctional

As the name ‘imperative by proxy’ suggests, Imp$_{\text{Rep}}$ can be used to issue commands to the addressee:

(8) **Order Scenario:** Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling: Uk’ **bin** a wo’och k’eyem=o’
drink. Imp$_{\text{Rep}}$ your meal pozole-Distal
‘Drink your pozole (she orders)!’ [Yucatec Maya]

While Aikhenvald (2010) focuses exclusively on command uses, recalling the polyfunctionality above, we find that Imp$_{\text{Rep}}$ can be used in other imperative speech acts:

(14) **Negative imperative:** Juan says he is going to kill one of his father’s pigs. I am on the phone with Juan’s dad and say:
Ma’ **bin** a kíinsik (le k’éek’en=o’)
Neg$_{\text{Rep}}$ A2 kill Def pig=Distal
‘Don’t kill the pig (he says)!’ [Yucatec Maya]
§2 Infelicitous for information-seeking

Not interchangeable with declaratives

- In principle, $\text{IMP}_{\text{REP}}$ contain *information* about what the reporter wants to have happen (and/or what they said they want).

- If $\text{IMP}_{\text{REP}}$ are neutral reports, we should expect them to be felicitous in contexts where the addressee seeks this information. However:

(15) **#Information-seeking scenario:** You talked to Mom, what did you hear?

#Xeen bin a maan bu’ul
go.$\text{IMP REP A2 buy.SUBJ bean}$

‘Go buy beans (I heard).’

*[Yucatec Maya]*
§2 Infelicitous for information-seeking

Not interchangeable with declaratives

- In principle, IMP\textsubscript{REP} contain *information* about what the reporter wants to have happen (and/or what they said they want).
- If IMP\textsubscript{REP} are neutral reports, we should expect them to be felicitous in contexts where the addressee seeks this information. However:

(16) **#Descriptive bouletic modal scenario:** You talked to Mom, what does Mom want?

---

[Yucatec Maya]
§2 Infelicitous for information-seeking

Not interchangeable with declaratives

- In principle, $\text{IMP}_{\text{REP}}$ contain information about what the reporter wants to have happen (and/or what they said they want).

- If $\text{IMP}_{\text{REP}}$ are neutral reports, we should expect them to be felicitous in contexts where the addressee seeks this information. However:

  (16) **#Descriptive bouletic modal scenario:** You talked to Mom, what does Mom want?
  
  #Xeen **bin** a maan bu’ul go.IMP REP A2 buy.SUBJ bean
  
  ‘Go buy beans (I heard).’
  
  [Yucatec Maya]

- Analogous declaratives with verba dicendi, deontic modals, or desideratives plus $\text{REP}$ are fine in this case.
§2 Responses to Imp<sub>Rep</sub>

Possible overt responses pattern with imperatives

- While declarative sentences do not oblige an overt response, they allow responses such as ‘yes’ and ‘no’ (e.g. Farkas & Bruce (2010) et seq.)
- If neutral reports, Imp<sub>Rep</sub> ought to allow for such responses.
- However, we find that such responses are infelicitous, whereas responses possible for ordinary imperatives are acceptable:

(17)  

a. A: Uk’  
    bin a wo’noch k’eyem=o’
    drink.IMPER Rep your meal pozole-DISTAL
    ‘Drink your pozole (she orders)!’

[Yucatec Maya]

b. B: Ma’alob túun. // #Jaaj.
    okay then true
    ‘Okay then.’ // ‘True.’
§2 Responses to Imp<sub>Rep</sub>

Possible overt responses pattern with imperatives

► While declarative sentences do not oblige an overt response, they allow responses such as ‘yes’ and ‘no’ (e.g. Farkas & Bruce (2010) et seq.)
► If neutral reports, IMP<sub>Rep</sub> ought to allow for such responses.
► However, we find that such responses are infelicitous, whereas responses possible for ordinary imperatives are acceptable:

(17) a. A: Uk’ bin a wo’och k’eyem=o’
    drink.IMPER REP your meal pozole-DISTAL
    ‘Drink your pozole (she orders)!’ [Yucatec Maya]

b. B: Ma’, (min jantik).// Mix táan. // #Ma’
    No NEG.1SG eat NEG PROG NEG
    jaaj=i’.
    true=NEG.CL
    ‘No, (I won’t).’ // ‘I won’t.’ // #‘It’s not true.’
Tagalog *daw*

- Schwager (2010) claims Tagalog $\text{IMP}_{\text{REP}}$ are neutral reports and offers the following judgment as support:

  (18)  
  a. $\text{KN<um>ain (ka) daw.}$
      $\text{eat<AV> you REP}$
      “e.g. ‘Mommy/They/... said that you should eat.’”
  
  b. Hindi totoo!
      $\text{NEG true}$
      ‘That’s not true!’
§2 Cross-linguistic uniformity?

Tagalog *daw*

- Schwager (2010) claims Tagalog IMPREP are neutral reports and offers the following judgment as support:
- However, in my own fieldwork, speakers find this response marginal at best, and show the same pattern as in YM:

(19) **Order Context:** Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their bread. I tell my sibling:

a. Kainin mo *daw* ang tinapay mo
   eat.PT INDIR.2SG REP DIR bread your
   ‘Eat you bread (she orders)!’

b. #Hindi (totoo) // Ayaw ko // #Oo // #Totoo iyan
   NEG true not.want INDIR.1SG yes true that
   // Sige (na) (nga)
   okay now indeed
   # ‘It’s not true.’ // ‘I don’t want to.’ // #‘Yes’ // # ‘That’s true.’ // Okay.
§3 ‘Softening’ of imperatives

Aikhenvald 2004/2010’s claims

- Aikhenvald claims that reportatives may ‘attenuate’ or ‘soften’ commands, implying that this possibility varies by languages:

(20) marna-lu ma-nta nganta?
spinifex-3pl get-IMPER REP
‘Pick up the spinifex, won’t you?’

[Warlpiri] (Laughren, 1982, p. 138)

(21) Arrantherre kwele n tert-irr-∅-aye!
2PLS REP quiet-INCH-IMPER-EMPH
‘You mob are supposed to be quiet.’

[Mparntwe Arrernte] (Wilkins, 1989, p. 393)

- N.B. it’s not clear how/if this claim extends to other speech acts like offers and advice.
‘Strength’ and deniability

Context modulates ‘strength’ indirectly

- For YM bin and Tagalog daw, however, we find no evidence of such a specific relationship.
- Rather, the perceived ‘strength’ is modulated by the social or rational authority of the reporter (cf. Hamblin (1987), Kaufmann (2012) on ordinary imperatives):
  - Indefinite/generic reporters often lead to ‘weakening’, but this is not a property of the reportative per se.

(22) **Strong Social Authority Order Scenario:** Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling:

Uk’ **bin** a wo’och k’eyem=о’
drink.IMP**ER** REP your meal pozole-DISTAL
‘Drink your pozole (**she orders**)!’  

[Yucatec Maya]
‘Strength’ and deniability

Context modulates ‘strength’ indirectly

- For YM **bin** and Tagalog **daw**, however, we find no evidence of such a specific relationship.
- Rather, the perceived ‘strength’ is modulated by the social or rational authority of the reporter (cf. Hamblin (1987), Kaufmann (2012) on ordinary imperatives):
- Indefinite/generic reporters often lead to ‘weakening’, but this is not a property of the reportative *per se*.

(23) **Weak Social Authority Order Scenario:** Our younger brother has told me to make sure my uncle eats his dinner. After talking to my brother, I turn to my uncle and say:

_Uk’ **bin** a wo’och k’eyem=o’ drink._

**Imper Rep** your meal **pozole-DISTAL**

‘Drink your pozole *(he orders)!’

[Yucatec Maya]
§3 ‘Strength’ and deniability

Context modulates ‘strength’ indirectly

- For YM *bin* and Tagalog *daw*, however, we find no evidence of such a specific relationship.
- Rather, the perceived ‘strength’ is modulated by the social or rational authority of the reporter (cf. Hamblin (1987), Kaufmann (2012) on ordinary imperatives):
- Indefinite/generic reporters often lead to ‘weakening’, but this is not a property of the reportative *per se*.

(24) **Unspecified Reporter Order Scenario:** We are sitting at the table and you aren’t having your pozole. I say to you: Uk’ *bin* a wo’och k’eyem=o’ drink. IMPER REP your meal pozole-DISTAL ‘Drink your pozole *(they say)*!’

[Yucatec Maya]
‘Strength’ and deniability

Deniability

- Related to the preceding observations, Thomas (2014) argues for a ‘neutral report’ approach in part by citing the following explicit denial:

(25) E-me’ē je chevy pe ka’ygua, va’eri nd-a-ipota-i.
2.IMPER-give REP me to mate, but NEG-A1-want-NEG
‘Give me the mate, I heard, but I don’t want it.’  [Mbyá]

- Similar such denials are somewhat possible in Yucatec Maya and Tagalog:

(26) Jáant bin a wo’och=o’, ba’ale’ ten=e’ ma’ in k’áat
eat.IMPER REP A2 meal=DISTAL but I=TOP NEG A1 wish
káa a jáant=i’.
IRR A2 eat=NEG.CL
‘Eat your meal (he says), but I don’t want you to eat it.’  [Yucatec Maya]
Deniability

Related to the preceding observations, Thomas (2014) argues for a ‘neutral report’ approach in part by citing the following explicit denial:

(25) E-me’ē je chevy pe ka’ygua, va’eri nd-a-ipota-i.
    2.IMPER-give Rep me to mate, but Neg-A1-want-Neg
    ‘Give me the mate, I heard, but I don’t want it.’
    [Mbyá]

Similar such denials are somewhat possible in Yucatec Maya and Tagalog:

(27) ?Tumakbo ka daw araw-araw, pero ayaw run.IMPER DIR.2SG Rep daily but not.want kita-ng tumakbo.
    DIR2SG.INDIR1SG-LNK run
    ‘Run daily (they say), but I don’t want you to.’
    [Tagalog]
Deniability

- Related to the preceding observations, Thomas (2014) argues for a ‘neutral report’ approach in part by citing the following explicit denial:

(25) $E-m$‘{ˇ} $je$ $chevy$ $pe$ $ka’ygu$ $va’eri$ $nd-a-ipota-i$.  
2.IMPER-give $REP$ $me$ $to$ $mate$, $but$ $NEG-A1$-want-NEG
‘Give me the mate, I heard, but I don’t want it.’ [Mbyá]

- ... and more marginally with conflicting imperatives:

(28) $?J’aant$ $bin$ $verduras$, $ba’ale’$ ($t-u$ $jaaj-il=e’$) $ma’$ eat.IMPER $REP$ vegetables but $PREP-A3$ true-REL=TOP Neg
a $jantik$.  
A2 eat
‘They say to eat your vegetables, but (really) don’t.’ [Yucatec Maya]
Related to the preceding observations, Thomas (2014) argues for a ‘neutral report’ approach in part by citing the following explicit denial:

\[(25)\] E-me’ē je chevy pe ka’ygua, va’eri nd-a-ipota-i.
2.IMPER-give Rep me to mate, but Neg-A1-want-Neg
‘Give me the mate, I heard, but I don’t want it.’ [Mbyá]

... and more marginally with conflicting imperatives:

\[(29)\] ?Tumakbo ka daw, pero (dapat) huwag ko-ng run. IMPER DIR.2SG Rep but should NEG.IMP INDIR.2SG-LNK tumakbo!
run
‘They say to run, but don’t run!’ [Tagalog]
§3 ‘Strength’ and deniability

Reportative exceptionality

- In §4, I analyze such cases as instances of ‘reportative exceptionality’ in declaratives. (AnderBois, 2014)

(30)  a. Pay-kuna-s ñoqa-ma qa quili ta muntu-ntin-pi
       (s)he-PL-REP I-ILLA-TOP money-Acc lot-INCL-LOC
       saqiy-wa-n
       leave-1O-3
   $p = \text{‘They leave me a lot of money, } \text{reportedly } $\ldots$$

  b. mana-má riki riku-sqa-yki ni un sol-ta centavo-ta-pis
       not-IMPR right see-PP-2 not one Sol-Acc cent-Acc-ADD
       saqi-sha-wa-n-chu
       leave-PROG-1O-3-NEG
   $q = \text{‘\ldots(but) that’s not true, as you have seen, they don’t leave me one sol, not one cent.’ } \text{[Cuzco Quechua]}, \text{(Faller, 2002, p. 191)}$
§3 ‘Strength’ and deniability

Reportative exceptionality

In §4, I analyze such cases as instances of ‘reportative exceptionality’ in declaratives. (AnderBois, 2014)

(31)  a. Ma’ bin t-in máans-(aj)-e eeksaamen=o’
     NEG REP Pfv-A1 pass-STATUS-DEF exam=DISTAL
     ‘I didn’t pass the exam reportedly, . . .’

     b. ba’ale’ t-u jaaj-il=e’ t-in máans-aj.
     but PREP-A3 true-REL=TOP Pfv-A1 pass-STATUS
     ‘. . . but actually I passed.’ [Yucatec Maya]
§4 An illocutionary account of ImpRep

\( \text{ImpRep} \) in the discourse scoreboard

- Empirically, I have argued that \( \text{ImpRep} \) produce the same illocutionary potential as other imperatives, differing in the addition of the report and pragmatic effects it brings.

- This section:
  - Develop a scoreboard semantics in the style of Farkas & Bruce (2010) for declaratives and imperatives.
  - Show that the illocutionary account of reportatives in AnderBois (2014) can be extended to capture \( \text{ImpRep} \) in a uniform way.
§4 Declaratives in the scoreboard

Declaratives contribute ‘dual’ updates

Uttering a declarative sentence produces two effects/two updates to the discourse scoreboard:

**Public commitment:** Publicly commit a to having adequate evidence supporting p (Add p to DC$_a$).

**Essential effect:** Propose to add p to a and b’s Common Ground subject to b’s approval (Add p to Table$\{a,b\}$)

\[(32)\]  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Shared ${a,b}$</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Table${a,b}$</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC$_a$</td>
<td>CG$_{{a,b}}$</td>
<td>DC$_b$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§4 Declaratives in the scoreboard

Declaratives contribute ‘dual’ updates

- Uttering a declarative sentence produces two effects/two updates to the discourse scoreboard:

  **Public commitment:** Publicly commit \(a\) to having adequate evidence supporting \(p\) (Add \(p\) to \(\text{DC}_a\)).

  **Essential effect:** Propose to add \(p\) to \(a\) and \(b\)’s Common Ground subject to \(b\)’s approval (Add \(p\) to \(\text{Table}_{\{a,b\}}\))

(32) **Propose and Commit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shared ({a,b})</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{Table}_{{a,b}})</td>
<td>(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{DC}_a)</td>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>(\text{CG}_{{a,b}})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Declaratives in the scoreboard

§4

Declaratives contribute ‘dual’ updates

- Uttering a declarative sentence produces two effects/two updates to the discourse scoreboard:

  **Public commitment:** Publicly commit $a$ to having adequate evidence supporting $p$ (Add $p$ to $\text{DC}_a$).

  **Essential effect:** Propose to add $p$ to $a$ and $b$’s Common Ground subject to $b$’s approval (Add $p$ to Table$\{a,b\}$)

(32) Accept

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
a & \text{Shared} \{a,b\} & b \\
\hline
\hline
 & \text{Table} \{a,b\} & \\
\hline
\text{DC}_a & p & \text{CG} \{a,b\} & p & \text{DC}_b \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Various independent arguments for both of these two updates in recent literature (e.g. Farkas & Bruce (2010), McCready (2015), AnderBois (2016), AnderBois (accepted))
Declaratives contribute ‘dual’ updates

- Uttering a declarative sentence produces two effects/two updates to the discourse scoreboard:
  
  **Public commitment:** Publicly commit $a$ to having adequate evidence supporting $p$ (Add $p$ to $DC_a$).
  
  **Essential effect:** Propose to add $p$ to $a$ and $b$’s Common Ground subject to $b$’s approval (Add $p$ to Table${a,b}$)

(32) Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shared ${a,b}$</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>Table${a,b}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$DC_a$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$CG_{a,b}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$DC_b$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Various independent arguments for both of these two updates in recent literature (e.g. Farkas & Bruce (2010), McCready (2015), AnderBois (2016), AnderBois (accepted))
§4 Reportatives as update modifiers

Declarative w/ reportative updates

- AnderBois (2014): illocutionary reportatives in declaratives like (33) leave the proposal intact, but alter the public commitment (see Faller (2002), Murray (2010), Murray (2014) for related accounts)

(33) Scenario: I am talking on the phone with a friend to ask about the weather in our town so we can decide whether to bring umbrellas and I tell you:
Táantik bin u chuunul u toosol ja’=e’ IMM.PAST Rep A3 start A3 sprinkle water=Top
‘It just started to sprinkle (he says).’

(34) Declarative w/ Reportative bin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Shared {a,b}</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table{a,b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_a</td>
<td>CG{a,b}</td>
<td>DC_b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§4 Reportatives as update modifiers

Declarative w/ reportative updates

- AnderBois (2014): illocutionary reportatives in declaratives like (33) leave the proposal intact, but alter the public commitment (see Faller (2002), Murray (2010), Murray (2014) for related accounts)

(33) **Scenario:** I am talking on the phone with a friend to ask about the weather in our town so we can decide whether to bring umbrellas and I tell you:

Táantik **bin** u chuunul u toosol ja’=e’

**IMM.PAST REP A3 start** A3 sprinkle water=**Top**

‘It just started to sprinkle (he says).’

(34) **Declarative w/ Reportative bin:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Shared {a,b}</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Table{a,b}</strong></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC\textsubscript{a}</td>
<td><strong>REP(p)</strong></td>
<td>CG{a,b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC\textsubscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§4 Reportatives as update modifiers

Declarative w/ reportative updates

- AnderBois (2014): illocutionary reportatives in declaratives like (33) leave the proposal intact, but alter the public commitment (see Faller (2002), Murray (2010), Murray (2014) for related accounts)

(33) **Scenario:** I am talking on the phone with a friend to ask about the weather in our town so we can decide whether to bring umbrellas and I tell you:

Táantik bin u chuunul u toosol ja’=e’

IMM.PAST REP A3 start A3 sprinkle water=TOP

‘It just started to sprinkle (he says).’

(34) **Declarative w/ Reportative bin:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Shared {a,b}</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table {a,b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_a</td>
<td>REP(p)</td>
<td>CG_{a,b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


§4 Imperatives are about preferences

Imperatives and effective preferences

- Much recent literature: imperative meanings involve preferences.
- However, ordinary preferences like those expressed by verbs like want need not be consistent:

(35) **Context:** I don’t want to teach at all next semester.
    I want to teach Tuesdays and Thursdays next semester. (Heim (1992))

- For imperatives, then, what we need are what Condoravdi & Lauer (2012) call **EFFECTIVE PREFERENCES**.
  - i.e. preferences with conflicts resolved in order to guide actions.
§4 Imperatives as proposals

Imperatives in the scoreboard

- To account for imperatives in a parallel fashion: add $\text{CPref}_{\{a,b\}}$ to scoreboard (mutual/common effective preferences).

(36) Imperative update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Shared ${a,b}$</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC_a</td>
<td>Table${a,b}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_b</td>
<td>CG${a,b}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPref${a,b}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§4 Imperatives as proposals

Imperatives in the scoreboard

- To account for imperatives in a parallel fashion: add $\text{CPref}_{\{a,b\}}$ to scoreboard (mutual/common effective preferences).

(36) Imperative update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shared ${a,b}$</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Table}_{{a,b}}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{DC}_a$</td>
<td>$\text{CG}_{{a,b}}$</td>
<td>$\text{DC}_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{CPref}_{{a,b}}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§4 Imperatives as proposals

Imperatives in the scoreboard

- To account for imperatives in a parallel fashion: add $\text{CPref}_{\{a,b\}}$ to scoreboard (mutual/common effective preferences).

(36) **Imperative update:**

|      | Shared $\{a,b\}$ | b
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$\text{Table}_{{a,b}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{DC}_a$</td>
<td>$\text{CG}_{{a,b}}$</td>
<td>$\text{DC}_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{CPref}_{{a,b}}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§4  Imperatives as proposals

Imperatives in the scoreboard

- To account for imperatives in a parallel fashion: add $\text{CPref}_{\{a,b\}}$ to scoreboard (mutual/common effective preferences).
- Parallel essential effect: put a preference for $p > \neg p$ on the Table, proposing to add it to $\text{CPref}_{\{a,b\}}$ if accepted.

(36) Imperative update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Shared ${a,b}$</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Table${a,b}$</strong></td>
<td>$p &gt; \neg p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC$_a$</td>
<td><strong>CG${a,b}$</strong></td>
<td>DC$_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPref${a,b}$</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§4 Imperatives as proposals

Imperatives in the scoreboard

- To account for imperatives in a parallel fashion: add \( CPref_{\{a,b\}} \) to scoreboard (mutual/common effective preferences).
- Parallel essential effect: put a preference for \( p > \neg p \) on the Table, proposing to add it to \( CPref_{\{a,b\}} \) if accepted.

(36) Imperative update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Shared {a,b}</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table_{{a,b}}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_{a}</td>
<td>CG_{{a,b}}</td>
<td>DC_{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPref_{{a,b}}</td>
<td>p &gt; \neg p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§4 Imperatives as proposals

Imperatives in the scoreboard

- To account for imperatives in a parallel fashion: add \( CPref\{a,b\} \) to scoreboard (mutual/common effective preferences).
- Parallel essential effect: put a preference for \( p > \neg p \) on the Table, proposing to add it to \( CPref\{a,b\} \) if accepted.

\[(36)\] Imperative update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shared ( {a,b} )</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Table({a,b})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC_a</td>
<td>CG({a,b})</td>
<td>DC_b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPref({a,b})</td>
<td>( p &gt; \neg p )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (See Starr (2013), von Fintel & Iatridou (t.a.) for similar ideas in different frameworks)
§4  Reportatives as update modifiers

\( \text{IMP}_\text{Rep} \) updates

- Extending the above to \( \text{IMP}_\text{Rep} \), I analyze them as leaving the proposal untouched, but adding the information that the reporter has the given effective preference:

\[(37) \textbf{Order Scenario:} \text{ Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling: } \]
\[\text{Uk’} \overset{\text{bin}}{\text{wo’och k’eyem=o’}} \text{ drink.IMP} \text{ REP your meal pozole-DISTAL} \]
\[\text{‘Drink your pozole (she orders)!’} \]

\[(38) \textbf{Imperative w/ Reportative bin:} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shared {a,b}</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Table{a,b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>CG{a,b}</td>
<td>DC&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPref{a,b}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§4  Reportatives as update modifiers

\textbf{IMP}_\text{Rep} updates

- Extending the above to IMP\textsubscript{Rep}, I analyze them as leaving the proposal untouched, but adding the information that the reporter has the given effective preference:

(37) **Order Scenario:** Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling: Uk’ \textbf{bin} a wo’och k’eyem=o’ drink.\textbf{IMPER REP} your meal pozole-DISTAL ‘Drink your pozole (she orders)!’

(38) **Imperative w/ Reportative bin:**

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{a} & \textbf{Shared \{a,b\}} & \textbf{b} \\
\hline
\textbf{Table}_{\{a,b\}} & \textbf{p > \neg p} & \\
\hline
\textbf{DC}_a \textbf{REP}(p > \neg p) & \textbf{CG}_{\{a,b\}} & \textbf{DC}_b \\
\hline
\textbf{CPref}_{\{a,b\}} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
§4 Reportatives as update modifiers

\( \text{IMP}_{\text{REP}} \) updates

- Extending the above to \( \text{IMP}_{\text{REP}} \), I analyze them as leaving the proposal untouched, but adding the information that the reporter has the given effective preference:

(37) **Order Scenario:** Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling: Uk’ **bin** a wo’och k’eyem=o’ drink.\( \text{IMPER ~ REP} \) your meal \( \text{pozole-DISTAL} \) ‘Drink your pozole (**she orders**)!’

(38) **Imperative w/ Reportative bin:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( a )</th>
<th>( \text{Shared} {a,b} )</th>
<th>( b )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Table}{a,b} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{DC}_a \text{ REP}(p &gt; \neg p) )</td>
<td>( \text{CG}{a,b} )</td>
<td>( \text{DC}_b )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CPref}{a,b} )</td>
<td>( p &gt; \neg p )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\textbf{IMP}_{\text{Rep}} \text{ updates} \\

- Extending the above to \textbf{IMP}_{\text{Rep}}, I analyze them as leaving the proposal untouched, but adding the information that the reporter has the given effective preference:

\begin{align*}
(37) \text{ Order Scenario: } & \quad \text{Our mother has told me to make sure that my younger sibling eats their dinner. After talking to her, I tell my sibling:} \\
& \quad \text{\textit{Uk’} bin a wo’och k’eyem=ô’ drink.IMP REP your meal pozole-DISTAL} \\
& \quad \text{‘Drink your pozole (she orders)!’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(38) \text{ Imperative w/ Reportative bin:} \\
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{a} & \text{Shared } \{a,b\} & \text{b} \\
\hline
\text{Table}\{a,b\} & \text{DC}_a \text{ REP}(p > \neg p) & \text{CG}\{a,b\} \\
\hline
\text{DC}_b & \text{CPref}\{a,b\} & p > \neg p \\
\hline
\end{array}
\end{align*}
§4 Reportatives as update modifiers

Reasoning about speech acts

- As in other recent accounts of imperatives (e.g. Condoravdi & Lauer (2012), Kaufmann (2012)), variability in illocutionary force is due to pragmatic reasoning:
  - What (likely private) preferences did the various agents previously have?
  - What is the relative social or rational authority of the agents?

- The speaker’s having committed to a third-party’s effective preference in ImpRep influences these pragmatic processes:
  - Who is the likely reporter? What is their relative social/rational authority?

- Finally, with respect to conflicting imperatives, I follow AnderBois (2014) in taking this to be due a pragmatic perspective-shift.
Empirical claims

- First detailed exploration of $\text{IMP}_{\text{REP}}$ in discourse, drawing on data from Yucatec Maya and Tagalog.

- Contrary to several recent authors, I have argued that such sentences have similar illocutionary potential to other imperatives (i.e. are ‘imperatives by proxy’ rather than ‘neutral reports’).

- Two apparent differences have been argued to be attributable to more general pragmatic processes:
  - ‘Softening’ of directive force due to reasoning about imperative polyfunctionality, which imperatives show whether or not they include evidentials.
  - Explicit deniability due to pragmatically-driven perspective shift, which reportatives facilitate across sentence types.
Illocutionary vs. modal evidentials

- Well-known dichotomy between illocutionary and modal evidentials (e.g. Faller (2006), Matthewson et al. (2007), Murray (2010))
  - i.e. evidentiality ‘above’ and ‘below’ the illocutionary update
- Central to these debates have been the interactions between interrogative sentences and different evidentials across languages.
- The illocutionary stability of imperatives with reportatives provides strong support to illocutionary analyses of these uses of evidentials.
§5 Against the dichotomy

No correlation with other aspects of reportatives

- However, *bin* and *daw* differ in many other ways, calling this dichotomy into question: embeddability (e.g. Schwager (2010), Kierstead (2015)) and felicity in ‘interrogative flip’ scenarios:

(39) **Scenario:** I know your friend went to a concert and you didn’t, but you probably talked to your friend about it. I’m asking you about the concert expecting your answer will be based on the friend’s report. 
Magaling ba *daw* yung *kumanta*?
"**According to what you’ve heard**, was the singer *good*?" [Tagalog]
§5 Against the dichotomy

No correlation with other aspects of reportatives

- However, *bin* and *daw* differ in many other ways, calling this dichotomy into question: embeddability (e.g. Schwager (2010), Kierstead (2015)) and felicity in ‘interrogative flip’ scenarios:

(40) **Scenario:** know your friend went to a concert and you didn’t, but you probably talked to your friend about it. I’m asking you about the concert expecting your answer will be based on the friend’s report.

#Ma’alob-chaj=áa le cha’an **bin**=o’?

good-Proc=POLQ Def event **REP**=DISTAL

#Intended: ‘According to what you’ve heard, did the event go well?’

[Yucatec Maya]
§5 Against the dichotomy

No correlation with other aspects of reportatives

- However, *bin* and *daw* differ in many other ways, calling this dichotomy into question: embeddability (e.g. Schwager (2010), Kierstead (2015)) and felicity in ‘interrogative flip’ scenarios:

(40) **Scenario:** know your friend went to a concert and you didn’t, but you probably talked to your friend about it. I’m asking you about the concert expecting your answer will be based on the friend’s report.

  #Ma’alob-chaj=áa le cha’an *bin*=o’?  
  good-PROC=POLQ DEF event *Rep*=DISTAL  
  #Intended: ‘According to what you’ve heard, did the event go well?’  
  [Yucatec Maya]

- **Conclusion:** such data call into question the viability of the dichotomy, or at least suggest that individual evidentials may have both types of uses (see Korotkova (2016) for a similar conclusion)
No correlation with other aspects of imperatives

- Schwager (2010), Thomas (2014) suggest that the felicity of $\text{IMP}_{\text{REP}}$ is related to embeddability of imperatives generally.

- Imperatives in Tagalog and Mbyá claimed to be embeddable (Schwager (2010), Thomas (2014))

- However, Yucatec Maya ones are not, most clearly seen for intransitives, which have an imperative suffix -en:

(41) $^*$T-u {tuklaj/ya’alaj} [xeen]!
Pfv-A3 think/say go.IMP
Intended: ‘He thought/said to go.’
Thank you!
Thanks Rosa Isela Canche Cen, Miguel Oscar Chan Dzul, Margarita Hau Hau, Norma Patricia Kuyoc Kuyoc, Irma Yolanda Pomol Cahum, and Luis Petul for Yucatec Maya judgments and thoughts! Thanks to Henrison Hsieh, Jenny Tan, and Amber Teng for their Tagalog judgments and thoughts. Thanks also to Polly Jacobson, Kyle Rawlins, 6 anonymous SALT 27 reviewers, and audiences at SAIL 2017 and Brown’s LingLangLunch for helpful feedback.
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Extra slides
§A  Reportatives vs. quotatives

Quotatives are particles with reporters encoded

► Reportative evidentials express information which is second-hand (or third-hand).

► Whereas quotatives allow for the reporter to be expressed explicitly as an argument or via agreement, as in (42), . . .

► . . . reportatives do not allow for an overt reporter argument:

(42) Scenario: I was talking to my friend Luis earlier about the Xtáabay and now tell you:
Luis=e’ chowak u tso’ots-el u pool le ixtáabay=o’
Luis=TOP long A3 hair-REL A3 head DEF Xtáabay=DISTAL
–kij  (teen).
QUOT.B3SG DAT.1SG
‘As for Luis, “the Xtáabay’s hair is long.” he tells me. [Yucatec Maya]
§A Reportatives vs. quotatives

Quotatives are particles with reporters encoded

- Reportative evidentials express information which is second-hand (or third-hand).
- Whereas quotatives allow for the reporter to be expressed explicitly as an argument or via agreement, as in (42), …
- … reportatives do not allow for an overt reporter argument:

(43) **Scenario:** I was talking to my friend Luis earlier about the Xtáabay and now tell you:
*Luis=e’ chowak **bin** u tso’ots-el u pool le
Luis=Top long **REP** A3 hair-**REL** A3 head **DEF**
ixtáabay=o’.
Xtáabay=**DISTAL**
Intended *‘As for Luis, I was told by him that the Xtáabay’s hair is long.’*

[Yucatec Maya]
§A Comparison with quotative k- in YM

Quotative k- in YM

- Within the neutral report approach, Korotkova (2015), Korotkova (2016) explicitly regard \text{Rep}\text{IMP} as quotations.
- YM has grammaticized ‘parenthetical’ quotative marker \textit{k(ij)-}, allowing for straightforward comparison (Lucy (1993), Hanks (1990))
  - Unlike both verbs of saying and \textit{bin}, \textit{k(ij)-} occurs only following the quoted material or prosodically separated in medial position.
  - Like verbs of saying, but unlike \textit{bin}, \textit{k(ij)-} inflects to agree with the reporter and allows the recipient of the report to be expressed with a dative.

(44) Tu’ux k-a \text{bin} - k-en ti’.
    where \text{IMP}-A2 go QUOT-B1sg DAT.3sg
    ‘“Where are you going?” I said to him.’ \textbf{[Yucatec Maya]} (Lucy, 1993)
§A Pronouns and shifty things in quotatives

Pronouns and shifty things in quotatives

- Unlike reportatives, local pronouns and other deictic expressions shift with \( k(ij) \):

\[
\begin{align*}
(45) \quad \text{Way } k-\text{in} \quad & \text{kutal-e’ - } \text{kiij} \\
& \text{here } \text{Imp-A1 sit-Top} \quad \text{QUOT.3SG} \\
& \text{‘ “I’ll sit here” he says.’ (He’s like ‘I’ll sit here).’} \\
& \text{(Hanks, 1990, p. 207)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

- The implicit imperative subject similarly shifts and the result is a neutral report or quote:

\[
\begin{align*}
(46) \quad \text{Scenario: A friend is asking what my father (who he hasn’t talked to) told me to do:} \\
P\acute{e}(k)n-en \quad & \text{Espita - } \text{kiij} \\
& \text{move.ANTIP-IMPER Espita} \quad \text{QUOT} \\
& \text{‘ “Go to Espita!” he said.’} \\
& \text{[Yucatec Maya]} \\
\end{align*}
\]
§A Illocutionary force of quotatives

Imperatives with quotatives really are ‘neutral reports’

- This is so regardless of how the arguments of \(k(ij)\) are spelled out:

(47) Xeen - \textit{kij} tech.
    go.IMPER QUOT.3SG DAT.2SG
    ‘“Go”, he said/says to you’

(48) Ko’ox=i’ - \textit{ki} teen
    go.HORT=DEIC QUOT.3SG DAT.1SG
    ‘“Let’s go!” he said to me’

- While both \textit{bin} REP with \(k(ij)\)- QUOT ‘pass along’ the speech of another agent, only the latter produces neutral reports.

- Lucy (1993): \(k(ij)\) is “functionally restricted to metacommunicative uses”