

- To account for why, in negative imperatives, like the italicized one in (1a), ***somebody*** can take narrow scope under the clause-mate negation, which is not the case in a declarative sentence in (1b).
- (1)a. [How to avoid offending minority customers?]
Do not touch them. [...] Do not use profanity or racial slurs, and
*do not question **somebody's** immigration status*. (Coca) [^{OK}*not* > *somebody*]
- b. I do not question somebody's immigration status. [^{*}*not* > *somebody*]
- c. Do not **inadvertently** question **somebody's** immigration status.
- Importantly, in such examples, the predicate denotes a non-intentional action, as shown by the compatibility with the adverb **inadvertently**, as in (1c).

- i) **Goncharov (2018)**: intentionality effect on aspectual constraint in negative imperatives
- In Slavic languages, negative imperatives are incompatible with perfective aspect with an intentional predicate, which is not the case with a non-intentional predicate.
 - What distinguishes intentional and non-intentional predicates is the presupposition (due to controllability intentionality) that if an intentional action starts, it reaches the end point (the action is guided throughout the process and up to the point when the result is reached).
- (2)a. *Don't open-PERF the window!' [with an intentional predicate]
b. Don't fall-PERF down!' [with a non-intentional predicate]

But

- This presupposition does not seem to distinguish the intentional *open the window* in (2a) and the non-intentional *fall down* in (2b): if the situation 'falling down' starts, it also reached the end point in ordinary situations

ii) **Goncharov (2020a,b)**: intentionality effect on the scope of indefinite pronouns

- In (3a), *someone* is out-scoped by the negation because the non-intentional predicate induces the presupposition that in some possible world near by the actual one, an event contrary to the expectation happens, and licensing is accomplished in this part.

- (3)a. I don't want to offend **someone**. [^{OK}*not* > *someone*] (Szabolcsi 2010: 6)
- b. $\exists w' \in \text{Near-by}(\text{Dox}_{\text{speaker}, w}) [\text{offend}(\text{someone})(\text{speaker})(w')]$
- c. "I didn't offend someone." should presuppose (3b) ?

But

- Since this presupposition is induced even in matrix clauses, *someone* should be equally licensed for example in "I didn't offend **someone**." , which is not the case.

Furthermore

- Goncharov (2018) and Goncharov (2020,b) advance essentially different accounts for non-intentionality effect on negative imperatives and on licensing of PPIs.
- It is not clear how her analyses apply to non-intentionality effect on PPI-licensing in negative imperatives, as in (1).

i) **Szabolcsi (2010)**

- Parallel to explic cases, as in (4), in (5a), the infinitive complement may be reanalyzed as a subjunctive clause, as in (5b), where **someone** is naturally out-scoped by the external negation.

(4) Nem akarom, [hogy lelöjek **valakit**]. (Hungarian)
 NEG want.1SG [that shoot.SBJV.1SG **someone**.ACC]
 'I do not want [that I (inadvertently) shoot **someone**].' (Szabolcsi 2010: 7)

(5)a. I dont want to offend **someone**. [*vnot* > *someone*] (= (3a))
 b. I want for it not to be the case [that I offend **someone**]. (*ibid.*)

ii) **Richardson (1985)**

- Negative imperatives with a non-intentional predicate, like (6a), convey not a prohibition, but a command to monitor against the events denoted by the VP.
- (6a) is paraphrased by (6b) including a coerced monitoring predicate, **TAKE CARE**.

(6)a. Don't catch cold! (Richardson 1985: 247)
 b. **TAKE CARE** not to catch cold. (*ibid.*)

- Because of the non-intentionality of the predicate, the negative imperative in (7a) is semantically reanalyzed as (7b), which is represented by (7c).

- (7)a. Do not question **somebody**'s immigration status. (= (1))
- b. Take care for it **not** to be the case [that you question **somebody**'s immigration status].
- c. $[\lambda x. x \text{ TAKE CARE } [\neg \exists p [p = \lambda w' (\exists y. \text{you question } y\text{'s immigration status in } w')]]] \in \text{To-Do-List}(\text{you})$
- Coercion of the monitoring predicate TAKE CARE is motivated by a need to avoid type-mismatch between the property-denotation of the imperative and the proposition-denotation due to the semantic reanalysis.
 - [speculative hypothesis] The externalization of the negation may be due to a need to avoid a semantic incongruity of wide scope of non-intentionality over the negation.
- (8)a. ??Inadvertently, I offend **no one**.
- b. There is **no one** I advertently offend.

Evidence 1 in favor of the analysis in terms of implicit exemption from obviation

- It allows to account in a parallel fashion for the narrow scope reading of indefinite pronouns:

- i) in French subjunctive purpose clauses, as in (8a), and;
- ii) in French infinitive purpose clauses, as in (8b).

(8)a. **je** maîtrise suffisamment mes sorts de glaces [of a video-game] **pour ne pas que je blesse quelqu'un par inadvertance** !! (google)

‘I sufficiently control my ice trails **in order not that I inadvertently hurt someone.**’

b. **pour ne pas déranger quelqu'un, je** suis parti m'asseoir sur les derniers bancs. (google)

‘**in order not to disturb someone,** I left to sit down on the benches in the last row’.

- Japanese auxiliary **–TE SHIMAU** conveys i) a completion with intentional predicates, or ii) the realization of an unexpected situation with non-intentional predicates (Cf. Sugimoto 1991).
- An imperative with <non-intentional predicate **–TE SHIMAU**> should be interpreted as a wish as regards the hearer's situation, as in (9b) (cf. Yoshikawa 1974: 72; Hayatsu 2014: 18).

(9)a. kaeru-o tabe-**te simae**.
 frog-ACC eat-**TE SHIMAU**-IMP
 ‘**Finish** eating that frog’ (Japanese translation of a book title, *Eat That Frog!*)

b. korona-ni kakat-**te simae**. (google)
 corona.virus-DAT eat-TE SHIMAU-IMP
 ‘(I wish) For **it** to **happen that** you catch the covid-19!

- In a negated purpose clause including <non-intentional predicate **–TE SHIMAU**> in (10), the indefinite pronoun **dare-ka** (‘**someone**’) take narrow scope, just as in the French (8b).

(10) **dareka**-o kizutsuke-**te shimawa**-nai yooni.
someone-ACC hurt-**TE SHIMAU**-NEG in order to
 ‘in order for **it** not to **happen that** you hurt **someone**’ (google)

- Farkas, D. 1988. On obligatory control. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 11. 27-58.
- Farkas, D. 1992. On Obviation. In Ivan A. Sag & A. Szabolcsi (eds.), *Lexical matters*, 85-109. CSLI Pub.
- Grano, T. 2015. Getting your to-do list under control: Imperative semantics and the grammar of intending. In Bui, T. and D. Özyildiz (eds.), *Proceedings of the forty-fifth annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society* vol. 1, 241–252.
- Grano, T. 2018. The logic of intention reports. *Journal of Semantics* 34(1). 587-632.
- Goncharov, J. 2018. Intentionality Effect in Imperatives. *Proceedings of FASL* 27
- Goncharov, J. 2020a. Intentionality in the grammar: Three puzzles about polarity sensitive items in infinitives (http://juliegoncharov.com/docs/three_puzzles_draft.pdf).
- Goncharov, J. 2020b. Language and intentions. GLOW 43. <https://osf.io/zm8k3/>
- Hayatsu, E. 2014. Intentional verbs and non-intentional verbs. *A Dictionary of Japanese Grammar* (The Society of Japanese Grammar). Taishuukan Pub., 18-20.
- Isshiki, M. 2011. The grammaticalization of an auxiliary verb TE-SHIMAU: from the viewpoints of subjectification and intersubjectification. *Japanese Researches* 15, 201-221. <http://hdl.handle.net/2115/45277>
- Kaneko, M. 2020. Non-responsibility and narrow scope reading of positive polarity indefinites in negative imperatives and negated controlled infinitive complements. In Ch. Pinon & L. Roussarie (eds.). *EISS* 13, 25-54. [CSSP \(cnrs.fr\)](https://www.cnrs.fr/CNRS/linguistics/eiss)
- Potsdam, E. 1998. *Syntactic issues in the English imperative*. Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics. Garland Publishing.
- Richardson, J. 1985. Agenthood and Ease. *Proceedings from the 21st Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. 241–251.
- Sugimoto, T. 1991; 1992. Aspect and Modality in the Case of *Te-simau* (1), (2). *Bulletin of the Faculty of Computer Science and Systems Engineering*, Kyushu Institute of Technology. Human sciences. https://kyutech.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=pages_view_main&active_action=repository_view_main_item_detail&item_id=1794&item_no=1&page_id=13&block_id=21;147423638.pdf (core.ac.uk)
- Szabolcsi, A. 2010. Infinitives vs. subjunctives: What do we learn from obviation and from exemptions from obviation? http://www.nyu.edu/projects/szabolcsi/szabolcsi_obviation_march_2010.pdf
- Yoshikawa, T. 1974. A Study of Volitional and Non-volitional Verbs. *Collected papers of the Japanese Language School*. no.1, 67 -76. <http://hdl.handle.net/10108/23970>