

# The Semantics of Weak Imperatives Revisited: Evidence from Free-Choice Item Licensing\*

Tamás Halm

Research Institute for Linguistics HAS

International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian 13

29-30 June, 2017, RIL HAS, Budapest

## 1 Introduction

- The Problem: are FCIs licensed in imperatives?

- (0) a. *?Vedd fel bármelyik ruhát*  
take-IMP-2SG PRT any dress-ACC  
'Take any dress.'
- b. *#Most azonnal vedd fel bármelyik ruhát*  
now at once take-IMP-2SG PRT any dress-ACC  
'Take any dress right now.'
- c. *Nyugodtan vedd fel bármelyik ruhát*  
PERMISSION take-IMP-2SG PRT any dress-ACC  
'Just take any dress. (Feel free to take any dress.)'

- Goal: provide an account which makes sense in terms of the data and what we otherwise think/know about imperatives and FCIs
- Background:
  - imperatives: To-Do-List-theory (minimal semantics+strong pragmatics) of Portner (2007), (2012), von Stechow and Iatridou (2017)
  - FCIs: dependent indefinite analysis (Giannakidou 2001)
- New proposal: in weak imperatives, instead of To-Do-List, the List of Actions Under Consideration by the addressee is manipulated (which is a part of the common ground)
- Evidence from:
  - Free-choice item licensing in imperatives (*cualquier* in Spanish, *n'importe quel* in French, *opjiosdhipote* in Greek). Observation: OK in weak imperatives, not OK in strong imperatives. Current theories of imperatives and FCIs can't really accommodate this.

---

\* This research was carried out within the framework of Project 112057 of OTKA, the Hungarian National Scientific Research Foundation.

- Strong imperatives are OK out of the blue, weak imperatives need special context (the shared knowledge that the addressee contemplates the action described in the prejacent).
- Strong imperatives create obligations, weak imperatives do not: TDL account just cannot accommodate this.
- There are languages that encode the strong vs. weak imperative distinction morphosyntactically: Poletto and Zanuttini (2003) on Rhaetoromance.

## 2 Imperatives and FCIs

- (1) *Pon cualquier excusa.* (Spanish)  
 put-IMP-2SG FCI excuse  
 ‘Give any excuse.’
- (2) *Dhialekse opjodhipote forema.* (Greek)  
 pick-IMP-2SG FCI dress  
 ‘Take any dress.’
- (3) *Prends n’importe quelle carte.* (French)  
 take-IMP-2SG FCI card  
 ‘Take any card.’

The two kinds of imperatives: *Come in!*

- Strong (command) imperative: ‘You must come in.’ (parent to children playing outside) ~ necessity
- weak (permission / acquiescence / indifference) imperative: ‘You can come in.’ (after hearing a knock on the door of your room in the office) ~ possibility
- difference can be encoded by grammaticalized adverbials (German, Hungarian, Italian) or particles (Rhaetoromance)

Divergent views in the literature:

- Aloni 2002, 2007, Kaufmann 2012: both strong and weak imperatives license FCIs, no difference in semantic well-formedness or pragmatic felicitousness
- Giannakidou 2001, Giannakidou and Quer 2013: both strong and weak imperatives license FCIs, but they are pragmatically very infelicitous in (most) strong imperatives
- Strickland 1982, Haspelmath 1997: in strong imperatives, FCIs are unacceptable, in weak imperatives, they are OK
- in much of the FCI literature, imperatives receive little attention, treated in tandem with necessity modals

## FCIs in imperatives: some data

- Strickland (1982: 19-20): comparative analysis of English *any* and French *n'importe quel*

(4) #Bring me any chair. (out of the blue)

(5) A: What chair do you want?

B: Oh, bring me any chair. It doesn't matter.

- Hungarian (cf. Halm 2016a):

(6) a. #*Azt parancsolom, hogy vedd fel bármelyik ruhát*  
it-ACC command-1SG that take-IMP-2SG PRT any dress-ACC  
'I command you to take any dress.'

b. #*Most azonnal vedd fel bármelyik ruhát*  
now at once take-IMP-2SG PRT any dress-ACC  
'Take any dress right now.'

c. ?*Vedd fel bármelyik ruhát*  
take-IMP-2SG PRT any dress-ACC  
'Take any dress.'

d. *Nyugodtan vedd fel bármelyik ruhát*  
nyugodtan<sup>1</sup> take-IMP-2SG PRT any dress-ACC  
'Just take any dress.' (permission/acquiescence reading)

e. *Meg engedem, hogy fel vedd bármelyik ruhát*  
PRT allow-1SG that PRT take-SUBJ-2SG any dress-ACC  
'I allow you take any dress.'

- Factors indicating strong vs. weak status:

- (6a) main verb of matrix clause
- (6b) *most azonnal* 'right now'
- (6c) none
- (6d) *nyugodtan* 'permission marker'
- (6e) main verb of matrix clause

- Conclusion: FCIs are fine in weak imperatives, unacceptable in strong imperatives, so-so where both strong and weak reading is accessible.

---

<sup>1</sup> *nyugodtan* literally translates as 'calmly, peacefully, in a relaxed fashion', but in imperatives it has a grammaticalized function to indicate permission or acquiescence, cf. the very similar use of *ruhig* 'calmly, peacefully' in German (cf. Grosz 2009, von Fintel-Iatridou 2017, 10-11)

### 3 Free choice items cross-linguistically and in Hungarian

- Intuitively, elements that express free choice (Vendler 1967).
- (Non-)Licensing environments (examples from Giannakidou 1997, 2001):

- Affirmative episodic (Giannakidou 1997):

(7)        \**Idha*                    *opjondhipote*  
             saw-PERF-1SG FC-person  
             ‘\*I saw anybody.’

- Modal:

(8)        *Opjosdhipote fititis bori na lisi afto to provlima.*  
             FC                    student can SUBJ solve-3SG this the problem  
             ‘Any student can solve this problem.’

- Generic:

(9)        *Opjadhipote ghata kinigai pondikia.*  
             FC                    cat        hunt-3SG mice  
             ‘Any cat hunts mice.’

- Negation<sup>2</sup>:

(10)        \**Dhen idha opjondhipote*  
             not                    saw-PERF-1SG FC-person  
             ‘\*I did not see anybody.’

- Various approaches:
  - FCIs as NPIs (NP-any and FC-any): Kadmon and Landman (1993), Chierchia (2013) vs. Baker (1970), Ladusaw (1979)
  - universal and/or existential quantificational force: Reichenbach (1947), Quine (1960), Horn (1972) ch.3, Lasnik (1972), Kroch 1975 vs. Horn (1972) ch.2, Ladusaw (1979), Carlson (1981), Linebarger (1981), and Dayal (1997)

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that English *any* (which *is* licensed under negation) is properly analyzed as a NPI and has a fundamentally different semantics than bona fide FCIs.

- indefinite analysis : Heim (1982), Partee (1986), Kadmon and Landman (1993), Lee and Horn (1994), Farkas (1997), Giannakidou (2001), Kratzer and Shimoyama (2001), Giannakidou and Quer (2013)
- contextual vagueness: Dayal (1997)
- nonveridicality and nonepidosity: Giannakidou (1997) and (2001)
- scalarity: Fauconnier (1975), Lee and Horn (1994), Rooth (1985), Hoeksema and Rullmann (2000), Krifka (1995), Lahiri (1998), Kadmon and Landman (1993)
- domain widening: Kadmon and Landman (1993), Aloni (2003)

Two dominant schools today:

- universal free choice analysis (involving propositional alternatives and Hamblin sets) (Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002, Aloni 2007, Menéndez-Benito 2010).
- dependent indefinite analysis (Farkas 1997, Giannakidou 1997, 2001, Giannakidou and Quer 2013)
  - FC phrases are represented as intensional indefinites
  - grammatical only in contexts providing alternatives (worlds or situations)
  - licensed in non-veridical and non-episodic contexts (e.g. modals, generics)
  - ungrammatical in extensional veridical contexts (e.g. episodic sentences, negation, interrogatives)
  - [[any student]] = **student**(x)(w) (or: **student**(x)(s)), where world/situation and individual variable(s) are to be bound by an appropriate Q-operator (i.e. generic, habitual, modal, intensional) in order for the FC phrase to be licensed
  - universality is derived from the intensionality and exhaustive variation: the FCI variable is to be assigned a distinct value in each world or situation under consideration (Dayal's (1997) i-alternatives):
    - *You can read any book.* In w<sub>1</sub>, you read War and Peace, in w<sub>2</sub>, you read The Iliad, in w<sub>3</sub>, you read Oedipus Rex etc.
- dependent indefinite analysis seems to work better for Hungarian (Halm (2013, 2015, 2016ab)). Earlier proposals on FCIs in Hungarian include: Hunyadi 1991, 2002, Abrusán 2007 and Szabó 2012).

#### 4 The Semantics and Pragmatics of Imperatives

- How to get from the denotational semantics to the illocutionary force:
  - *Go home!* denotes something like ‘the addressee goes home’
  - Common ground updated to the effect that the addressee now has the obligation to go home (‘In view of the speaker’s wishes, the addressee must go home.’)

- Division of labour between denotational semantics and dynamic pragmatics.
    - Rich denotational semantics models (e.g. Kaufmann 2012):
      - *Go home!* essentially has same denotation as *Addressee must go home.*
      - Plus presuppositional meaning component to derive performative effects.
    - Thin denotational semantics models (e.g. Portner 2007):
      - *Go home!* denotes a property restricted to the addressee: *Addressee goes home.*
- (12)  $[[\text{go home!}]] = \lambda w \lambda x: x \text{ is the addressee. } x \text{ goes home in } w$
- Imperative illocutionary force elicited in the dynamic pragmatics component: task of making this property true of herself is added to addressees To-Do-List. (Similarly to how declaratives update the common ground.)
- Recent overviews: Han (2011), Charlow (2014), von Stechow and Iatridou (2017).

#### 4.1 Permission imperatives

A headache for strong denotational semantics approach (in-built necessity modality).

- Kaufmann 2012, Wilson and Sperber 1988: relativized modality through contextual weakening:

(13) *Go home!*[command] ~ ‘in view of the speaker’s wishes, the addressee must go home’

(14) *Go home!*[permission] ~ ‘in view of the addressee’s wishes, the addressee must go home’

- Issues:
  - #*You must go home!*[permission]
  - FCIs in imperatives have existential reading.
  - *Go left! Go right! Either way is fine with me.* ‘#in view of the addressee’s wishes, the addressee must go left and go right’
  - imperative and declarative constructions (von Stechow and Iatridou 2007)
  - sentence adverbials (Gärtner 2017): *You must (unfortunately/ allegedly/ presumably) stay here.* vs. *Stay here (\*unfortunately / \*allegedly / \*presumably).*

A somewhat milder headache for weak denotational semantics approaches (no in-built necessity modality).

- Idea (mooted in Portner 2007): weak imperatives affect a special segment of the To-Do-List.
  - Segmented TDL (according to nature of obligation, cf. Similar differentiation of modals by ordering source Kratzer 1981):

- (17) *Sit down right now* (order imperative)  
 ‘Noah should sit down right now, given that he’s been ordered to do so.’  
 (deontic necessity)
- (18) *Have a piece of fruit* (invitation imperative)  
 ‘Noah should have a piece of fruit, given that it would make him happy.’  
 (bouletic necessity)
- (19) *Talk to your advisor more often* (suggestion imperative)  
 ‘Noah should talk to his advisor more often, given that he wants to finish his degree.’ (teleological necessity)

- Imperative particles in Rhaetoromance (Poletto and Zanuttini 2003), overt subject in English imperatives (Potsdam 1996).
- Problem: we do not want weak imperatives to create obligations (however mild):

- (20) *Vegyél egy szendvicset*  
 take-IMP-2SG a sandwich-ACC  
 ‘Have a sandwich.’ (invitation, host exhorting the guest to avail himself of the buffet)

- (21) *Nyugodtan nyisd ki az ablakot*  
 nyugodtan open-IMP-2SG PRT the window-ACC  
 ‘Open the window.’ (permission: speaker after noticing that addressee may be inconvenienced by lack of fresh air)

- (22) *#Nyugodtan vegyél egy szendvicset . Engem nem zavar.*  
 nyugodtan take-IMP-2SG a sandwich-ACC me NEG disturb-3SG  
 ‘Have a sandwich, it is fine with me (literally: it does not disturb me).’  
 (invitation, host exhorting the guest to avail himself of the buffet)

- (23) *Nyugodtan nyisd ki az ablakot. Engem nem zavar.*  
 nyugodtan open-IMP-2SG PRT the window-ACC me NEG disturb-3SG  
 ‘Open the window, it is fine with me (literally: it does not disturb me).’  
 (permission: speaker after noticing that addressee may be inconvenienced by lack of fresh air)

- invitation imperatives create obligations (obligation by courtesy), it is OK to assume they affect TDL

- permission (or acquiescence) imperatives do not create obligations, therefore, it is not OK to assume that they affect the addressee's TDL
- von Fintel and Iatridou (2017): speaker endorsement parameter in imperatives
  - speaker endorsement in assertions (Malamud and Stephenson 2015):

- (24) a. *Tom's here.*  
 b. *Tom's here, isn't he?* (reverse-polarity tag)  
 c. *Tom's here, is he?* (same-polarity tag)  
 d. *Tom's here?* (rising intonation)

- speaker endorsement in questions (Farkas and Bruce 2010, Gärtner and Gyuris 2012):

- (25) *Oare Petru a sosit deja?*  
 oare Peter has arrived already  
 'Has Peter arrived already?'

- von Fintel and Iatridou 2017: weak imperatives are imperatives with weak speaker endorsement: speaker floats the imperative, but it is up to the addressee whether to add it to her TDL
- problematic prediction: if the speaker so decides, weak imperative would create an obligation, in the same vein as a strong imperative does
- solution: strength of obligation varies by TDL section, weak imperatives filed under 'commitments'

## 5 FCIs in imperatives: previous accounts

Giannakidou 2001: FCIs in imperatives analyzed analogously to FCIs in modals: 'the quantificational force of a permissive imperative can [...] be understood as equivalent to that of permissive modals':

- (29) *Boris na danistis opjodhipote vivlio.*  
 may-2SG you borrow-2SG FCI book  
 'You may borrow any book.'

- (30)  $!\exists w, x [[w \in K \wedge \mathbf{book}(x,w)] \wedge \mathbf{borrow}(you,x,w)]$

- (31) i.  $[[\text{You may borrow any book.}]^{w^0, g, K} = 1 \text{ iff } \exists w' \in K, \text{ where } K \text{ is the extended permissive modal base, such that } [[\text{You borrow a book.}]^{w', g} = 1$

- ii.  $[[\text{You borrow a book.}]]^{w,g} = 1$  iff there is at least one individual  $d \in D$  such that  $[[\mathbf{book}(x) \wedge \mathbf{borrow}(\text{you},x)]]^{w,g[d/x]} = 1$ .
- iii. Values in i-alternatives:
- (a) i-alt<sub>1</sub>:  $g(x) = \text{War and Peace}$   
 $[[\mathbf{book}(x) \wedge \mathbf{borrow}(\text{you},x)]]^{w_1,g} = 1$
- (b) i-alt<sub>2</sub>:  $g(x) = \text{The Iliad}$   
 $[[\mathbf{book}(x) \wedge \mathbf{borrow}(\text{you},x)]]^{w_2,g} = 1$
- (c) i-alt<sub>3</sub>:  $g(x) = \text{Oedipus Rex}$   
 $[[\mathbf{book}(x) \wedge \mathbf{borrow}(\text{you},x)]]^{w_3,g} = 1$

Intuitively: ‘Consider the books that *any book* can be assigned as its value in each relevant i-alternative; you are free to borrow one of those books’.

- (32) *Dialekse opjodhipote filo; opjo thelis.*  
 pick-IMP-2SG FCI card whichever want-2SG  
 ‘Pick any card, whichever you want.’

- (33)  $!\exists w, x [[w \in K \wedge \mathbf{card}(x,w)] \wedge \mathbf{pick}(\text{you},x,w)]$

- (34) a. i-alt<sub>1</sub>:  $g(x) = \text{ace of spades}$   
 $![\mathbf{pick}(\text{you}, \text{ace of spades})]$
- b. i-alt<sub>2</sub>:  $g(x) = \text{queen of hearts}$   
 $![\mathbf{pick}(\text{you}, \text{queen of hearts})]$
- c. i-alt<sub>3</sub>:  $g(x) = \text{king of diamonds}$   
 $![\mathbf{pick}(\text{you}, \text{king of diamonds})]$

Intuitively: ‘Consider the cards that *any card* can be assigned as its value in each relevant i-alternative; you are free to pick one of those cards’.

Issues:

- what to do with strong imperatives? Split: strong imperatives ~ necessity modals, weak imperatives ~ possibility modals
- data question: are FCIs licensed in strong imperatives? Giannakidou argues they should be (nonveridical environment):.

- (35) Context: I am playing a game with a child. I instruct her how to win the game:

*Exo kripsi 10 avga se diafora meri. Ja na kerdhisis prepi na vris ena opjodhipote avgo – dhen exi simasia pjo – ke na to valis sto kalathi.*

‘I have hidden 10 eggs in various places. Here is how you win: you must find any egg – it doesn’t really matter which one – and put it in the basket.’

(36) Context: The hotel manager to a candidate cleaning lady who has just asked him which room to clean in order to get the job:

*Dhen exi simasia, to mono pu thelo na dho ine an kseris na katharizis. Pijene tora, ke katharise opjodhipote dhomatío!*

‘It doesn’t really matter, all I want to see is whether you know how to clean. Go now and clean any room (= some room, it doesn’t matter which one)!’

- I think these are prototypical weak imperatives: that the addressee considers carrying out these actions is common knowledge; speaker expresses indifference/acquiescence to certain specifics.
- FCIs interpreted existentially in (35-36): tricky to derive from necessity modal starting point.
- does the dependent indefinite analysis really predict that strong imperatives license FCIs?

## 6 FCIs in imperatives: a new account

Two major shortcomings of existing accounts:

- how to explain the contrast between strong imperatives and permission imperatives
- how to derive the modality and/or illocutionary force of imperatives containing FCIs

New approach, couching the analysis of FCIs in imperatives in the general theory of the semantics and pragmatics of imperatives.

- Observation 1: FCIs are OK in weak imperatives, not OK in strong imperatives.
  - Strong denotational semantics approaches: struggle with weak imperatives in general, with FCIs in weak imperatives in particular.
  - To-Do-List approach: in fact, these predict FCIs to be uninterpretable in imperatives:

- (38) a. *Nyugodtan vedd fel a kék ruhát*  
 nyugodtan take-IMP -2SG PRT the blue dress-ACC  
 ‘Just take the blue dress.’
- b. *Nyugodtan vegyél fel egy ruhát*  
 nyugodtan take-IMP-2SG PRT a dress-ACC  
 ‘Just take a dress.’
- c. *Nyugodtan vedd fel bármelyik ruhát*  
 nyugodtan take-IMP -2SG PRT any dress-ACC  
 ‘Just take any dress.’

○ What is the property-to-be-made-true in (38c)?

- Observation 2: weak imperatives (with or without FCIs) are not OK out of the blue, it needs to be common knowledge that the action described by the pre-jacent is being considered by the addressee (recall also: (4), (5), (21), (35), (36)):

- (41) a. *Állj meg*  
 stop-IMP-2SG PRT  
 ‘Stop.’ (felicitous out of the blue)
- b. *Nyugodtan állj meg*  
 nyugodtan stop-IMP-2SG PRT  
 ‘Stop (if you wish).’ (felicitous if the addressee is visibly tired, needs a rest etc.)

○ Difficult to explain in the To-Do-List framework, where strong and weak imperatives differ only in speaker endorsement level (and TDL section).

- My proposal: weak imperative do not manipulate the To-Do-List, but a separate addressee-oriented list which is part of the common ground.
  - List of Actions Under Consideration by the addressee: those actions of which it is part of common knowledge that the addressee is considering them.
  - Pragmatic effect of uttering a permission imperative: lifting of prohibition (ascribed to the speaker by the addressee) on a course of action already known to be contemplated by the addressee. (cf. Kamp 1972 on permission statements)

- (38) *Nyugodtan vedd fel a kék ruhát*  
 nyugodtan take-IMP -2SG PRT the blue dress-ACC  
 ‘Just take the blue dress.’

- speaker presupposes that addressee is considering the action denoted by the prejacent
- speaker assumes that addressee may believe that the course of action denoted by the prejacent is prohibited (discouraged etc.) by the speaker
- ‘as far as I am concerned, you are free to take the blue dress, you are free to delete any prohibition that you may have ascribed to me against your taking the blue dress.’
- weak imperatives have nothing to do with the TDL
- several issues are solved by new account:
  - why are strong imperatives fine out of the blue, whereas weak imperatives not?
    - weak imperatives ‘live on’ a component of the common ground: prejacent needs to be on LAUC
  - why the contrast in FCI-licensing?
    - set of possible world-value pairs needed by FCI are provided by LAUC

(46) *Nyugodtan vedd fel bármelyik ruhát*  
 nyugodtan take-IMP-2SG PRT any dress-ACC  
 ‘Just take any dress.’ (permission/acquiescence reading)

- the List of Actions Under Consideration includes, among others, the following items:

(47) ‘Take the blue dress.’  
 ‘Take the lilac dress.’  
 ‘Take the pink dress.’  
 Etc.

- this is, in fact, the list of *i*-alternatives:

(48) in  $w_1$ , the addressee takes the blue dress  
 in  $w_2$ , the addressee takes the lilac dress  
 in  $w_3$ , the addressee takes the pink dress  
 in  $w_n$ , ...

- with strong imperative, the LAUC with its alternatives is not relevant, therefore, no *i*-alternatives are provided; also, there is no well-defined task to be added to TDL:

- (49) a. *Most azonnal vedd fel a kék ruhát*  
 now at once take-IMP-2SG PRT the blue dress-ACC  
 ‘Take the blue dress right now.’
- b. *#Most azonnal vedd fel bármelyik ruhát*  
 now at once take-IMP-2SG PRT any dress-ACC  
 ‘Take any dress right now.’
- ‘weak imperatives creating obligations’ paradox: this is solved by clarifying the difference between:
- bona fide weak imperatives (permission / acquiescence / indifference)
  - weakly endorsed strong imperatives (advices / invitations / etc.)
- (50) *Most azonnal hagyd abba*  
 now at once leave-IMP-2SG PRT  
 ‘Stop it right now.’
- (51) *Kérlek, vedd egy szendvicset*  
 ask-1SG take-IMP-2SG a sandwich-ACC  
 ‘Please have a sandwich.’ (host to guest)
- (52) *Szerintem beszélj egy orvossal*  
 according-to-me speak-IMP-2SG a doctor-INS  
 ‘Talk to a doctor (if you ask me.)’ (~‘I think you should talk to a doctor.’)
- (53) *Nyugodtan vedd fel a kék ruhát*  
 nyugodtan take-IMP-2SG PRT the blue dress-ACC  
 ‘Just take the blue dress (if you wish).’ (permissive)
- (50), (51), (52): strong imperatives, with varying speaker endorsement, varying latitude for addressee to decide whether to add the task to her TDL
  - (53): weak imperative, affecting the LAUC
  - of course, speaker endorsement can vary with weak imperatives, too (this is reflected in the terminological variation: permission / acquiescence / indifference imperatives):
- (54) *Nyugodtan vedd fel a kék ruhát, meg engedem*  
 nyugodtan take-IMP-2SG PRT the blue dress-ACC PRT allow-1SG  
 ‘Just take the blue dress (if you wish), you have my permission.’

(55) *Nyugodtan vedd fel a kék ruhát, engem nem zavar*  
 nyugodtan take-IMP-2SG PRT the blue dress-ACC me NEG  
 disturb-3SG

‘Just take the blue dress (if you wish), it is fine with me.’

(56) *Nyugodtan vedd fel a kék ruhát, nekem mindegy*  
 nyugodtan take-IMP-2SG PRT the blue dress-ACC me all-the-same  
 ‘Just take the blue dress (if you wish), I do not care.’

- RVIs (referentially vague items, e.g. *some or other*) are close cousins of FCIs: they are referentially vague, but do not need i-alternatives to be licensed (Giannakidou and Quer 2013). As expected, they are fine in strong imperatives:

(57) a. *#Most azonnal vedd fel bármelyik ruhát*  
 now at once take-IMP-2SG PRT any dress-ACC  
 ‘Take any dress right now.’

b. *Most azonnal vedd fel valamelyik ruhát*  
 now at once take-IMP-2SG PRT RVI dress-ACC  
 ‘Take some dress or other right now.’

- Facts from Rhaetoromance revisited (Poletto and Zanuttini 2003):
  - *ma/pö*: ‘advice and permission’
  - *mo/pa*: ‘order’
  - based on data provided (appearance in IaDs, speaker oriented-addressee oriented distinction, translation with Italian sentences containing *pure*, presuppositionality), it appears these particles encode exactly the strong imperative vs. weak imperative distinction
  - this distinction is grammaticalized in many languages either through discourse markers (*nyugodtan, rubig, pure*) or imperative particles (*ma/pö, mo/pa*)
  - obligatory binary encoding on morphosyntactic level supports a binary model (no shades) of weak-strong distinction over a graded model (such as von Stechow and Iatridou 2017’s speaker endorsement based model)

## 7 Conclusions

- FCIs are licensed in weak imperatives, not licensed in strong imperatives
- This (and a lot more) can be accounted for using a modified model of the semantics and pragmatics of imperatives.

### References:

- Abrusán, Márta. 2007. *Even* and free-choice *any* in Hungarian. In Estela Puig-Waldmüller (ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 11, 1-15. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Aloni, Maria. 2002. Free choice in modal contexts. In Matthias Weisgerber (ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 7, 25-37. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz.
- Aloni, Maria. 2007. Free choice, modals, and imperatives. *Natural Language Semantics* 15:1, 65-94.
- Baker, C. Lee. 1970. Double negatives. *Linguistic inquiry*, 1(2), 169-186.
- Carlson, Gregory. 1981. Distribution of free-choice *any*. In Roberta A. Hendrick et al. (eds.), *Papers from the Seventeenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 8–23. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Charlow, Nate. 2014. The meaning of imperatives. *Philosophy Compass* 9:8, 540-555.
- Condoravdi, Cleo, Sven Lauer. 2012. Imperatives: Meaning and illocutionary force. *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 9, 37–58.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1997. Free choice and *ever*: Identity and free choice readings. In Aaron Lawson (ed.), *Proceedings of SALT* 7, 99–116. Stanford: Stanford University.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1998. Any as Inherently Modal. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21, 433–476.
- Farkas, Donka. 1997. Dependent indefinites. In Corblin, Francis, Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin and Jean-Marie Marandin (eds.): *Empirical issues in formal syntax and semantics*. Peter Lang.
- Farkas, Donka and Kim Bruce. 2010. On reacting to assertions and polar questions. *Journal of Semantics* 27:1, 81–118.
- Fauconnier, Gilles. 1975. Pragmatic Scales and Logical Structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 353–376.
- von Fintel, Kai, and Sabine Iatridou. 2017. A modest proposal for the meaning of imperatives. In Arregui, Ana, María Luisa Rivero, and Andrés Salanova (eds.), *Modality Across Syntactic Categories*, 288-319. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2017. Root Infinitivals and Modal Particles: An Interim Report. In Josef Bayer and Volker Struckmeier (eds.): *Discourse Particles. Formal Approaches to their Syntax and Semantics*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 115-143.
- Gärtner, Hans-Martin and Beáta Gyuris. 2012. Pragmatic markers in Hungarian: Some introductory remarks. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 59(4), 387-426.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1997. *The Landscape of Polarity Items*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Groningen.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2001. The meaning of free choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24, 659–735.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia and Josep Quer. 2013. Exhaustive and non-exhaustive variation with free choice and referential vagueness: Evidence from Greek, Catalan, and Spanish. *Lingua* 126, 120-149.
- Grosz, Patrick. 2009. German particles, modality, and the semantics of imperatives. *North East Linguistics Society (NELS)* 39, 323-336.
- Halm, Tamás. 2013. Free choice and Focus: FCIs in Hungarian. In Balázs Surányi (ed.) *Proceedings of the Second Central European Conference in Linguistics for Postgraduate Students*, 109-121. Budapest: Pázmány Péter Catholic University.
- Halm, Tamás. 2015. Free Choice and Aspect in Hungarian. In É. Kiss, Katalin, Balázs Surányi and Éva Dékány (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian. Volume 14: Papers from the 2013 Piliscsaba Conference*, 167-186. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Halm, Tamás. 2016a. *The Grammar of Free-Choice Items in Hungarian*. PhD dissertation, Pázmány Péter Catholic University.
- Halm, Tamás. 2016b. The syntactic position and quantificational force of FCIs in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 63:2, 241-276.
- Heim, Irene. 1982. *The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Published in 1989 by Garland, New York.
- Han, Chung-hye. 2011. Imperatives. In Maierborn, Claudia, Klaus von Stechow and Paul Portner (eds.): *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning*, 1785-1804. De Gruyter
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hausser, Roland R. 1980. Surface compositionality and the semantics of mood. In John R. Searle, Ferenc Kiefer, and Manfred Bierwisch (eds.), *Speech act theory and pragmatics* (Texts and Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 10), 71–95. Reidel.
- Hoeksema, Jack, and Hotze Rullmann. 2000. Scalarity and polarity. In Hoeksema, Jack et al. (eds.), *Perspectives on negation and polarity items*, 129–171. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Horn, Laurence. 1972. *On the semantic properties of logical operators in English*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, Department of Linguistics.
- Hunyadi, László. 1991. On the syntax of ANY and EVERY. In Korponay, Béla et al. (eds.) *Studies in Linguistics: a Supplement to Hungarian Studies in English*, 83-88. Debrecen: Kossuth Lajos University.
- Hunyadi, László. 2002. *Hungarian sentence prosody and Universal Grammar*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Jayez, Jacques, and Lucia M. Tovená. 2005. Free choiceness and non-individuation. *Linguistics and philosophy* 28:1, 1-71.
- Kadmon, Nirit, Fred Landman. 1993. Any. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4, 353-422.
- Kamp, Hans. 1973. Free choice permission. In: *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*: 74, 57-74.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2012. Interpreting imperatives (*Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy* (SLAP) 88). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1981. The notional category of modality. In Eikmeyer, Hans J. and Hannes Rieser (eds.): *Words, worlds, and contexts: New approaches in word semantics*, 38-74. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kratzer, Angelika, Junko Shimoyama. 2002. Indeterminate pronouns: The view from Japanese. In Yukio Otsu (ed.), *The Proceedings of the Third Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*, 1-25. Tokyo: Hituzi Publishing Company.
- Krifka, Manfred, et al. 1995. Genericity: An Introduction. In Gregory N. Carlson and Francis J. Pelletier (eds.), *The Generic Book*. 1-124. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Ladusaw, A. William. 1979. *Polarity sensitivity as inherent scope relations*. PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, reproduced by IULC, 1980.
- Lahiri, Utpal. 1998. Focus and negative polarity in Hindi. *Natural Language Semantics* 6, 57-123.
- Lewis, David. 1979. A problem about permission. In Esa Saarinen, Risto Hilpinen, Ilkka Niiniluoto and Merrill Provence Hintikka (eds.), *Essays in honour of Jaako Hintikka*: On the occasion of his fiftieth birthday on January 12, 1979, 163-175. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Linebarger, Marcia. 1981. Polarity any as existential quantifier. In Kreiman, Jody, Almerindo Ojeda (eds.), *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 211-219. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Lee, Young-Suk, Laurence Horn. 1994. *Any as indefinite plus even*. Ms. Yale University.
- Malamud, Sophia A. and Tamina Stephenson. 2015. Three ways to avoid commitments: Declarative force modifiers in the conversational scoreboard. *Journal of Semantics* 32: 2, 275-311.
- Menéndez-Benito, Paula. 2010. On Universal Free Choice Items. *Natural Language Semantics* 18:1, 33-64.
- Partee, Barbara. 1986. The airport squib: any, almost and superlatives. In *Compositionality in formal semantics: selected papers by Barbara Partee*, 31-40. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Poletto, Cecilia and Raffaella Zanuttini. 2003. Making imperatives: evidence from central Rhaetoromance. In Tortora, Christina (ed.) *The syntax of Italian dialects*, 175-206. Oxford University Press.
- Portner, Paul. 2007. Imperatives and modals. *Natural Language Semantics* 15(4). 351-383.
- Portner, Paul. 2010. Permission and choice. In Grewendorf, Günther and Thomas Ede Zimmermann (eds.): *Discourse and grammar: From sentence types to lexical categories*. (Studies in Generative Grammar 112), 43-68. De Gruyter.
- Potsdam, Eric. 1996. *Syntactic issues in English imperatives*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of California at Santa Cruz.
- Quer, Josep. 1999. *The Quantificational Force of Free Choice Items*. Ms., University of Amsterdam.
- Quine, Willard Van Orman. 1960. *Word and Object*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. *Elements of symbolic logic*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rivero, Maria-Luisa – Terzi, Arhonto. 1995. Imperatives, V-movement and logical mood. *Journal of Linguistics* 31: 301-332.
- Rooth, Mats. 1985. *Association with focus*. PhD dissertation. University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Strickland, Martha. 1982. A propos de any et la valeur 'n'importe quel'en anglais. *Bulletin de l'Université de Besançon de Linguistique Appliquée et Générale* 9:17-48.
- Szabó, Martina. 2012. A bárki nem akárki, avagy a bár- és akár- elemek eltérő nyelvi sajátosságai. [Bárki and akárki are not the same: grammatical differences of bár- and akár- words.] Paper presented at the Conference of Doctoral Students, University of Szeged, 31 May.
- Varga, Diána. 2014. A magyar felszólító mondatok szerkezete. [The structure of imperatives in Hungarian.] PhD dissertation. Pázmány Péter Catholic University.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber. 1988. Mood and the analysis of non-declarative sentences. In Dancy, Jonathan and Julius Moravcsik (eds.): *Human agency: Language, duty and value*, 77-101. Stanford University Press.