

Intentionality and accidentality at the interfaces

Masha Esipova

University of Konstanz

Fachbereichskolloquium

July 20, 2023

Universität
Konstanz



- ① Introduction
- ② A deeper dive
- ③ Desiderata for an account
- ④ Developing an account
- ⑤ Outro

Introducing the key contrast: **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID**

- Two types of readings emerge in environments that convey willingness to prevent something from happening (e.g., for negated imperatives, 'not want', and 'fear'):
 - **ABSTAIN**: prevent someone from intentionally engaging in an activity
 - **AVOID**: prevent an unintended outcome

Introducing the key contrast: ABSTAIN vs. AVOID

- Two types of readings emerge in environments that convey willingness to prevent something from happening (e.g., for negated imperatives, 'not want', and 'fear'):
 - **ABSTAIN**: prevent someone from intentionally engaging in an activity
 - **AVOID**: prevent an unintended outcome
- (1) a. **ABSTAIN**
 Don't call anyone! / I don't want to call anyone. / I'm afraid of calling anyone.
- b. **AVOID**
 Don't (accidentally) call someone! / I don't want to (accidentally) call someone. / I'm afraid of (accidentally) calling someone.

Introducing the key contrast: ABSTAIN vs. AVOID

- Two types of readings emerge in environments that convey willingness to prevent something from happening (e.g., for negated imperatives, 'not want', and 'fear'):
 - **ABSTAIN**: prevent someone from intentionally engaging in an activity
 - **AVOID**: prevent an unintended outcome
- (1) a. **ABSTAIN**
 Don't call anyone! / I don't want to call anyone. / I'm afraid of calling anyone.
- b. **AVOID**
 Don't (accidentally) call someone! / I don't want to (accidentally) call someone. / I'm afraid of (accidentally) calling someone.
- Cross-linguistically, some grammatical phenomena are sensitive to the **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** distinction, like anti-/re-licensing of *some* indefinites in English illustrated in (1) (first observed in Szabolcsi 2004); we will focus on imperfective vs. perfective aspect and distribution of indefinites in Russian

ABSTAIN vs. AVOID in Russian: aspect and indefinites

- Russian aspect (TO BE REVISED): across the three environments we've evoked so far, verbs that are part of accomplishment descriptions are imperfective in ABSTAIN cases and perfective in AVOID ones

ABSTAIN vs. AVOID in Russian: aspect and indefinites

- Russian aspect (TO BE REVISED): across the three environments we've evoked so far, verbs that are part of accomplishment descriptions are imperfective in ABSTAIN cases and perfective in AVOID ones
- Russian indefinites:
 - Negated imperatives and 'not want': only *ni* negative concord items (NCIs) in ABSTAIN cases, but both *ni* NCIs and dependent *nibud'* indefinites in AVOID cases
 - 'Fear': only free choice indefinites (e.g., *libo*) in ABSTAIN cases, but both free choice and *nibud'* indefinites in AVOID cases

ABSTAIN vs. AVOID in Russian: aspect and indefinites

- (2) a. Ne {zvoni / *pozvoni} {nikomu / *komu-nibud'}!
 not {call.IPFV.IMP / *call.PFV.IMP} {NI-who / *who-NIBUD'}
 'Don't call anyone!' (**ABSTAIN**)
- b. (Ostorožno!) Ne {*zvoni / pozvoni} (slučajno) {%nikomu /
 (careful) not {*call.IPFV.IMP / call.PFV.IMP} (accidentally) {%NI-who /
 komu-nibud'}!
 who-NIBUD'}
 '(Careful!) Don't (accidentally) call someone!' (**AVOID**)

ABSTAIN vs. AVOID in Russian: aspect and indefinites

- (2) a. Ne {zvoni / *pozvoni} {nikomu / *komu-nibud'}!
 not {call.IPFV.IMP / *call.PFV.IMP} {NI-who / *who-NIBUD'}
 'Don't call anyone!' (**ABSTAIN**)
- b. (Ostorožno!) Ne {*zvoni / pozvoni} (slučajno) {%nikomu /
 (careful) not {*call.IPFV.IMP / call.PFV.IMP} (accidentally) {%NI-who /
 komu-nibud'}!
 who-NIBUD'}
 '(Careful!) Don't (accidentally) call someone!' (**AVOID**)
- (3) a. Ja ne xoču {nikomu / *komu-nibud'} {zvoniť / *pozvoniť}.
 I not want {NI-who / *who-NIBUD'} {call.IPFV.INF / *call.PFV.INF}
 'I don't want to call anyone.' (**ABSTAIN**)
- b. Ja ne xoču {%nikomu / komu-nibud'} (slučajno) {*zvoniť /
 I not want {%NI-who / who-NIBUD'} (accidentally) {*call.IPFV.INF /
 pozvoniť}.
 call.PFV.INF}
 'I don't want to (accidentally) call someone.' (**AVOID**)

ABSTAIN vs. AVOID in Russian: aspect and indefinites

- (2) a. Ne {zvoni / *pozvoni} {nikomu / *komu-nibud'}!
 not {call.IPFV.IMP / *call.PFV.IMP} {NI-who / *who-NIBUD'}
 'Don't call anyone!' (**ABSTAIN**)
- b. (Ostorožno!) Ne {*zvoni / pozvoni} (slučajno) {%nikomu /
 (careful) not {*call.IPFV.IMP / call.PFV.IMP} (accidentally) {%NI-who /
 komu-nibud'}!
 who-NIBUD'}
 '(Careful!) Don't (accidentally) call someone!' (**AVOID**)
- (3) a. Ja ne xoču {nikomu / *komu-nibud'} {zvoniť / *pozvoniť}.
 I not want {NI-who / *who-NIBUD'} {call.IPFV.INF / *call.PFV.INF}
 'I don't want to call anyone.' (**ABSTAIN**)
- b. Ja ne xoču {%nikomu / komu-nibud'} (slučajno) {*zvoniť /
 I not want {%NI-who / who-NIBUD'} (accidentally) {*call.IPFV.INF /
 pozvoniť}.
 call.PFV.INF}
 'I don't want to (accidentally) call someone.' (**AVOID**)
- (4) a. Ja bojus' {komu-libo / ??komu-nibud'} {zvoniť / *pozvoniť}.
 I fear {who-LIBO / ??who-NIBUD'} {call.IPFV.INF / *call.PFV.INF}
 'I am afraid of calling anyone.' (**ABSTAIN**)
- b. Ja bojus' {komu-libo / komu-nibud'} (slučajno) {*zvoniť /
 I fear {who-LIBO / who-NIBUD'} (accidentally) {*call.IPFV.INF /
 pozvoniť}.
 call.PFV.INF}
 'I'm afraid of (accidentally) calling someone.' (**AVOID**)

Anticipating the solution

- Anticipating the solution:

Anticipating the solution

- Anticipating the solution:
 - The complements of the target operators in **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases have **distinct compositional structures: a situation layer in AVOID, but not in ABSTAIN** cases. This will allow us to explain the relevant facts about aspect and indefinites.

Anticipating the solution

- Anticipating the solution:
 - The complements of the target operators in **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases have **distinct compositional structures: a situation layer in AVOID, but not in ABSTAIN** cases. This will allow us to explain the relevant facts about aspect and indefinites.
 - The choice between the two compositional structures in the cases at hand is driven by **global pragmatic considerations about preventing unwanted scenarios**. This explains the distinct inferences about intentional vs. accidental actions arising in the two cases.

- ① Introduction
- ② A deeper dive**
- ③ Desiderata for an account
- ④ Developing an account
- ⑤ Outro

Quick note about *odnaždy*

- Note that *odnaždy* ('once', 'one day', 'on one occasion') is only compatible with **AVOID** sentences (so we can use it as a quick diagnostic):

- (5) a. Ne {*otkryvaj / otkroj} odnaždy ètot škof
 not {*open.IPFV.IMP / open.PFV.IMP} once this closet
 (slučajno)!
 (accidentally)
 'Don't (accidentally) open this closet one day!' (only **AVOID**)
- b. Ja {ne xoču / bojus'} odnaždy (slučajno) {*otkryvat' /
 I {not want / fear} once (accidentally) {*open.IPFV.INF /
 otkryt'} ètot škof.
 open.PFV.INF} this closet
 '{I don't want to / I am afraid that I will} (accidentally) open this
 closet one day.' (only **AVOID**)

Utterance-level nature of ABSTAIN vs. AVOID

- The ABSTAIN vs. AVOID distinction holds at the utterance-level—not at the level of, e.g., specific verb forms.

Utterance-level nature of ABSTAIN vs. AVOID

- The ABSTAIN vs. AVOID distinction holds at the utterance-level—not at the level of, e.g., specific verb forms.
- E.g., both sentences in (6) are AVOID cases (they have *odnaždy*). The part of the situation outside the agent's control is if they see a monster or hear a scraping sound; the closet opening is intentional (as indicated by the purposive clause), and the aspect choice is determined solely by its placement relative to the reference time (i.e., perfective vs. imperfective has the standard viewpoint aspect interpretation).

- (6) a. Ja ne xoču odnaždy otkryt' škař, čtoby dostat' noski, i uvidet'
 I not want once open.PFV.INF closet to get socks and see.PFV.INF
 tam monstra.
 there monster
 'I don't want to one day open the closet to get socks and see a monster there.'
- b. Ja ne xoču odnaždy otkryvat' škař, čtoby dostat' noski, i
 I not want once open.IPFV.INF closet to get socks and
 uslyšet' skrežet.
 hear.PFV.INF scrape
 'I don't want to one day be opening the closet to get socks and hear a scraping sound.'

Utterance-level nature of **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID**

- Some naturalistic examples from Google illustrating the same point:

Utterance-level nature of ABSTAIN vs. AVOID

- Some naturalistic examples from Google illustrating the same point:

- (7) Ne xoču odnaždy otkryt' xolodil'nik i ne obnaruzhit' tam
 not want once open.PFV.INF fridge and not discover.PFV.INF there
 ničego krome ovošej.
 NI-what except vegetables
 'I don't want to one day open the fridge and find nothing but vegetables there.'
- (8) Ja ne xoču odnaždy sidet' na kuxne i uslyšat' zvonok.
 I not want once sit.IPFV.INF in kitchen and hear.PFV.INF call
 'I don't want to one day be sitting in the kitchen and hear a phone call.'

Utterance-level nature of ABSTAIN vs. AVOID

- Some naturalistic examples from Google illustrating the same point:

- (7) Ne xoču odnaždy otkryt' xolodil'nik i ne obnaruzhit' tam
 not want once open.PFV.INF fridge and not discover.PFV.INF there
 ničego krome ovošej.
 NI-what except vegetables
 'I don't want to one day open the fridge and find nothing but vegetables there.'
- (8) Ja ne xoču odnaždy sidet' na kuxne i uslyšat' zvonok.
 I not want once sit.IPFV.INF in kitchen and hear.PFV.INF call
 'I don't want to one day be sitting in the kitchen and hear a phone call.'
- In fact, you can just have imperfective in AVOID cases (also from Google):

Utterance-level nature of ABSTAIN vs. AVOID

- Some naturalistic examples from Google illustrating the same point:

(7) Ne xoču odnaždy otkryt' xolodil'nik i ne obnaružit' tam
 not want once open.PFV.INF fridge and not discover.PFV.INF there
 ničego krome ovošej.

NI-what except vegetables

'I don't want to one day open the fridge and find nothing but vegetables there.'

(8) Ja ne xoču odnaždy sidet' na kuxne i uslyšat' zvonok.
 I not want once sit.IPFV.INF in kitchen and hear.PFV.INF call
 'I don't want to one day be sitting in the kitchen and hear a phone call.'

- In fact, you can just have imperfective in AVOID cases (also from Google):

(9) Ja ne xoču odnaždy ležat' v uglu spal'ni so slomannymi
 I not want once lie.IPFV.INF in corner bedroom.GEN with broken
 rëbrami i razbitym licom, potomu što tebe pokažetsja, što ja s
 ribs and bruised face because you.DAT seems that I with
 kem-to flirtuju
 somebody flirt

'I don't want to one day be lying in the corner of the bedroom with broken ribs and bruised face because you thought I was flirting with someone.'

Revising the generalization about aspect

- So, the correct generalization (and already a crucial informal analytical insight) for aspect in **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases is:
 - Standard viewpoint aspect interpretation of perfective vs. imperfective in **AVOID** cases (how the event is situated wrt the reference time)
 - No viewpoint aspect in **ABSTAIN** cases; imperfective inserted as a meaningless morphosyntactic default? (caveat upcoming)

Some other environments where **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** holds

- Root modals are also sensitive to the **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** distinction (contra some of the claims in Goncharov 2018)

Some other environments where **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** holds

- Root modals are also sensitive to the **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** distinction (contra some of the claims in Goncharov 2018)
- Obligation regarding the activity vs. the outcome ($\Box\neg$):
 - (10a): Olya isn't allowed to engage in any dying event (odd, unless she or someone else can somehow control this process)
 - (10b): Olya can't be allowed to die, i.e., we need to prevent the outcome

- (10) a. Olja ne dolžna umirat'.
 Olya not must die.IPFV.INF
 ≈'Olya isn't allowed to die.' (**ABSTAIN**)
- b. Olja ne dolžna umeret'.
 Olya not must die.PFV.INF
 ≈'You/we/etc. can't let Olya die.' (**AVOID**)

Some other environments where **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** holds

- Note that this is about preventability, not who the target of obligation is (also contra Goncharov 2018):

(11) a. *Context: Sasha is my child, and I am giving instructions to the baby-sitter.*

Saša ne dolžna vxodit' v ètu komnatu.

Sasha not must enter.IPFV.INF in this room

'Sasha mustn't enter this room.' (**ABSTAIN**)

b. *Context: We're at war, and I am talking to my generals.*

Vrag ne dolžen vojti v gorod.

enemy not must enter.PFV.INF in city

'The enemy mustn't enter the city.' (**AVOID**)

Some other environments where **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** holds

- Deontic vs. circumstantial readings for *nel'zja* (historically 'not-can'; lexicalized $\neg\Diamond$):
 - (12a): deontic (prohibition); we want to prevent a certain outcome, so we prohibit engaging in any kind of door-opening events;
 - (12b): circumstantial (lack of ability); we don't want to prevent anything, we're just saying a certain outcome can't be obtained.

- (12) a. Ètu dver' nel'zja otkryvat'.
 this door NOT-CAN open.IPFV.INF
 ≈ 'This door mustn't be opened.' (**ABSTAIN**)
- b. Ètu dver' nel'zja otkryt'.
 this door NOT-CAN open.PFV.INF
 ≈ 'It's impossible to open this door.' (neither **ABSTAIN**, nor **AVOID**)

What **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** *isn't*

- The **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** distinction is orthogonal to *de se* (lit. 'of self') vs. non-*de se* interpretations of different types of overt or null elements in embedded clauses (the infamous "subject obviation" constraint; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, a.o.), which are also often talked about in terms of how much control the agent has over their actions. E.g., in French:

What **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** isn't

- The **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** distinction is orthogonal to *de se* (lit. 'of self') vs. non-*de se* interpretations of different types of overt or null elements in embedded clauses (the infamous "subject obviation" constraint; Farkas 1992; Schlenker 2005, a.o.), which are also often talked about in terms of how much control the agent has over their actions. E.g., in French:

- (13) a. Je veux partir. (obligatory *de se*)
 I want leave.INF
 'I want to leave.'
- b. Je veux que je parte. (obligatory non-*de se*)
 I want that I leave.SUBJ
 'I want that I leave.'

What **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** *isn't*

- As we have seen, the **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** distinction obtains for non-finite embedded clauses whose subjects are necessarily controlled by the matrix subject, such as 'I don't want to leave' (these are supposed to be obligatorily *de se* regardless)

What **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** *isn't*

- As we have seen, the **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** distinction obtains for non-finite embedded clauses whose subjects are necessarily controlled by the matrix subject, such as 'I don't want to leave' (these are supposed to be obligatorily *de se* regardless)
- ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** also obtains for finite embedded clauses where the subject of the matrix clause and the subject of the embedded clause are not co-referential (the subject obviation constraint does not apply):

(14) *Context: I am directing a movie and...*

a. *...I am having second thoughts about a certain scene.*

Ja ne xoču, čtoby Nina {ubivala / #ubila} Anju

I not want that.SUBJ Nina {kill.IPFV.SUBJ / #kill.PFV.SUBJ} Anya

(v sledujušej scene).

(in next scene)

'I don't want Nina to kill Anya (in the next scene).' (**ABSTAIN**)

b. *...I want to make sure my actors are safe.*

(Prover'te rekvizit!) Ja ne xoču, čtoby Nina (slučajno)

(check prop) I not want that.SUBJ Nina (accidentally)

{#ubivala / ubila} Anju.

{#kill.IPFV.SUBJ / kill.PFV.SUBJ} Anya

'(Check the prop!) I don't want Nina to (accidentally) kill Anya.' (**AVOID**)

What **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** *isn't*

- Finally, **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** obtains in finite embedded clauses where the matrix subject and the overt embedded subject are co-referential, but the obviation constraint is lifted (i.e., non-*de se* contexts):

- (15) *Context: Nina and I are actors in a movie, and we're about to shoot the next scene, where my character was originally supposed to kill Nina's character. I am also the writer-director of this movie and suddenly decided to change the scene. I announce my decision to the crew:*

Ja ne xoču, čtoby ja {ubivala / #ubila} Ninu (v sledujušej
 I not want that.SUBJ I {kill.IPFV.SUBJ / #kill.PFV.SUBJ} Nina (in next
 scene).
 scene)

'I don't want that I [= my character] kill Nina [= Nina's character] (in the next scene).'

(**ABSTAIN**)

- (16) *Context: We are playing DnD, and we are in a fight. It's my move, and I (i.e., my character) could shoot my longbow at the enemy now, but Nina's character is in my way, and if I shoot from my current position, I might accidentally kill them (it's not in my power to prevent that, though—how well I execute the shot literally depends on a roll of the dice). So I choose to spend my next move moving to a better position instead. I explain my decision to the group:*

Ja ne xoču, čtoby ja (slučajno) {#ubivala / ubila} Ninu.
 I not want that.SUBJ I (accidentally) {#kill.IPFV.SUBJ / kill.PFV.SUBJ} Nina
 'I don't want that I [= my character] accidentally kill Nina [= Nina's character].'

(**AVOID**)

What **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** *isn't*

- The bottom line:

What ABSTAIN vs. AVOID *isn't*

- The bottom line:
 - In the target environments in Russian, aspect tracks preventability, while subject obviation tracks some *de se*-related distinction (what exactly this distinction is is irrelevant for our purposes)

What ABSTAIN vs. AVOID *isn't*

- The bottom line:
 - In the target environments in Russian, aspect tracks preventability, while subject obviation tracks some *de se*-related distinction (what exactly this distinction is is irrelevant for our purposes)
 - These two pieces of meaning are fairly orthogonal to each other (not to say they can never interact or correlate in specific cases) and, thus, require distinct analyses

A few examples from other languages (courtesy of V-NYI #6 students)

- German, by Felicitas Andermann:

“As [(17)] shows, in German, the **ABSTAIN** reading licenses *niemanden* (‘nobody’) but not *nicht jemanden* (‘not someone’). In [(18a)], under the **AVOID** reading, on the other hand, both *niemanden* and *nicht jemanden* are acceptable, although *nicht jemanden* is highly marked. When the adverbial *versehentlich* (‘by.mistake’) is added, *nicht jemanden* is fully acceptable, as in [(18b)], while *niemanden* is but marginally acceptable when preceding *versehentlich*, as in [(18d)], and (for me) almost unacceptable when following *versehentlich*, as in [(18c)].”

(17) **ABSTAIN**:

Ruf {niemanden / *nicht jemanden} an
 call.IMP {nobody / *not someone} up

(18) **AVOID**:

- Ruf {niemanden / (?)nicht jemanden} an
 call.IMP {nobody / (?)not someone} up
- Ruf nicht versehentlich jemanden an
 call.IMP not by.mistake someone up
- ?*Ruf versehentlich niemanden an
 call.IMP by.mistake nobody up
- ?Ruf niemanden versehentlich an
 call.IMP nobody by.mistake up

A few examples from other languages (courtesy of V-NYI #6 students)

- Slovenian, by Kristina Gregorčič:

“...commands in **AVOID** cases cannot be expressed with the imperative; they are formed with the particle *bi* used to express conditional mood instead.”

(19) {Nikogar / *kogarkoli / *koga / *nekoga} ne kliči.
 {NI-who / *who-KOLI / *who / *NE-who} not call.IPFV.IMP
 ‘Don’t call anyone.’ (**ABSTAIN**)

(20) Da ne bi po nesreči {*nikogar / kogarkoli / koga /
 that not would by accident {*NI-who / who-KOLI / who /
 ?nekoga} poklicala.
 ?NE-who} call.PFV
 ‘Don’t accidentally call someone.’ (**AVOID**)

A few examples from other languages (courtesy of V-NYI #6 students)

- Kildin Saami (Uralic > Saami; spoken in Murmansk region, Russia), by Alexander Sergienko:

“The prohibitives with **AVOID** readings show both perfective [(21)] and imperfective [(22)] aspectual markers, as well as verbs not marked for aspect [(23)]. On the contrary, **ABSTAIN** prohibitives can only be combined with imperfective [(24)] or unmarked aspect [(25)].”

(21) Jel' kadc-es't' gr'iib

PROH catch-PERF flu.ACC

'Don't catch the flu!' (**AVOID**)

(22) Jel'l'e maŋŋn-an'n't-e urk-et'

PROH.PL be.late-IPFV1-PL class-PL.ACC

'Don't be late for classes!' (**AVOID**)

(23) Jel' maŋŋen' pojs-e

PROH be.late train-ACC

'Don't be late for your train!' (**AVOID**)

(24) Jel' vel'l's-el soan-en'

PROH jump.off-IPFV2 sled-LOC.PL

'Don't jump off the sled!' (**ABSTAIN**)

(25) Jel'l'e poačk-e, nadj-edd-e min'n'-e.

PROH.PL run.away-PL hope-MID-IMP.PL 1SG-DAT

'Don't run away, have faith in me.' (**ABSTAIN**)”

- ① Introduction
- ② A deeper dive
- ③ Desiderata for an account**
- ④ Developing an account
- ⑤ Outro

Some prior attempts to account for some parts of the puzzle

- Imperfective vs. perfective aspect in imperatives in Slavic:
 - Oft expressed intuition: pragmatic competition b/n imperfective and perfective: "...a command to not open the window with the perfective forbids the addressee to succeed in opening the window leaving it open whether an attempt to open the window can be made. The use of imperfective makes a stronger prohibition against attempting to open the window." (Goncharov 2018)
 - Goncharov 2018 relies on an ad hoc intentionality operator in **ABSTAIN** cases to formalize this intuition

Some prior attempts to account for some parts of the puzzle

- Imperfective vs. perfective aspect in imperatives in Slavic:
 - Oft expressed intuition: pragmatic competition b/n imperfective and perfective: "...a command to not open the window with the perfective forbids the addressee to succeed in opening the window leaving it open whether an attempt to open the window can be made. The use of imperfective makes a stronger prohibition against attempting to open the window." (Goncharov 2018)
 - Goncharov 2018 relies on an ad hoc intentionality operator in **ABSTAIN** cases to formalize this intuition
- Distribution of polarity-sensitive items (e.g., *any* vs. *some*) in English:
 - Goncharov 2020 (focuses on (*not*) *want*): an intervening presupposition that "shields" *some* from anti-licensing in **AVOID** cases ("shielding" insight already present in Szabolcsi 2004)

Desiderata for an account

- General enough (explains both aspect and indefinite facts; applies to all the environments we talked about), but still properly constrained (e.g., doesn't have direct consequences for subject obviation-related contrasts)

Desiderata for an account

- General enough (explains both aspect and indefinite facts; applies to all the environments we talked about), but still properly constrained (e.g., doesn't have direct consequences for subject obviation-related contrasts)
- Proper framing: in terms of different interpretations having certain grammatical reflexes, not 'a rule and an exception'

Desiderata for an account

- General enough (explains both aspect and indefinite facts; applies to all the environments we talked about), but still properly constrained (e.g., doesn't have direct consequences for subject obviation-related contrasts)
- Proper framing: in terms of different interpretations having certain grammatical reflexes, not 'a rule and an exception'
- Explanatory: we can hard-code any differences we want into our semantics, but what is the why behind them?

Desiderata for an account

- General enough (explains both aspect and indefinite facts; applies to all the environments we talked about), but still properly constrained (e.g., doesn't have direct consequences for subject obviation-related contrasts)
- Proper framing: in terms of different interpretations having certain grammatical reflexes, not 'a rule and an exception'
- Explanatory: we can hard-code any differences we want into our semantics, but what is the why behind them?
- Applying at the correct level; in particular, capturing the utterance-level nature of the **AVOID** vs. **ABSTAIN** distinction

Proposal: connection to prior literature

- I propose a more uniform and principled analysis for the **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** distinction and its grammatical reflexes, preserving two insights from prior work:

Proposal: connection to prior literature

- I propose a more uniform and principled analysis for the **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** distinction and its grammatical reflexes, preserving two insights from prior work:
 - There is indeed a (general) pragmatic competition between the two cases but (i) it is not directly hard-coded into the lexical semantics of any specific items, and (ii) there are also compositional differences

Proposal: connection to prior literature

- I propose a more uniform and principled analysis for the **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** distinction and its grammatical reflexes, preserving two insights from prior work:
 - There is indeed a (general) pragmatic competition between the two cases but (i) it is not directly hard-coded into the lexical semantics of any specific items, and (ii) there are also compositional differences
 - Something does indeed “shield” *nibud’/some* indefinites from anti-licensing in **AVOID** cases under negation, but it’s something in the compositional structure

- ① Introduction
- ② A deeper dive
- ③ Desiderata for an account
- ④ Developing an account**
- ⑤ Outro

Summary of the account

- The target complements in **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases have distinct compositional structures (cf. prior work):

Summary of the account

- The target complements in **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases have distinct compositional structures (cf. prior work):
 - **AVOID**: a situation layer, with the events described by the verbs situated with respect to the situation's runtime (i.e., *reference time* in Reichenbach 1947, or *topic time*)—viewpoint aspect

Summary of the account

- The target complements in **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases have distinct compositional structures (cf. prior work):
 - **AVOID**: a situation layer, with the events described by the verbs situated with respect to the situation's runtime (i.e., *reference time* in Reichenbach 1947, or *topic time*)—viewpoint aspect
 - **ABSTAIN**: no situation layer; descriptions of “unsituated events”, i.e., no viewpoint aspect

Summary of the account

- The target complements in **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases have distinct compositional structures (cf. prior work):
 - **AVOID**: a situation layer, with the events described by the verbs situated with respect to the situation's runtime (i.e., *reference time* in Reichenbach 1947, or *topic time*)—viewpoint aspect
 - **ABSTAIN**: no situation layer; descriptions of “unsituated events”, i.e., no viewpoint aspect
- Russian aspect:

Summary of the account

- The target complements in **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases have distinct compositional structures (cf. prior work):
 - **AVOID**: a situation layer, with the events described by the verbs situated with respect to the situation's runtime (i.e., *reference time* in Reichenbach 1947, or *topic time*)—viewpoint aspect
 - **ABSTAIN**: no situation layer; descriptions of “unsituated events”, i.e., no viewpoint aspect
- Russian aspect:
 - Imperfective: can be meaningful (situates the event relative to the situation's runtime when there is a situation layer) or meaningless (a morphosyntactic default for unsituated events)

Summary of the account

- The target complements in **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases have distinct compositional structures (cf. prior work):
 - **AVOID**: a situation layer, with the events described by the verbs situated with respect to the situation's runtime (i.e., *reference time* in Reichenbach 1947, or *topic time*)—viewpoint aspect
 - **ABSTAIN**: no situation layer; descriptions of “unsituated events”, i.e., no viewpoint aspect
- Russian aspect:
 - Imperfective: can be meaningful (situates the event relative to the situation's runtime when there is a situation layer) or meaningless (a morphosyntactic default for unsituated events)
 - Perfective: always meaningful (always requires a situation layer)

Summary of the account

- The target complements in **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases have distinct compositional structures (cf. prior work):
 - **AVOID**: a situation layer, with the events described by the verbs situated with respect to the situation's runtime (i.e., *reference time* in Reichenbach 1947, or *topic time*)—viewpoint aspect
 - **ABSTAIN**: no situation layer; descriptions of “unsituated events”, i.e., no viewpoint aspect
- Russian aspect:
 - Imperfective: can be meaningful (situates the event relative to the situation's runtime when there is a situation layer) or meaningless (a morphosyntactic default for unsituated events)
 - Perfective: always meaningful (always requires a situation layer)
- Indefinites: the situation layer can also re-license dependent indefinites by making negation too non-local for licensing *ni*-NCIs in certain configurations

Summary of the account

- The target complements in **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases have distinct compositional structures (cf. prior work):
 - **AVOID**: a situation layer, with the events described by the verbs situated with respect to the situation's runtime (i.e., *reference time* in Reichenbach 1947, or *topic time*)—viewpoint aspect
 - **ABSTAIN**: no situation layer; descriptions of “unsituated events”, i.e., no viewpoint aspect
- Russian aspect:
 - Imperfective: can be meaningful (situates the event relative to the situation's runtime when there is a situation layer) or meaningless (a morphosyntactic default for unsituated events)
 - Perfective: always meaningful (always requires a situation layer)
- Indefinites: the situation layer can also re-license dependent indefinites by making negation too non-local for licensing *ni*-NCIs in certain configurations
- Pragmatic considerations affect the choice between the two compositional structures when we're talking about preventing undesirable scenarios; these considerations are global and don't rely, e.g., on lexical presuppositions of specific items

Events, situations, worlds

- Ontology:

Events, situations, worlds

- Ontology:
 - Events: e (type v)

Events, situations, worlds

- Ontology:
 - Events: e (type v)
 - Worlds: w (type w); ultimate mega-containers for all events

Events, situations, worlds

- Ontology:
 - Events: e (type v)
 - Worlds: w (type w); ultimate mega-containers for all events
 - Situations: s (type s); “snapshots” of worlds or “little videos” (a notion used in all sorts of ways in the literature; see Kratzer 2021 for an overview)

Events, situations, worlds

- Ontology:
 - Events: e (type v)
 - Worlds: w (type w); ultimate mega-containers for all events
 - Situations: s (type s); “snapshots” of worlds or “little videos” (a notion used in all sorts of ways in the literature; see Kratzer 2021 for an overview)
- Containment/overlap:

Events, situations, worlds

- Ontology:
 - Events: e (type v)
 - Worlds: w (type w); ultimate mega-containers for all events
 - Situations: s (type s); “snapshots” of worlds or “little videos” (a notion used in all sorts of ways in the literature; see Kratzer 2021 for an overview)
- Containment/overlap:
 - An event can be contained in a world: $e \subseteq w$ (mereological containment, not subsethood!)

Events, situations, worlds

- Ontology:
 - Events: e (type v)
 - Worlds: w (type w); ultimate mega-containers for all events
 - Situations: s (type s); “snapshots” of worlds or “little videos” (a notion used in all sorts of ways in the literature; see Kratzer 2021 for an overview)
- Containment/overlap:
 - An event can be contained in a world: $e \subseteq w$ (mereological containment, not subsethood!)
 - A situation can be contained in a world: $s \subseteq w$

Events, situations, worlds

- Ontology:
 - Events: e (type v)
 - Worlds: w (type w); ultimate mega-containers for all events
 - Situations: s (type s); “snapshots” of worlds or “little videos” (a notion used in all sorts of ways in the literature; see Kratzer 2021 for an overview)
- Containment/overlap:
 - An event can be contained in a world: $e \subseteq w$ (mereological containment, not subsethood!)
 - A situation can be contained in a world: $s \subseteq w$
 - An event can overlap with a situation: $e \circ s$

Events, situations, worlds

- Ontology:
 - Events: e (type v)
 - Worlds: w (type w); ultimate mega-containers for all events
 - Situations: s (type s); “snapshots” of worlds or “little videos” (a notion used in all sorts of ways in the literature; see Kratzer 2021 for an overview)
- Containment/overlap:
 - An event can be contained in a world: $e \subseteq w$ (mereological containment, not subsethood!)
 - A situation can be contained in a world: $s \subseteq w$
 - An event can overlap with a situation: $e \circ s$
 - A specific case of such overlap is when an event is fully contained within a situation: $e \subseteq s$

Events, situations, worlds

- Events, situations, and worlds differ, a.o., in if/how they are introduced compositionally:

Events, situations, worlds

- Events, situations, and worlds differ, a.o., in if/how they are introduced compositionally:
 - Sentences denote *propositions*, i.e., sets of worlds, which are part of the lexical meaning of all predicates

Events, situations, worlds

- Events, situations, and worlds differ, a.o., in if/how they are introduced compositionally:
 - Sentences denote *propositions*, i.e., sets of worlds, which are part of the lexical meaning of all predicates
 - Events get introduced as part of the lexical meaning of some predicates (ontologically enriched quantificational event semantics from Champollion 2015):

$$(26) \llbracket \text{open} \rrbracket = \lambda f_{vt} \lambda w_w. \exists e_v. f(e) \wedge e \subseteq w \wedge \text{open}(e)$$

Events, situations, worlds

- Events, situations, and worlds differ, a.o., in if/how they are introduced compositionally:
 - Sentences denote *propositions*, i.e., sets of worlds, which are part of the lexical meaning of all predicates
 - Events get introduced as part of the lexical meaning of some predicates (ontologically enriched quantificational event semantics from Champollion 2015):

(26) $\llbracket \text{open} \rrbracket = \lambda f_{vt} \lambda w_w. \exists e_v. f(e) \wedge e \subseteq w \wedge \text{open}(e)$
 - Situations are optionally introduced into the compositional structure:

Events, situations, worlds

- Events, situations, and worlds differ, a.o., in if/how they are introduced compositionally:
 - Sentences denote *propositions*, i.e., sets of worlds, which are part of the lexical meaning of all predicates
 - Events get introduced as part of the lexical meaning of some predicates (ontologically enriched quantificational event semantics from Champollion 2015):

$$(26) \llbracket \text{open} \rrbracket = \lambda f_{vt} \lambda w_w. \exists e_v. f(e) \wedge e \subseteq w \wedge \text{open}(e)$$
 - Situations are optionally introduced into the compositional structure:
 - Lexically introduced events get situated relative to the situation's runtime (same role as *reference time* in Reichenbach 1947, or *topic time*)

Events, situations, worlds

- Events, situations, and worlds differ, a.o., in if/how they are introduced compositionally:
 - Sentences denote *propositions*, i.e., sets of worlds, which are part of the lexical meaning of all predicates
 - Events get introduced as part of the lexical meaning of some predicates (ontologically enriched quantificational event semantics from Champollion 2015):

(26) $\llbracket \text{open} \rrbracket = \lambda f_{vt} \lambda w_w. \exists e_v. f(e) \wedge e \subseteq w \wedge \text{open}(e)$
 - Situations are optionally introduced into the compositional structure:
 - Lexically introduced events get situated relative to the situation's runtime (same role as *reference time* in Reichenbach 1947, or *topic time*)
 - “Optionally”, i.e., no need for situations to build up to a proposition compositionally (I'm agnostic on whether all syntactic constituents of a certain kind have a situation layer, but not all non-finite clauses do)

Events, situations, worlds

- Events, situations, and worlds differ, a.o., in if/how they are introduced compositionally:
 - Sentences denote *propositions*, i.e., sets of worlds, which are part of the lexical meaning of all predicates
 - Events get introduced as part of the lexical meaning of some predicates (ontologically enriched quantificational event semantics from Champollion 2015):

$$(26) \llbracket \text{open} \rrbracket = \lambda f_{vt} \lambda w_w. \exists e_v. f(e) \wedge e \subseteq w \wedge \text{open}(e)$$
 - Situations are optionally introduced into the compositional structure:
 - Lexically introduced events get situated relative to the situation's runtime (same role as *reference time* in Reichenbach 1947, or *topic time*)
 - "Optionally", i.e., no need for situations to build up to a proposition compositionally (I'm agnostic on whether all syntactic constituents of a certain kind have a situation layer, but not all non-finite clauses do)
 - Many ways to cut the pie compositionally; this situation-introducing modifier will do (assumptions: any further regular event modifiers undergo an appropriate type-shift; some lexical items are sensitive to whether their input has a situation layer; s is existentially closed off at the end):

$$(27) \llbracket \text{SIT} \rrbracket = \lambda V_{\langle vt, wt \rangle} \lambda f_{vt} \lambda s_s \lambda w_w. s \subseteq w \wedge V(\lambda e. f(e) \wedge e \circ s)(w)$$

Situations and Russian aspect

- In Russian, imperfective doesn't always require a situation layer (i.e., imperfective verbs can describe unsituated events), but perfective does

Situations and Russian aspect

- In Russian, imperfective doesn't always require a situation layer (i.e., imperfective verbs can describe unsituated events), but perfective does
- Two types of the IPFV head: a vacuous one in (28a), combining with a situation-less verbal projection (a morphosyntactic default), or a meaningful one, e.g., one that describes events whose endpoints are situated outside the situation's runtime ($rt(s)$):

- (28) a. $\llbracket \text{IPFV}_{\text{vac}} \rrbracket = \lambda V_{\langle vt, wt \rangle} \lambda f_v \lambda w_w . V(\lambda e . f(e))(w)$
- b. $\llbracket \text{IPFV}_{\text{sit}} \rrbracket = \lambda S_{\langle vt, \langle s, wt \rangle \rangle} \lambda f_v \lambda s_s \lambda w_w . S(\lambda e . f(e) \wedge rt(s) \subseteq rt(e))(s)(w)$
- c. $\llbracket \llbracket [\text{open}] \text{SIT} \rrbracket \text{IPFV}_{\text{sit}} \rrbracket \rrbracket = \lambda f_v \lambda s_s \lambda w_w . s \subseteq w \wedge \exists e . f(e) \wedge rt(s) \subseteq rt(e) \wedge e \circ s \wedge e \subseteq w \wedge \text{open}(e)$

Situations and Russian aspect

- In Russian, imperfective doesn't always require a situation layer (i.e., imperfective verbs can describe unsituated events), but perfective does
- Two types of the IPFV head: a vacuous one in (28a), combining with a situation-less verbal projection (a morphosyntactic default), or a meaningful one, e.g., one that describes events whose endpoints are situated outside the situation's runtime ($rt(s)$):

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{a. } \llbracket \text{IPFV}_{\text{vac}} \rrbracket &= \lambda V_{\langle vt, wt \rangle} \lambda f_v \lambda w_w. V(\lambda e. f(e))(w) \\ \text{b. } \llbracket \text{IPFV}_{\text{sit}} \rrbracket &= \lambda S_{\langle vt, \langle s, wt \rangle \rangle} \lambda f_v \lambda s_s \lambda w_w. S(\lambda e. f(e) \wedge rt(s) \subseteq rt(e))(s)(w) \\ \text{c. } \llbracket \llbracket [\text{open}] \text{SIT} \rrbracket \text{IPFV}_{\text{sit}} \rrbracket \rrbracket &= \lambda f_v \lambda s_s \lambda w_w. s \subseteq w \wedge \exists e. f(e) \wedge rt(s) \subseteq \\ &rt(e) \wedge e \circ s \wedge e \subseteq w \wedge \text{open}(e) \end{aligned}$$

- There is no vacuous version of the PFV head, it always combines with a situation-full verbal projection, e.g., perfective verbs can describe events that culminate within ($\text{culm}(e) \subseteq rt(s)$):

$$(29) \quad \llbracket \text{PFV} \rrbracket = \lambda S_{\langle vt, \langle s, wt \rangle \rangle} \lambda f_v \lambda s_s \lambda w_w. S(\lambda e. f(e) \wedge \text{culm}(e) \subseteq rt(s))(s)(w)$$

Situations and Russian aspect

- In Russian, imperfective doesn't always require a situation layer (i.e., imperfective verbs can describe unsituated events), but perfective does
- Two types of the IPFV head: a vacuous one in (28a), combining with a situation-less verbal projection (a morphosyntactic default), or a meaningful one, e.g., one that describes events whose endpoints are situated outside the situation's runtime ($rt(s)$):

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{a. } \llbracket \text{IPFV}_{\text{vac}} \rrbracket &= \lambda V_{\langle vt, wt \rangle} \lambda f_v \lambda w_w. V(\lambda e. f(e))(w) \\ \text{b. } \llbracket \text{IPFV}_{\text{sit}} \rrbracket &= \lambda S_{\langle vt, \langle s, wt \rangle \rangle} \lambda f_v \lambda s_s \lambda w_w. S(\lambda e. f(e) \wedge rt(s) \subseteq rt(e))(s)(w) \\ \text{c. } \llbracket \llbracket [\text{open}] \text{SIT} \rrbracket \text{IPFV}_{\text{sit}} \rrbracket \rrbracket &= \lambda f_v \lambda s_s \lambda w_w. s \subseteq w \wedge \exists e. f(e) \wedge rt(s) \subseteq \\ &\quad rt(e) \wedge e \circ s \wedge e \subseteq w \wedge \text{open}(e) \end{aligned}$$

- There is no vacuous version of the PFV head, it always combines with a situation-full verbal projection, e.g., perfective verbs can describe events that culminate within ($\text{culm}(e) \subseteq rt(s)$):

$$(29) \quad \llbracket \text{PFV} \rrbracket = \lambda S_{\langle vt, \langle s, wt \rangle \rangle} \lambda f_v \lambda s_s \lambda w_w. S(\lambda e. f(e) \wedge \text{culm}(e) \subseteq rt(s))(s)(w)$$

- NB: The “vacuous” imperfective isn't completely vacuous; it still has its atelic, mass-noun-y, plural-y interpretation—but no viewpoint aspect interpretation (because there is no viewpoint)

Cases at hand

- The relevant complements in **AVOID** cases have a situation layer, but those in **ABSTAIN** cases don't

Cases at hand

- The relevant complements in **AVOID** cases have a situation layer, but those in **ABSTAIN** cases don't
- NB: This captures the fact that only **AVOID** cases allow *odnaždy* ('once'/'one day'/'on one occasion') if the latter quantifies over/modifies situations

Cases at hand

- The relevant complements in **AVOID** cases have a situation layer, but those in **ABSTAIN** cases don't
- NB: This captures the fact that only **AVOID** cases allow *odnaždy* ('once'/'one day'/'on one occasion') if the latter quantifies over/modifies situations
- Negated imperatives and 'not want':
 - I assume that the imperative operator (Kaufmann 2012-style) and 'want' compose with their complements in the same way in **ABSTAIN** and **AVOID** cases (not crucial):

(30) [['Don't open the closet!' / 'I don't want to open the closet']] =

1 in w iff $\forall w' R_{imp/want} w :$

a. **ABSTAIN**:

$$\neg[\exists e.e \subseteq w' \wedge \text{open}(e) \wedge \text{ag}(e) = \text{addr/sp} \wedge \text{th}(e) = \iota x.\text{closet}(x)]$$

b. **AVOID**:

$$\neg[\exists s.s \subseteq w' \wedge \exists e.\text{culm}(e) \subseteq \text{RT}_s \wedge e \circ s \wedge e \subseteq w' \wedge \text{open}(e) \wedge (...)]$$

Cases at hand

- 'Fear':
 - **ABSTAIN**: 'fear' encodes a relation between its subject and its complement (propositional or not) in the world of evaluation
 - **AVOID**: 'fear' asserts the epistemic possibility of its propositional complement and presupposes the speaker's "fearful" attitude towards it (I think this at-issue vs. not-at-issue distinction is pragmatic and, thus, don't encode it lexically):

(31) \llbracket 'I am afraid (a.) of opening the closet / (b.) that I'll open the closet' \rrbracket
 $= 1$ in w iff

- a. **ABSTAIN**: $\text{fear}(\text{sp}, \lambda w'. \exists e. e \subseteq w' \wedge \text{open}(e) \wedge \text{ag}(e) = \text{sp} \wedge \text{th}(e) = \iota x. \text{closet}(x), w)$
- b. **AVOID**:
 $\exists w' R_{\text{bel}} w [\exists s. s \subseteq w' \wedge \exists e. \text{culm}(e) \subseteq \text{RT}_s \wedge e \circ s \wedge e \subseteq w' \wedge \text{open}(e) \wedge \text{ag}(e) = \text{sp} \wedge \text{th}(e) = \iota x. \text{closet}(x)] \wedge \text{fear}(\text{sp}, \lambda w''. \exists s. (...), w)$

Indefinite licensing

- The situation layer can re-license *nibud'* indefinites under negation

Indefinite licensing

- The situation layer can re-license *nibud'* indefinites under negation
 - *Nibud'* indefinites need to “depend” on something, with a potential to co-vary (see Yanovich 2005; Pereltsvaig 2008 for details); quantification over worlds in imperatives and ‘want’ licenses *nibud'*

Indefinite licensing

- The situation layer can re-license *nibud'* indefinites under negation
 - *Nibud'* indefinites need to “depend” on something, with a potential to co-vary (see Yanovich 2005; Pereltsvaig 2008 for details); quantification over worlds in imperatives and ‘want’ licenses *nibud'*
 - *Ni* NCIs are licensed by (local enough) negation and, when licensed, block *nibud'*

Indefinite licensing

- The situation layer can re-license *nibud'* indefinites under negation
 - *Nibud'* indefinites need to “depend” on something, with a potential to co-vary (see Yanovich 2005; Pereltsvaig 2008 for details); quantification over worlds in imperatives and ‘want’ licenses *nibud'*
 - *Ni* NCIs are licensed by (local enough) negation and, when licensed, block *nibud'*
 - The situation layer blocks *ni*-NCI licensing (the negation is no longer local enough) and by doing so re-licenses *nibud'*

Indefinite licensing

- The situation layer can re-license *nibud'* indefinites under negation
 - *Nibud'* indefinites need to “depend” on something, with a potential to co-vary (see Yanovich 2005; Pereltsvaig 2008 for details); quantification over worlds in imperatives and ‘want’ licenses *nibud'*
 - *Ni* NCI are licensed by (local enough) negation and, when licensed, block *nibud'*
 - The situation layer blocks *ni*-NCI licensing (the negation is no longer local enough) and by doing so re-licenses *nibud'*
 - Thus, in the **ABSTAIN** cases at hand involving negation, only *ni* NCIs are licensed, but in the **AVOID** cases, either one can be licensed, depending on whether the indefinite scopes above or below the situation layer:

- (32) a. *ni*: $\forall w' R w \neg [\boxed{\exists x} \exists e]$ or $\forall w' R w \neg [\boxed{\exists x} \exists s \exists e]$
 b. *nibud'*: $\forall w' R w \neg [\exists s \boxed{\exists x} \exists e]$

Indefinite licensing

- The situation layer can re-license *nibud'* indefinites under negation
 - *Nibud'* indefinites need to “depend” on something, with a potential to co-vary (see Yanovich 2005; Pereltsvaig 2008 for details); quantification over worlds in imperatives and ‘want’ licenses *nibud'*
 - *Ni* NCI are licensed by (local enough) negation and, when licensed, block *nibud'*
 - The situation layer blocks *ni*-NCI licensing (the negation is no longer local enough) and by doing so re-licenses *nibud'*
 - Thus, in the **ABSTAIN** cases at hand involving negation, only *ni* NCIs are licensed, but in the **AVOID** cases, either one can be licensed, depending on whether the indefinite scopes above or below the situation layer:

(32) a. *ni*: $\forall w' R w \neg [\boxed{\exists x} \exists e]$ or $\forall w' R w \neg [\boxed{\exists x} \exists s \exists e]$

b. *nibud'*: $\forall w' R w \neg [\exists s \boxed{\exists x} \exists e]$

- *Nibud'* under ‘fear’ (situations don’t play a role):
 - **ABSTAIN**-type ‘fear’ doesn’t license *nibud'* indefinites (nothing for them to depend on)
 - **AVOID**-type ‘fear’ licenses *nibud'* indefinites thanks to the quantification over worlds

Indefinite licensing

- The situation layer can re-license *nibud'* indefinites under negation
 - *Nibud'* indefinites need to “depend” on something, with a potential to co-vary (see Yanovich 2005; Pereltsvaig 2008 for details); quantification over worlds in imperatives and ‘want’ licenses *nibud'*
 - *Ni* NCIs are licensed by (local enough) negation and, when licensed, block *nibud'*
 - The situation layer blocks *ni*-NCI licensing (the negation is no longer local enough) and by doing so re-licenses *nibud'*
 - Thus, in the **ABSTAIN** cases at hand involving negation, only *ni* NCIs are licensed, but in the **AVOID** cases, either one can be licensed, depending on whether the indefinite scopes above or below the situation layer:

(32) a. *ni*: $\forall w' R w \neg [\boxed{\exists x} \exists e]$ or $\forall w' R w \neg [\boxed{\exists x} \exists s \exists e]$

b. *nibud'*: $\forall w' R w \neg [\exists s \boxed{\exists x} \exists e]$

- *Nibud'* under ‘fear’ (situations don’t play a role):
 - **ABSTAIN**-type ‘fear’ doesn’t license *nibud'* indefinites (nothing for them to depend on)
 - **AVOID**-type ‘fear’ licenses *nibud'* indefinites thanks to the quantification over worlds
- I assume the main insight extends to English *some* re-licensing

Indefinite licensing

- NB: It is the situation layer itself that has to block *ni*-NCI licensing, not quantification over situations

Indefinite licensing

- NB: It is the situation layer itself that has to block *ni*-NCI licensing, not quantification over situations

- *Kak-nibud'* can be used instead of *odnaždy* as a 'once'-type modifier, and we wouldn't want to say that it licenses itself:

- (33) a. Ne {*otkryvaj / otkroj} kak-nibud' ètot škaf!
 not {*open.IPFV.IMP / open.PFV.IMP} how-NIBUD' this closet
 'Don't open this closet one day!' (only **AVOID**)
- b. Ja {ne xoču / bojus'} kak-nibud' {*otkryvat' /
 I {not want / fear} how-NIBUD' {*open.IPFV.INF /
 otkryt'} ètot škaf.
 open.PFV.INF} this closet
 '{I don't want to / I am afraid that I will} open this closet one day.'
 (only **AVOID**)

Indefinite licensing

- NB: It is the situation layer itself that has to block *ni*-NCI licensing, not quantification over situations
 - *Kak-nibud'* can be used instead of *odnaždy* as a 'once'-type modifier, and we wouldn't want to say that it licenses itself:

(33) a. Ne {*otkryvaj / otkroj} kak-nibud' ètot škof!
 not {*open.IPFV.IMP / open.PFV.IMP} how-NIBUD' this closet
 'Don't open this closet one day!' (only **AVOID**)

b. Ja {ne xoču / bojus} kak-nibud' {*otkryvat' /
 I {not want / fear} how-NIBUD' {*open.IPFV.INF /
 otkryt'} ètot škof.
 open.PFV.INF} this closet
 '{I don't want to / I am afraid that I will} open this closet one day.'
 (only **AVOID**)
 - *Nikogda* 'never' is incompatible w/**AVOID** (if a situation layer is present, existential temporal quantifiers bind *s* and can't emerge as *ni* NCIs):

(34) a. Nikogda ne {otkryvaj / *otkroj} ètot škof!
 NI-when not {open.IPFV.IMP / *open.PFV.IMP} this closet
 'Never open this closet!' (only **ABSTAIN**)

b. Ja ne xoču nikogda {otkryvat' / *otkryt'} ètot škof.
 I not want NI-when {open.IPFV / *open.PFV} this closet
 'I don't want to ever open this closet.' (only **ABSTAIN**)

Pragmatics of prevention

- In **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases, the choice to have a situation layer is driven by global pragmatic considerations on how unwanted scenarios can/should be prevented

Pragmatics of prevention

- In **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases, the choice to have a situation layer is driven by global pragmatic considerations on how unwanted scenarios can/should be prevented
- Assumption: introducing a situation layer (when it is not obligatory for syntactic reasons) needs to be justified

Pragmatics of prevention

- In **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases, the choice to have a situation layer is driven by global pragmatic considerations on how unwanted scenarios can/should be prevented
- Assumption: introducing a situation layer (when it is not obligatory for syntactic reasons) needs to be justified
- Intuitions:

Pragmatics of prevention

- In **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases, the choice to have a situation layer is driven by global pragmatic considerations on how unwanted scenarios can/should be prevented
- Assumption: introducing a situation layer (when it is not obligatory for syntactic reasons) needs to be justified
- Intuitions:
 - In all three environments at hand, we directly or indirectly infer that the speaker (imperatives) or experiencer ('not want', 'fear') considers certain scenarios undesirable

Pragmatics of prevention

- In **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases, the choice to have a situation layer is driven by global pragmatic considerations on how unwanted scenarios can/should be prevented
- Assumption: introducing a situation layer (when it is not obligatory for syntactic reasons) needs to be justified
- Intuitions:
 - In all three environments at hand, we directly or indirectly infer that the speaker (imperatives) or experiencer ('not want', 'fear') considers certain scenarios undesirable
 - In the case of accomplishments, this attitude can be about a certain outcome (event culmination) or about the activity (potentially) leading to it

Pragmatics of prevention

- In **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases, the choice to have a situation layer is driven by global pragmatic considerations on how unwanted scenarios can/should be prevented
- Assumption: introducing a situation layer (when it is not obligatory for syntactic reasons) needs to be justified
- Intuitions:
 - In all three environments at hand, we directly or indirectly infer that the speaker (imperatives) or experiencer ('not want', 'fear') considers certain scenarios undesirable
 - In the case of accomplishments, this attitude can be about a certain outcome (event culmination) or about the activity (potentially) leading to it
 - If the attitude is about the activity rather than the outcome, we don't need to include the event culmination and will thus have imperfective no matter what

Pragmatics of prevention

- In **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases, the choice to have a situation layer is driven by global pragmatic considerations on how unwanted scenarios can/should be prevented
- Assumption: introducing a situation layer (when it is not obligatory for syntactic reasons) needs to be justified
- Intuitions:
 - In all three environments at hand, we directly or indirectly infer that the speaker (imperatives) or experiencer ('not want', 'fear') considers certain scenarios undesirable
 - In the case of accomplishments, this attitude can be about a certain outcome (event culmination) or about the activity (potentially) leading to it
 - If the attitude is about the activity rather than the outcome, we don't need to include the event culmination and will thus have imperfective no matter what
 - If the attitude is about the outcome, whether we include the event culmination in our description (and, thus, have to introduce a situation layer) depends on whether we think it is possible to "nip it in the bud"

Pragmatics of prevention: illustration

- (35) a. Ne {otkryvaj / *otkroj} ètu dver'! Spinu nadorvěš'.
 not {open.IPFV.IMP / *open.PFV.IMP} this door back strain.FUT.2SG
 'Don't [try to] open this door! You'll strain your back.'
- b. Ne {otrkyvaj / otkroj (slučajno)} ètu dver'! Za nej
 not {open.IPFV.IMP / open.PFV.IMP (accidentally)} this door behind it
 monstr.
 monster
 'Don't {[intentionally] / (accidentally)} open this door! There's a monster
 behind it.'

Pragmatics of prevention: illustration

- (35) a. Ne {otkryvaj / *otkroj} ètu dver'! Spinu nadorvěš'.
 not {open.IPFV.IMP / *open.PFV.IMP} this door back strain.FUT.2SG
 'Don't [try to] open this door! You'll strain your back.'
- b. Ne {otrkyvaj / otkroj (slučajno)} ètu dver'! Za nej
 not {open.IPFV.IMP / open.PFV.IMP (accidentally)} this door behind it
 monstr.
 monster
 'Don't {[intentionally] / (accidentally)} open this door! There's a monster
 behind it.'
- (35a): I don't want the addressee to partake in any door opening whatsoever because of the potential risk of the activity itself and, thus, goes for an unsituated event description (**ABSTAIN**)

Pragmatics of prevention: illustration

- (35) a. Ne {otkryvaj / *otkroj} ètu dver'! Spinu nadorvěš'.
 not {open.IPFV.IMP / *open.PFV.IMP} this door back strain.FUT.2SG
 'Don't [try to] open this door! You'll strain your back.'
- b. Ne {otrkyvaj / otkroj (slučajno)} ètu dver'! Za nej
 not {open.IPFV.IMP / open.PFV.IMP (accidentally)} this door behind it
 monstr.
 monster
 'Don't {[intentionally] / (accidentally)} open this door! There's a monster
 behind it.'
- (35a): I don't want the addressee to partake in any door opening whatsoever because of the potential risk of the activity itself and, thus, goes for an unsituated event description (**ABSTAIN**)
 - (35b): I don't want the end-state of the door being open to obtain
 - If I think this outcome can be prevented by the relevant agent not engaging in any door opening events whatsoever, I should go for an unsituated event description (**ABSTAIN**)
 - If I don't think that all such events can be prevented (e.g., the activity leading to the end-state cannot be controlled or even recognized as such), I have to go for a situation description containing the end-state (**AVOID**)

- ① Introduction
- ② A deeper dive
- ③ Desiderata for an account
- ④ Developing an account
- ⑤ **Outro**

Summary and outlook

- Summary:

Summary and outlook

- Summary:
 - I have proposed a uniform, principled account of aspect and indefinite licensing facts from Russian in a natural class of environments, which are sensitive to the same pragmatic considerations about prevention

Summary and outlook

- Summary:
 - I have proposed a uniform, principled account of aspect and indefinite licensing facts from Russian in a natural class of environments, which are sensitive to the same pragmatic considerations about prevention
 - I have implemented this account within a semantics that combines events, situations, and worlds within a single ontology and a single compositional structure

Summary and outlook

- Summary:
 - I have proposed a uniform, principled account of aspect and indefinite licensing facts from Russian in a natural class of environments, which are sensitive to the same pragmatic considerations about prevention
 - I have implemented this account within a semantics that combines events, situations, and worlds within a single ontology and a single compositional structure
- Moving forward:

Summary and outlook

- Summary:
 - I have proposed a uniform, principled account of aspect and indefinite licensing facts from Russian in a natural class of environments, which are sensitive to the same pragmatic considerations about prevention
 - I have implemented this account within a semantics that combines events, situations, and worlds within a single ontology and a single compositional structure
- Moving forward:
 - I view this work as part of a larger research endeavor aiming to elucidate the interaction between (i) clause size, (ii) presence of events, situations, and/or worlds in the compositional structure, and (iii) pragmatics of how the event participants are viewed within a given situation and how much control they have over the situation—across languages

Summary and outlook

- Summary:
 - I have proposed a uniform, principled account of aspect and indefinite licensing facts from Russian in a natural class of environments, which are sensitive to the same pragmatic considerations about prevention
 - I have implemented this account within a semantics that combines events, situations, and worlds within a single ontology and a single compositional structure
- Moving forward:
 - I view this work as part of a larger research endeavor aiming to elucidate the interaction between (i) clause size, (ii) presence of events, situations, and/or worlds in the compositional structure, and (iii) pragmatics of how the event participants are viewed within a given situation and how much control they have over the situation—across languages
 - Explore the implications of the proposed account for aspect and indefinite distribution in Russian outside of the **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases

Summary and outlook

- Summary:
 - I have proposed a uniform, principled account of aspect and indefinite licensing facts from Russian in a natural class of environments, which are sensitive to the same pragmatic considerations about prevention
 - I have implemented this account within a semantics that combines events, situations, and worlds within a single ontology and a single compositional structure
- Moving forward:
 - I view this work as part of a larger research endeavor aiming to elucidate the interaction between (i) clause size, (ii) presence of events, situations, and/or worlds in the compositional structure, and (iii) pragmatics of how the event participants are viewed within a given situation and how much control they have over the situation—across languages
 - Explore the implications of the proposed account for aspect and indefinite distribution in Russian outside of the **ABSTAIN** vs. **AVOID** cases
 - Work out the more fine-grained details of the event-situation-world semantics and its applications to various event-related issues (e.g., anaphora to events vs. situations, “negative events”)

Thanks!

Thanks!
Questions?

A few more notes on Russian aspect

- Non-negated imperfective imperatives in Russian:

A few more notes on Russian aspect

- Non-negated imperfective imperatives in Russian:
 - Sometimes they convey lack of speaker investment/urgency (permissions, polite requests), but sometimes it's the opposite:

A few more notes on Russian aspect

- Non-negated imperfective imperatives in Russian:
 - Sometimes they convey lack of speaker investment/urgency (permissions, polite requests), but sometimes it's the opposite:

(36) A: Možno ja doem tort?
may I eat-up.PFV.FUT.1SG cake
'May I finish the cake?'

- B: (i) Doedaj.
eat-up.IMP.IPFV
≈ 'Sure, finish it.' (permission)
- (ii) Snačala sup doeš!
first soup eat-up.IMP.PFV
'First, finish the soup!' (command)

A few more notes on Russian aspect

- Non-negated imperfective imperatives in Russian:
 - Sometimes they convey lack of speaker investment/urgency (permissions, polite requests), but sometimes it's the opposite:

(36) A: Možno ja doem tort?
may I eat-up.PFV.FUT.1SG cake
'May I finish the cake?'

B: (i) Doedaj.
eat-up.IMP.IPFV
≈'Sure, finish it.' (permission)

(ii) Snačala sup doeš'!
first soup eat-up.IMP.PFV
'First, finish the soup!' (command)

(37) a. Vstavaj potixon'ku.
get-up.IPFV.IMP gradually
≈'Start the process of getting up.' (no urgency)

b. Vstavaj nemedlenno!
get-up.IPFV.IMP immediately
'Get up now!' (very urgent)

A few more notes on Russian aspect

- Intuition: the non-urgent cases of imperfective don't include the culmination because the speaker doesn't care or doesn't want to impose too much on the addressee; the urgent cases are about the immediate situation (the $rt(s)$ is now), so the culmination is outside $rt(s)$; cf. the (rude) past tense commands (the $rt(s)$ is like 5 minutes ago):

A few more notes on Russian aspect

- Intuition: the non-urgent cases of imperfective don't include the culmination because the speaker doesn't care or doesn't want to impose too much on the addressee; the urgent cases are about the immediate situation (the $rt(s)$ is now), so the culmination is outside $rt(s)$; cf. the (rude) past tense commands (the $rt(s)$ is like 5 minutes ago):

(38) Vstal i vyšel!

get-up.past.masc.sg and leave.past.masc.sg

'Get up and leave!'

A few more notes on Russian aspect

- Semelfactive and minimizers:

A few more notes on Russian aspect

- Semelfactive and minimizers:
 - Semelfactive perfective verbs aren't always associated with unintentional actions in the environments at hand, e.g.:

(39) a. Už i ne vzgljani na nego!
already MIN not look.PFV-SEMELF.IMP at him
≈'You can't even cast a single glance at him!'

b. Ja bojus {i / daže} vzgljanut' na nego.
I fear {MIN / even} look.PFV-SEMELF.IMP at him
'I am afraid of casting a single glance at him.'

A few more notes on Russian aspect

- Semelfactive and minimizers:
 - Semelfactive perfective verbs aren't always associated with unintentional actions in the environments at hand, e.g.:

(39) a. Už i ne vzgljani na nego!
already MIN not look.PFV-SEMELF.IMP at him
≈'You can't even cast a single glance at him!'

b. Ja bojus {i / daže} vzgljanut' na nego.
I fear {MIN / even} look.PFV-SEMELF.IMP at him
'I am afraid of casting a single glance at him.'
 - Intuition: in minimizer contexts, the smallest possible events need to be prevented, and semelfactives describe just such events (w/no further internal structure)

A few more notes on Russian aspect

- Counterfactual uses of imperative forms do not necessarily imply wanting to prevent (or assure) anything; such imperative forms are always part of situation descriptions, and their aspect is determined solely by the placement of the events they describe wrt $rt(s)$:

- (40) a. Ne otkroj ja dver' tak bystro, xuligany by
not open.PFV.IMP I door so fast pranksters SUBJ
uspeli ubežat'.
have-time.SUBJ run-away.INF
'Had I not opened the door so fast, the pranksters would've had time to run away.'
- b. Ne otkryvaj ja dver' tak gromko, Saša by ne
not open.IPFV.IMP I door so loud Sasha SUBJ not
prosnulas'.
wake-up.SUBJ
'Had I not been opening the door so loudly, Sasha wouldn't have woken up.'

References I

- Champollion, Lucas. 2015. The interaction of compositional semantics and event semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 38(1). 31–66. doi:10.1007/s10988-014-9162-8.
- Farkas, Donka F. 1992. On obviation. In Ivan A Sag & Anna Szabolcsi (eds.), *Lexical matters*, 85–109. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Goncharov, Julie. 2018. Intentionality effect in imperatives. In *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics (FASL) 27*, Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Goncharov, Julie. 2020. Dynamic presupposition of 'want' and polarity sensitivity. In Joseph Rhyne, Kaelyn Lamp, Nicole Dreier & Chloe Kwon (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 30*, 779–800. doi:10.3765/salt.v30i0.4823.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2012. *Interpreting imperatives*. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-2269-9.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2021. Situations in natural language semantics. In Edward N Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*, Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University Winter 2021 edn.
- Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2008. Russian *nibud'*-series as markers of co-variation. In Natasha Abner & Jason Bishop (eds.), *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL) 27*, 370–378. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. *Elements of symbolic logic*. New York: Macmillan Co.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2005. The lazy Frenchman's approach to the subjunctive: Speculations on reference to worlds and semantic defaults in the analysis of mood. In Twan Geerts, Ivo van Ginneken & Haike Jacobs (eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2003: Selected papers from 'going romance'*, 269–309. John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi:10.1075/cilt.270.15sch.

References II

- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2004. Positive polarity–negative polarity. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22(2). 409–452. doi:10.1023/B:NALA.0000015791.00288.43.
- Yanovich, Igor. 2005. Choice-functional series of indefinite pronouns and hamblin semantics. In Efthymia Georgala & Jonathan Howell (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 15*, 309–326. doi:10.3765/salt.v0i0.2921.