

How directive constructions emerge

Grammaticalization, constructionalization, cooptation

Caterina Mauri, Andrea Sansò

Abstract. Directive strategies, i.e. strategies through which the speaker orders someone to do something, are very frequent in everyday speech, and are particularly subject to processes of diachronic renewal. Based on a 200-language sample, this paper provides an extensive survey of the most frequent diachronic processes of emergence of positive directive strategies (imperatives, hortatives, jussives, etc.). Three basic processes are discussed: (i) the grammaticalization of lexical material into markers of orders and commands; (ii) the cooptation of non-directive forms (used in indirect speech acts) as directive strategies; and (iii) the creation of new directive strategies through constructionalization of various types of insubordinated clauses. The stages and outcomes of these processes are reconstructed on the basis of the available diachronic and synchronic evidence. In some of these processes, the identity of the performer of the order (addressee, speaker + addressee, third party) turns out to play a crucial role in favouring the development of a non-directive strategy into a directive one. Other diachronic processes, on the contrary, are shown to be connected to the widespread tendency to express orders in an indirect way, i.e. by putting the face-threatening component of directive speech acts off-stage.

Keywords: directives, indirect speech acts, grammaticalization, cooptation, constructionalization

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to provide a comprehensive survey of the mechanisms by which directive strategies emerge and conventionalize. By *directive strategies* we mean constructions and markers that encode positive directive speech acts, i.e. situations in which the speaker orders someone to do something. As will be discussed below (Section 1.2), grammars adopt various labels to refer to these constructions and markers (imperatives, hortatives, jussives, etc.), and this terminological variety in part reflects the fact that languages often have various strategies devoted to the expression of orders differentiated on the basis of parameters such as the intended performer of the order, the degree of politeness, the degree of urgency, etc.

Being crucial to the establishing and maintenance of interpersonal relationships, directive speech acts are very frequent in everyday conversation, and directive forms, especially when the intended performer is the addressee, are often among the simplest verbal forms of a language. Frequency, simplicity, and their strict connection with the pragmatic dimensions of face and politeness are among the reasons why such forms are particularly subject to processes of diachronic renewal. In these processes either new directive forms are created through various diachronic mechanisms such as grammaticalization and constructionalization, or non-directive forms come to be used with a directive function (i.e. are coopted to serve a directive function) through conventionalization of pragmatic implicatures.

Some of these processes of grammaticalization have been already singled out in the literature on imperatives and related forms (see, for instance, the survey in Aikhenvald 2010: 346ff.), but their stages have rarely been described in detail, and the variety of their motivations and outcomes has been mostly overlooked. At the same time, the patterns by which non-directive strategies are exploited to convey orders are known from a massive amount of language-specific pragmatic analyses, but there are no cross-linguistic studies dealing with the cooptation of these strategies based on a large language sample. As directive speech acts are complex situations involving different components such as, e.g., the speaker's wish, the appeal to the addressee, and the expectation of an imminent actualization of the order (see Section 1.2), the diachronic sources of directive markers include different strategies originally attested in indirect speech acts and primarily devoted, among other things, to the expression of futurity/imminence (e.g. future constructions), or to the expression of the speaker's wish (e.g. optative constructions). The survey presented in this paper will try to identify a set of recurrent sources of directive markers and constructions, and will take into account the different semantic and pragmatic motivations behind (i) the extension of particular forms from non-directive to directive situations and (ii) the creation of new directive constructions through grammaticalization and constructionalization.

In what follows we will first discuss the pragmatic approach underlying the present cross-linguistic analysis of directives (Section 1.1). After addressing some preliminary terminological and theoretical questions regarding directive situations (Section 1.2), the issue of direct vs. indirect speech acts will be discussed, with

special focus on the indirect strategies adopted to convey directive situations (Section 1.3). As will become clear from the following discussion, it will be argued that indirect strategies frequently constitute the diachronic source for direct ones. In section 2 we will highlight some methodological issues raised by the present investigation, and we will briefly present the sample on which this survey is based.

The main sources of directive constructions will be analyzed in detail in Section 3. Some of these sources appear to be connected to specific components of directive situations such as the speaker's wish, the appeal to the addressee, and the expectation of imminence. In some of these cases, which will be discussed in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, the identity of the performer appears to play a crucial role in determining the development of a directive strategy out of a non-directive one. Other diachronic paths that are not specifically connected to a specific performer will be discussed in Section 3.3, while in Section 3.4 we will briefly tackle the question of why so-called (ir)realis markers/constructions are used as markers of directive situations. Section 3.5 will provide some quantitative data on the cross-linguistic frequency of the various patterns identified in Section 3. Finally, Section 4 will recapitulate the main points of the present study and will provide some general theoretical insights into the nature of directives across languages.

1.1. A pragmatic approach to the development of directives

The analysis of how directive strategies emerge will be framed within a historical-pragmatic approach. The major assumptions underlying this approach are that (i) it is not languages that change, but it is speakers who change languages (Croft 2000: 4), (ii) language change is driven by language use and by the active role of speech-act participants (Bybee 2006), (iii) language change is triggered by pragmatic phenomena, such as conversational inferences and their conventionalization (Traugott & Dasher 2002, Traugott 2010). In this contribution, we will make a number of hypotheses concerning the pragmatic processes leading to the emergence of new directive strategies, i.e. new strategies encoding directive speech acts, on the basis of a 200-language sample.

It is well known that Grice himself (1989: 39) suggested a diachronic application of his theory of implicatures: "it may not be impossible for what starts life, so to speak, as a conversational implicature to become conventionalized". The direction sketched by Grice has been followed by the neo-Gricean tradition, where a significant effort has been made to understand how conversational implicatures, established at a pragmatic level, may become part of the semantics of a construction (Brown & Levinson 1987: 261). The role of pragmatics in diachronic change is widely recognized also outside the neo-Gricean school (see Hopper & Traugott 2003, 2004, 2010; Bybee 2006 among others), and it is nowadays widely accepted that pragmatic inferences may conventionalize and may trigger processes of form-function reanalysis. One of the most cited examples is the development of the causal value of *since* out of a purely temporal one, as a result of the conventionalization of an invited inference of causality (according to the frequent logic fallacy characterized as *post hoc propter hoc* 'after this, therefore because of this', Hopper & Traugott 2003: 80-83).

A systematic account of the role of pragmatics in language change has been proposed by Traugott & Dasher (2002), who developed the Invited Inferencing Theory of Semantic Change (IITSC). According to their view, the speaker/writer invites the addressee/reader to make inferences, and both interlocutors are conceptualized as active partners in the communicative dyad. Traugott & Dasher focus on the first stage of language change, i.e. the onset of the diachronic path, and acknowledge a central role to the speaker. A slightly different perspective is proposed by Heine *et al.* (1991), who speak about "context-induced reinterpretations", paying more attention to the outcomes of change (i.e. the reinterpretation of a construction) than to its beginning, and to the importance of the addressee. The respective roles of speaker and addressee in language change do not overlap, despite their obvious interdependence: the addressee is more likely to operate a reinterpretation of the pragmatics associated with a construction, but it is when s/he acts as a speaker that the reinterpretation becomes visible and starts to spread in the community. As argued by Traugott (2010), context is an enabling factor, but the real locus of change lies in the perception of a "mismatch between speaker intention and hearer interpretation, on the assumption that speakers and addressees are not mirror images of each other, but have different cognitive statuses".

Whereas several functional domains have been reconsidered within such an approach (e.g. temporal adverbs, causal and concessive connectives, see Mosegaard Hansen 2008, Traugott 2003), no systematic work has been done on the diachrony of directives in a historical-pragmatic framework. The topic of this study is especially challenging because it deals with the diachronic dimension of pragmatics under two respects: on the one hand, we take into account the role of pragmatics in diachronic processes (e.g. conversational inferences triggering the change, conventionalization of inferences); on the other hand, pragmatics stands out as

the object itself of our analysis, in that we examine how pragmatic phenomena such as requests and orders come to be encoded by dedicated constructions.

In this study, we will start from a traditional semantic and pragmatic analysis of directive speech acts along the lines described by Searle (1969, 1975), identifying the main components – *conditions* in Searle’s terminology – which allow for a felicitous request or command. We will follow Searle also in attaching great significance to indirect strategies through which a directive speech act may be realized, which may be preferred for politeness reasons or because they are taken to be more effective. However, we depart from traditional pragmatic approaches to directive speech acts in two respects: first, this study is characterized by a constant cross-linguistic perspective, since our goal is to identify the mechanisms by which directive strategies emerge and conventionalize across different languages, and such a comparative approach has a number of methodological consequences (see Section 2); second, we are mainly concerned with those strategies that reach a high degree of conventionalization and can be argued to constitute one of the most rooted ways of expressing requests and commands in a given language, leaving the range of possible, less conventionalized, indirect ways of expressing commands aside. The latter aspect is a direct consequence of the first, being impossible to gather reliable data for a good number of (often under-described) languages on the great intra-linguistic variation characterizing indirect speech acts. In other words, instead of analyzing the possible strategies through which a directive speech act may be expressed in a given language, we will focus on the strategies that have *developed into* directive constructions across languages, being aware that the pool of intra-linguistic synchronic variation is where the origin of change is to be sought for (Croft 2000, 2010).

In the following two sections a semantic-pragmatic definition of directive speech act (Section 1.2) and a brief overview of the most recent approaches to the theory of indirect speech acts (Section 1.3) are provided.

1.2. Directive situations: a definition

By *directive situations* we mean all those situations in which the speaker *wishes* a state of affairs (henceforth SoA) to become true and conveys an *appeal* to the addressee(s) to help make this SoA true. The performer(s) of the action(s) required to bring about the desired SoA may coincide (i) with the addressee, (ii) with the speaker, (iii) with a third party or (iv) with any possible combination of (i)-(iii).

In the most typical directive situation, the performer coincides with the addressee (2nd person singular directive: 2). Languages, however, are generally able to express directive speech acts addressed to the addressee plus a third party (2nd person plural directive: 2+3), to the addressee(s) plus the speaker (1st person plural inclusive directive: 1+2, 1+2+3), and to a third party (3rd person singular or plural directive: 3, 3+3):¹

- (1)
 - a. *Go away!* (2, 2+3)
 - b. *Let’s go!* (1+2, 1+2+3)
 - c. *Let him/her/them go!* (3, 3+3)

In order to be successful, a directive situation minimally comprises the speaker and the addressee, who may or may not coincide with the performer. If the addressee does not coincide with the performer he/she may be intended as the mediator of the request/command, as in (1c). Third person performers, on the other hand, are not necessarily present when the appeal is uttered. Indeed, they are typically distant in space from the place where the directive situation takes place.

Searle (1969: ch. 3) identifies four felicity conditions for directive speech acts: Preparatory condition (Hearer is able to perform Act), Sincerity condition (Speaker wants Hearer to do Act), Propositional condition (Speaker predicates a future Act of Hearer), Essential condition (counts as an attempt by Speaker to get Hearer to do Act). In our view, the felicity conditions identified by Searle can be condensed in three main components, characterizing any directive situation: the speaker’s *wish* that a given SoA takes place (2A), the speaker’s *appeal* to the addressee to do something in order to make the desired SoA true (2B), and the speaker’s *expectation* that the realization of the order is imminent (2C). As will become clear in the next sections, the three semantic components of a directive situation identified in (2) turn out to be in focus in many of the diachronic scenarios leading to the emergence of directive constructions described below:

¹ The present analysis will be limited to 1st person **plural inclusive** directives. 1st person *singular* and 1st person plural *exclusive* directives are less compatible with the core imperative meaning for a number of reasons and are therefore much less frequently grammaticalized across languages (see the discussion in van der Auwera *et al.* 2003: 56).

- (2) A. The speaker *wishes* that a SoA become true;
- B. the speaker conveys an *appeal* to the addressee(s) to help make this SoA true;
- C. the speaker *expects* the desired SoA to be brought about right away.

The term *directives* will be used throughout this paper to refer to the set of forms that encode positive directive situations in a language (so-called prohibitives will not be taken into account). There are at least two reasons for adopting the terms “directives” and “directive situation”. One is merely terminological: the grammars of different languages use very different terms to refer to forms and constructions encoding directive situations. In particular, the label *imperative* is generally reserved for directive speech acts in which the performer coincides with the addressee, while for other performers other labels are used (*hortative*, *cohortative*, *exhortative*, *injunctive*, *jussive*, but also, somewhat less appropriately, *optative* or *deontic*). This terminological variety may engender confusion in a cross-linguistic study. This choice is in principle compatible with similar terminological choices made in other typological studies of directives: Birjulin & Xrakovskij (2001), for instance, simply generalize the term *imperative* to non-second person directives, while van der Auwera *et al.* (2003: 52) use the term “imperative-hortative” system/paradigm to refer to forms encoding directive situations in a language.

The second reason is more substantial: the terminological variety in this domain reflects the fact that forms encoding directive situations are seldom formally homogeneous within a given language, and their formal differences are generally associated with the different performers to which the speech act is addressed. However, the cases in which a given directive strategy extends from one person to another as well as the fact that there are languages in which a formally homogeneous directive paradigm for all the persons exists (van der Auwera *et al.* 2003: 50ff.) are suggestive of the existence of a semantic/conceptual core common to all directive situations, independently of the performer, which might be concealed by the plethora of terms used to refer to forms encoding them.

Finally, in the literature on directives a distinction is frequently made between dedicated (or direct) and non-dedicated (or indirect) strategies (cf. Birjulin & Xrakovskij 2001: 8-9; van der Auwera *et al.* 2005: 294; König & Siemund 2007: 311; Schalley 2008: 22). Dedicated directive strategies are those whose primary function is to encode the directive situation by either morphological or syntactic means, i.e. they are specialized constructions. Non-dedicated strategies, on the other hand, are those whose primary function is to encode some other situation (e.g. optatives, futures, etc.) and which are exploited to express also directive situations. A similar distinction between direct and indirect forms is drawn by Frajzyngier & Jirsa (2006). According to them, a form can be considered as “the direct means of encoding a functional domain if that functional domain is invoked explicitly” (2006: 517), by simply using the form alone and without further inferential enrichments based on the context of the utterance. They define as indirect means, on the other hand, those means that “are deployed for the expression of a given functional domain, but that grammatically or lexically are direct means of some other domain” (2006: 518).

In a diachronic perspective the distinction between dedicated (or direct) and non-dedicated (or indirect) forms must be recast as referring to successive stages along a continuum: the diachronic patterns exemplified below show that what looks as dedicated/direct on purely synchronic grounds might well be the result of a diachronic process in which the source was a non-dedicated/indirect construction; conversely, a non-dedicated strategy used to encode a directive situation may undergo processes of reinterpretation, and, as a result, a new dedicated directive strategy may emerge. The cases analyzed in this survey will range from fully specialized directive strategies to strategies that clearly have a different primary function but whose directive use is highly conventionalized. Therefore, the distinction between dedicated and non-dedicated directive constructions will not be adopted in the following discussion, neither as a parameter of analysis nor as a key to understanding and explaining the diachronic patterns that recur across languages. What will be considered is the diachronic dimension along which a non-dedicated, indirect strategy may develop into a dedicated, direct one.

In the historical-pragmatic perspective adopted here, the crucial issue is therefore to identify what constructions are most frequently employed (and exploited) to express directive situations, first as indirect speech acts and subsequently as conventionalized strategies, and to make hypotheses concerning the paths through which they may eventually undergo processes of grammaticalization, cooptation, and constructionalization. Given the central role that indirect speech acts may play in the first stage of the diachronic paths under examination, in the next section a brief discussion of the theory of indirect speech acts and in particular of directive indirect speech acts is provided.

1.3. From indirect to direct directive speech acts

The most cited example of indirect speech act is the well known question uttered in front of a tasteless meal: *Can you pass the salt?* Despite the interrogative form, the speaker's goal is not to get an answer, but to get the addressee to pass the salt. This is an indirect speech act, which Searle (1975: 59-60) defines as a case in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another, and as an utterance where "a sentence that contains the illocutionary force indicators of one kind of illocutionary act can be uttered to perform, in addition, another type of illocutionary act". According to Searle, in indirect speech acts the speaker relies on the addressee's inferential ability and on the mutually shared contextual and background information. Highly frequent indirect speech acts may become conventionalized and thus be systematically associated to a given illocutionary force.

Searle's account of indirect *directive* speech acts constitutes the most systematic description of what types of constructions ('sentence types' in his terms) are usually deployed to indirectly convey requests and orders. His analysis is based on data from English but, as will become clear in section 3, it has striking correspondences in our cross-linguistic survey. Searle's interest in directive situations is motivated by the fact that ordinary requirements of politeness usually make the use of flat imperatives inappropriate in normal conversation and speakers are therefore prone to find indirect means to reach their illocutionary goals. Based on the four felicity conditions that Searle identifies for any directive speech act (Preparatory condition, Sincerity condition, Propositional condition and Essential condition, see Section 1.2), he identifies three basic sentence types that are most frequently employed to indirectly express directive situations (Searle 1975: 65ff):

- 1- Sentences having to do with felicity conditions on the performance of a directive illocutionary act, including the ability of H to perform A (Preparatory condition; *can you reach the salt?*), the desire of S that H perform A (Sincerity condition; *I hope you'll do it*), and the predication of A of H (Propositional content condition; *officers will henceforth wear ties at dinner*).
- 2- Sentences having to do with reasons for doing the act, including H's desire to do something and explicit reasons (*would you be willing to write a letter of recommendation for me? It would be a good idea if you left town*)
- 3- Sentences embedding one element inside another one, typically through performative verbs (*Would you mind awfully if I asked you if you could write me a letter of recommendation?*).

As a consequence of this classification, Searle proposes four generalizations that explain the systematic associations between particular types of indirect speech acts and the directive illocutionary force (Searle 1975: 72): (i) S can make an indirect request (or other directive) by either asking whether or stating that a preparatory condition concerning H's ability to do A obtains; (ii) S can make an indirect directive by either asking whether or stating that the propositional content condition obtains; (iii) S can make an indirect directive by stating that the sincerity condition obtains, but not by asking whether it obtains; (iv) S can make an indirect directive by either stating that or asking whether there are good or overriding reasons for doing A.

Although the notion of indirect speech acts as formulated by Searle (1975) has become one of the backbones of modern pragmatics, it has been criticized and revised (Clark 1979, Asher and Lascarides 2001, Stefanowitsch 2000, Frajzyngier & Jirsa 2006 among many others) and has even been rejected by certain scholars. According to Wierzbicka (1991), for instance, the distinction between 'direct' and 'indirect' speech acts itself should be abandoned until some clear definition of these terms is provided, and, instead of speaking of direct vs. indirect ways of speaking, linguists should focus on the analysis of the different phenomena associated with these labels.

Whereas traditionally scholars have held that addressees have to do a number of successive inferential steps in order to interpret indirect speech acts (Searle 1975, Grice 1975, Sperber & Wilson 1986), more recently a rephrasing of Searle's theory has been suggested in terms of cognitive models that activate each other through metonymy (Thornburg & Panther 1997; Panther & Thornburg 1998; see also Stefanowitsch 2000). Thornburg and Panther have developed an account of indirect speech acts interpretation based on what they call 'speech act scenarios', idealized cognitive models of particular culturally entrenched activities, which include the event itself, knowledge about preconditions and expectations regarding the results of the event. For instance, the simplified scenario for requests is "H(earer) can do A(ct) - S(peaker) wants H to do A - S puts H under a (more or less strong) obligation to do A - H is under an obligation to do A - H will do A". This is a very abstract cognitive model, which in turn can co-occur with cognitive models of different events, depending on the specific propositional content of the request. According to this theory, when an in-

direct speech act is uttered, a particular event schema activates one part of the intended speech act scenario, and this part metonymically evokes the whole scenario, thus triggering the correct interpretation of the utterance. In other words, an utterance that refers to any aspect of the model can metonymically evoke the whole model, and the closer to the core of a particular scenario an utterance is, the more frequently it will be used as an indirect speech act for that scenario (Panther & Thornburg 1998: 761ff.).

Thornburg and Panther's theory of speech act metonymies provides a motivation for why particular constructions are more likely to be conventionalized with a particular illocutionary force than others, and it also provides an answer to the question of how the addressee derives the intended meaning from the literal one. The mechanisms, motivations, and outcomes of the processes through which indirect strategies become conventionalized and new directive constructions emerge are the bulk of the present study. In section 3 we will show that a number of recurrent diachronic paths leading to the emergence of new directive strategies can be motivated in Thornburg & Panther's terms, since the diachronic sources in these paths are constructions referring to one of the three basic components of any directive situation, as described in section 1.2 (the appeal to the addressee, the speaker's wish, and the expectation of imminence), which in turn can be argued to be parts of Thornburg & Panther's directive scenario. But this is not the whole story. As will become clear from the following discussion, it is frequently the case that a particular type of indirect speech act is conventionalized for a directive situation with a specific performer (1st, 2nd or 3rd person), because the performer determines which parts of the directive scenario are activated, and only at a successive stage the reinterpretation may spread to other directive situations with different performers. Moreover, following a suggestion by Searle himself (1975: 76) concerning the relevance of a cross-linguistic account of the conventionalization of indirect speech acts, the aim of this paper is to provide a cross-linguistic insight into the most frequent diachronic sources of directive strategies by identifying the indirect means that are most frequently reinterpreted and coopted as directives on the basis of a 200-language sample. The cross-linguistic character of this research requires us to address some preliminary methodological issues. It is to this task that we now turn.

2. Methodology and sample

The empirical side of this research raises a number of methodological questions. Firstly, the source of many directive strategies is bound to remain unidentified, and in some cases it is also dubious whether a source (lexical or phrasal) can be postulated at all: in other words, in many cases it is impossible to trace back an imperative morpheme to originally lexical or phrasal material in the same way as one is able to trace back the future form of Italian and other Romance languages (*canterò*) to the Late Latin construction *cantare habeo* 'I have to sing'. This is especially true for many phonologically short imperative morphemes and for other imperative forms based on tonal and other suprasegmental mutations, let alone the numerous cases in which the second person singular imperative in a language coincides with the verb stem. Secondly, in most of the cases dealt with in this paper in which a given diachronic pathway can be reasonably hypothesized, there is hardly anything known about the history of the languages discussed. Thus, the reconstruction of the diachronic pathways leading to the emergence of directive strategies may be highly problematic and raise important methodological questions that need to be explicitly stated. In particular, the research presented here faces three major methodological challenges:

- (i) **lack of documentation:** while in well-documented languages it is possible to trace the successive stages of development of a given diachronic path in real texts, and to identify the critical contexts (in the sense of Diewald 2002) in which a grammaticalization process starts, in lesser-documented languages and language families the diachronic analysis of directives is in most cases at best limited to the etymological reconstruction of their source;
- (ii) **the relationship between synchronic distribution and diachrony, and the danger of circularity:** as a consequence of (i), in many cases what we can reconstruct are not fully-fledged diachronic developments but diachronic scenarios based on plausibility and on synchronic distributional patterns. To provide but an example, cross-linguistic data show that it is more frequent for optative strategies to be used as directive strategies for 3rd person performers (see below, Section 3.2.1), and for future strategies to be used with a directive function when the performer includes the speaker plus the addressee (see Section 3.2.2), i.e. there are connections between a given source construction and a given performer. Such connections can be explained in diachronic terms, as the result of specific semantic relations between the functional domain of the source constructions (futurity, optativity) and certain features of a given directive situation with a specific performer. In other words, it might be the

case that a given non-directive strategy starts being used with a directive function in specific directive situations in which there is a specific performer, and this would be mirrored in the synchronic distribution of directive constructions based on (or derived from) that non-directive strategy. The plausibility of such a scenario, however, can be only limitedly proved on independent grounds, and there is a serious danger of circularity in the argumentation;

- (iii) **degree of conventionalization:** in some of the examples we will discuss, finally, it is not always clear whether grammar has already “emerged” from discourse: the directive strategies in question are said to be typical of the informal use, or to be “alternative” ways of conveying orders in a given language. In some cases, this leads to a marginal treatment of these patterns in the grammatical description, and no data on the frequency of these strategies are available, let alone comparative data on their relative frequency with respect to more established/conventionalized ways of conveying orders. In some of these cases, however, we may assume, somewhat speculatively, that we have to do with emergent constructions, i.e. constructions with a high degree of ambiguity between their source meaning and their new (directive) meaning that are not acknowledged by grammarians as distinct entities in the grammar (see, e.g., the Modern Hebrew, Oriya, and Mongsen Ao cases discussed in (16), (33), and (40) respectively).

With respect to (i)-(iii), we generally followed our primary sources in the evaluation of a given directive form as historically derived from (or synchronically related to) a certain source construction: whenever the connection between a given directive marker and its source is still synchronically evident (either because there is a marker which is synchronically polysemous or because there is sufficient resemblance between the source construction and the target construction), or is explicitly postulated by the grammarian, we take this source-target relationship for granted.

When the grammar is not explicit or simply by-passes the question of the possible origins of a directive construction, however, a procedure can be adopted which is based on a commonsense assumption: insights into the possible diachronic source of a given marker could come from reconstructions within a given language family or from cross-linguistic comparison, following the so-called “internal reconstruction” method (Givón 2000, Ringe 2003, among many others). This method is based on the principle that all the types of diachronic pathways that can be identified and documented with reasonable certainty have a heuristic value also when dealing with cases in which there is no such certainty. In other words, if in a given language a diachronic path from a given source to a given target can be reconstructed on the basis of clear data, this will reinforce also those cases in which the same path can be reconstructed with a lower degree of reliability or only hypothesized. This principle of *typological plausibility* (Givón 2000: 120) is clearly uniformitarian, being based on the idea that what is known from the observed history of languages can be used as a key for making inferences about what is unknown/unobservable. Although this method may appear unsatisfactory for various reasons (mostly because “a preponderance [...] of evidence rather than an absolute proof is what is expected”, Givón 2000: 122), it still is the best (or, perhaps, the only) method available when dealing with underdocumented languages, and it is compatible with the theoretical assumptions coming from the ever-growing body of research on the origins of grammatical markers and constructions. In order to comply with the principle of typological plausibility, in the discussion of the various pathways identified in Section 3 special efforts have been made, whenever possible, to illustrate the diachronic development at issue by means of the available synchronic evidence drawn from better described languages for which real life conversational data can be gathered more easily.

In this respect, it is also important to note that the patterns of diachronic development identified in this paper **are not meant to exhaust** the set of possible pathways through which new directive forms come into existence. The motivation behind the present cross-linguistic survey is somewhat different: the list of the possible sources of directive constructions provided in this paper is to be conceived of as a first attempt to identify the areas of grammar to which directives are more closely connected and the constructional templates that may evolve into directive constructions, much in the spirit of similar analyses of the sources of other grammatical constructions such as, e.g., the passive (see Givón 1981, Haspelmath 1990), the progressive (Bybee *et al.* 1994: 127ff.), or past and perfective constructions (Bybee *et al.* 1994: 51ff.). Ideally, the present survey should also serve as a background for language-specific diachronic studies on the emergence of directives based on real textual data and as a sort of check-list to be used by grammarians and language experts when documenting and describing new languages, with the proviso that a source not included in the present survey is always possible, but there is also ample evidence that the set of possible sources of a given type of grammatical construction is finite: all the aforementioned studies of the sources of specific grammat-

ical markers have been observing that paths from source to target are strikingly similar across unrelated languages, and it is generally possible to identify a limited array of diachronic pathways through which specific grammatical forms evolve out of other (grammatical or lexical) forms.

The paper is based on a convenience sample of 200 languages, chosen with a view to maximizing genealogical diversity but with little or no statistical concerns, as we have decided to leave out many languages whose grammatical descriptions did not contain enough data on imperatives and related constructions, and we have included grammars of languages closely related whenever it appeared useful to compare diachronic developments in genealogically related languages. The sample is given in the appendix.²

3. The sources of directives

In this section, the pathways through which directive constructions come into existence and non-directive strategies are coopted to serve a directive function will be inspected in detail. For a number of pathways there are reasons to assume that the directive reinterpretation of a non-directive strategy starts from a specific performer: complex constructions involving motion verbs, for instance, are the source of directive constructions only with 2nd and 1st person plural performers (see sections 3.1.1.1 and 3.1.1.2). Other non-directive strategies, on the other hand, may develop into directives for all persons, but the cross-linguistic distribution of these strategies is suggestive of the existence of bridgeheads from which they start being used with a directive function (e.g. 3rd person performers for optative and causative constructions, see sections 3.2.1 and 3.1.2; 1st person plural performers for future constructions, see section 3.2.2). In the analysis of these cases, we will discuss whether or not a diachronic scenario involving a given performer acting as bridgehead is semantically plausible, and is able to account for a given synchronic distribution.

The pathways of change described below instantiate different types of diachronic processes. In what follows, we will adopt the following technical terms to refer to these different processes: *cooptation* will be used to refer to the conventionalized use of a non-directive form with a directive function where no structural change is involved, no matter whether the coopted non-directive form is the only directive strategy available in a language.³ *Grammaticalization* will be used to refer to changes in which lexical or phrasal material evolves into grammatical material. In some of the cases discussed below, grammaticalization may be characterized not simply as the recruitment of lexical material into grammatical function, but also in terms of *con-*

² In the examples, the interlinear glosses of the original sources have been generally maintained, except for some standardization (e.g. SUBJ and SBJ, both referring to ‘subject’, have been merged into SBJ). The following abbreviations are used: 1, 2, 3 = 1st, 2nd, 3rd person; I, II, III, IV, etc. = noun classes; AAP = absolutive antipassive; ABL = ablative; ABS = absolutive; ACC = accusative; AG = agent; ALL = allative; ANAP = anaphoric; ANT = anticipatory; AOR = aorist; APPL = applicative; ART = article; ASS = assertive; AUX = auxiliary; BEN = benefactive; BR = basic root; CAUS = causative; CLIT = clitic; COMP = completive aspect; COND = conditional; CONV = converb; CORE = core argument; CPLTZR = complementizer; DAT = dative; DECL = declarative; DEF = definite; DET = determiner; DIST = distal; DP = deontic particle; DU = dual; EMPH = emphatic; EQUAT = equative; ERG = ergative; ETAG = emphatic tag; EXCL = exclusive; EXCLAM = exclamative; EXHORT = exhortative; F = feminine; FAC.CONJ = facilitative conjunction; FOC = focalizer; FUT = future; GEN = genitive; HAB = habitual; HORT = hortative; IMM = immediate; IMP = imperative; IMPFPART = imperfective participle; INCL = inclusive; IND = indicative; INDEF = indefinite; INDIV = individuator; INF = infinitive; INSTR = instrumental; INTER = interrogative marker; INTR = intransitive; IPFV = imperfective; IRR = irrealis; LK = linker; LOC = locative; LOCUT = locutor person marker; M = masculine; MIR = mirative; MOD = modal suffix; MOT = motion; MR = modified root; NEG = negation; NFUT = non-future; NMLZR = nominalizer; NOM = nominative; NPS = non-past stem; NRFUT = near future; NRL = non-relational prefix; OBJ = object; OBL = oblique; ODIR = other (non-self) directed; OPT = optative; PART = participle; PAT = patient; PL = plural; PLT:IMP = polite imperative; POSS = possessive; PPM = proximal patient marker; PRF = perfective; PRO = pronoun; PROG = progressive; PROH = prohibitive; PROS = prospective; PROX = proximal; PRS = present; PST = past; PURP = purposive; PURP_ADV = purposive/advisory mood; R = realis; REFL = reflexive; SBJ = subject; SBJV = subjunctive; SG = singular; SPM = subordinate patient marker; SPVP = suffixed pronoun verb phrase; SUBORD = subordinator; SUP = supine; SV = serial verb marker; TERM = terminative aspect; TOP = topic; TR = transitive; TS = transitive suffix; VAL = valency increasing marker; VOC = vocative.

³ The term *cooptation* will be used throughout this paper to describe a sub-set of the diachronic pathways that can be subsumed under Heine’s (2002) *conventionalization*, a term embracing all the cases in which a given context-induced inference develops some frequency of use and does not need to be supported by context to be effective (i.e. cases in which contextual meanings “turn into ‘normal’ or ‘inherent’ or ‘usual’ or ‘semantic’ meanings”, Heine 2002: 85). We prefer *cooptation* to *conventionalization* because the latter term may engender some confusion in the reader: firstly, processes of conventionalization of pragmatic implicature are not exclusive to the kinds of change we subsume under the rubric of cooptation but are an important part of grammaticalization processes as well. Secondly, in Heine’s phrasing (Heine 2002: 86) *conventionalization* also covers cases in which the source marker/construction is no longer (or less) compatible with the source meaning (which is not the case in many of the processes described below as cases of cooptation), and in which the possibility of structural changes affecting the conventionalized item (marker, construction) is not excluded: in the diachronic path analyzed by Heine in his paper, for instance, the originally reflexive construction of !Xun is said to be conventionalized as a passive construction only when an external agent can be added (i.e. when there is a structural change in the original construction that makes it incompatible with a reflexive interpretation).

structionalization, i.e. as the gradual emergence of a new construction (i.e. a conventionalized form-function pair) out of an older, less systematic morpho-syntactic configuration: in this process, the implicatures triggered by the more or less occasional configuration are progressively semanticized (i.e. they become part of its meaning) and there is no necessary increase in grammaticality of any of the parts that form the construction.

3.1. Grammaticalization

In this section we will discuss a number of diachronic paths in which the source constructions contain themselves an *appeal to the addressee* to do something in order for the desired SoA to be brought about. This appeal refers to a preliminary action through which the addressee favours the realization of the order (or to the Preparatory condition, in Searle's terms). This action may be a displacement ('go', 'come'), a permission ('let') or a simple transmission of the order ('say'). The source constructions belonging to this type are semantically heterogeneous, but a unified discussion of these cases is motivated first of all by the fact that the source constructions share a twofold internal structure consisting of two events (preliminary action and ordered event), and secondly by the fact that in all these cases the directive form referring to the preliminary action grammaticalizes into a general directive marker.

3.1.1. Motion verbs as sources of directive constructions

The deictic (dislocative and ventive) dimension turns out to be crucial to directive situations for a number of reasons: in many languages there are directional affixes denoting, among other meanings, motion away from or towards the speaker that are incompatible with forms other than directives (Aikhenvald 2010: 136-138), and it is cross-linguistically very frequent to find suppletive directive forms for the two verbs 'go' and 'come' (Veselinova 2007: 139; Aikhenvald 2010: 33ff).⁴

The close connection between dislocative/ventive motion and directive situations is also confirmed by the existence of diachronic pathways through which a directive form of a deictic motion verb grammaticalizes into a general directive marker. These processes will be discussed in two separate sections (3.1.1.1 on directives deriving from dislocative verbs meaning 'go' and 3.1.1.2 on directives deriving from ventive verbs meaning 'come').

That motion verbs are possible sources of directive markers is not new to grammaticalization studies. Heine & Kuteva (2002), for instance, acknowledge the existence of two paths of semantic change that lead to the development of what they call 'hortative' strategies. In both these paths a deictic motion verb is involved as the lexical source of the construction: *come* > *hortative* (2002: 69) and *go* > *hortative* (2002: 159). According to Aikhenvald (2010: 346-351), motion verbs have the potential for developing into imperative markers by virtue of their "purposeful overtones" (Aikhenvald 2010: 349), and because "semantics of motion is intrinsically linked to a change of state or creating a new situation" (*ibidem*). Neither Heine & Kuteva nor Aikhenvald, however, seem to draw any distinction between the grammaticalization of a directive form of 'go'/'come' as a general directive marker and the more widespread pattern by which expressive/emphatic strategies with an exhortative meaning derive from imperatives of motion verbs (cf. English '*come on*, let's go'), as exemplified in (3) from Baure, in which the free particle *pa* (< 'go'), directly preceding the verb, has an emphatic function and reinforces either an assertion (the two clauses in (3a) are both answers to a question such as "Who will eat it?") or a command (as in (3b)).

(3) Baure (Arawak; Danielsen 2007: 292)

- a. *pa nti' nikier! pa nti'-niš!*
pa nti' nik=ro / pa nti'=niš
 EMPH 1SG 1SG.eat=3SG.M EMPH 1SG=EXCLAM

⁴ In languages lacking dedicated directive strategies, these two verbs are often the only roots for which a dedicated directive form exists. In Yucatec, for instance, the two suppletive forms *xen* 'go!' (for the root *b'in* 'go') and *ko'oten* 'come!' (for the root *tal* 'come') are attested for 2nd persons and the two forms *ko'ox* 'let's go (you-and-I)' and *ko'on-e'ex* 'let's go (you.all-and-I)' are attested for 1st person plural (Hofling & Ojeda 1994: 279, 284). A similar situation is found in Hausa (Afro-Asiatic, Chadic; Jaggar 2001: 451), where special forms for the commands 'go (on/away)!' and 'come (here)!' are reported. Suppletive directives for verbs of motion outnumber suppletive directives for other verbs, representing 70% of suppletive imperatives across languages (Veselinova 2007: 139). As suppletive (and, more generally, irregular) forms tend to correlate with high frequency of occurrence, this fact is suggestive of a great frequency of orders involving motion away from or towards the speaker in everyday conversation.

- ‘I will eat it!’ ‘Well, I will!’
- b. *to pa pihirikašan nan siy-ye*
to pa pi=hirik-a-ša-no nan siy-ye
 ART EMPH 2SG=sit-LK-IRR-IMP here chair-LOC
 ‘Go, sit here on the chair!’

In our view, although there is no doubt a connection between the semantics of motion verbs, which inherently implies telicity and change of state, and their potential for grammaticalization as directive markers, there are also more specific motivations characterizing the grammaticalization processes described in the following sections that cannot be captured by simply invoking their semantics: for instance, it is to be explained why “go” verbs grammaticalize into directive markers for 2nd person performers and, to a lesser extent, for 1st person plural performers, whereas “come” verbs develop into directive markers for 1st person plural performers exclusively. The fact that there are some performers acting as bridgeheads for these grammaticalization paths requires us to discuss the motivations for these paths in a more detailed fashion, with a view to teasing out all the mechanisms at work in these paths, and to address seriously the issue of the relationship between the paths described in the following sections and other grammaticalization paths involving motion verbs. Moreover, the (rather frequent) cases in which directive forms of verbs meaning ‘go’ or ‘come’ acquire a discourse function of encouragement, exhortation or emphasis are to be kept apart from the cases of grammaticalization of ‘go’ and ‘come’ as directive markers discussed below, because they do not specifically encode a directive situation, but simply have a reinforcing function. They are non-obligatory emphatic devices, which frequently (but not exclusively, as shown by (3a)) occur in directive contexts.

3.1.1.1. “Go” > directive

The verb ‘go’ (intended strictly as a verb indicating motion *away from the speaker*) is often grammaticalized as a marker of grammatical functions connected with the ideas of futurity, determination, and immediacy. These grammatical functions may fall within the domains of tense/aspect/modality (e.g. future, intentional, prospective, etc.) or within the domain of case relations (e.g. purpose markers, allative markers, etc.; see Heine & Kuteva 2002: 155-160 for a survey of the various grammaticalization paths involving “go” as source meaning).

When it grammaticalizes into a marker of directive situations, the verb meaning ‘go’ may maintain its deictic motion component and give rise to specialized dislocative directive markers. For instance, in Jingulu (Australian, West Barkly; Pensalfini 2003: 230-231), it is possible to encode a directive situation addressed to 2nd persons by means of a construction in which the imperative of motion */-yirri/* (lit. ‘go.IMP’) is suffixed to the verb stem, resulting in directives that involve motion away from the site of commanding (‘go and do X!’). There is one language in our sample, Sipakapense Maya (Mayan, Barrett 1999), where there is a special deictic imperative that is not restricted to 2nd persons, but may be employed in directives addressed to all persons (see example (4)): this special imperative is formed by means of the prefix *j-*, related to the irregular imperative of the verb meaning ‘go’ (*jat*).⁵

(4) Sipakapense Maya (Mayan; Barrett 1999: 89-90)

- a. *jo', ji'cha'n k'chi' ruk' Liy tla'.*
jo', j+iY+cha'+n k'a+chi' r+uk' Liy tla'
 go:1PL.IMP MOT.IMP+3.ABS+talk+AAP then+well 3SG-with Liy over.there
 ‘Let’s go, let’s go talk with Liy over there, then’

⁵ A similar case is attested in Toqabaqita (Austronesian, Eastern Malayo-Polynesian, Oceanic; Lichtenberk 2008: 857) in which the verb *lae* ‘go’ combines with other verbs to form complex dislocative directives for 2nd person and 1st person plural performers:

- (i) a. *lae moro fanga naqa*
 go 2DU.NFUT eat PRF
 ‘Go eat now (you two)!’
 b. *lae kulu qili nguda*
 go PL.INCL.NFUT dig crab
 ‘Let’s go digging for crabs!’

- b. *jilq'o'!*
j+Ø+i+loq'+V'
 MOT.IMP+3SG.ABS+2.ERG+buy+MOD
 'Go buy it!'

Tetun and Vietnamese, on the other hand, provide two clear instances of 'go' developing into a directive marker *tout court*, without any reference to motion. In Tetun *bá* 'go' is used after other verbs in commands or invitations for the addressee to do something without the speaker, even in those contexts in which no motion is implied, as in (5).

- (5) Tetun (Austronesian, Central Malayo-Polynesian; Williams-van Klinken *et al.* 2002: 68)

imi hán bá
 2PL eat go
 'You (plural) eat up!'

In Vietnamese (Nguyễn 1997: 242; Bystrov & Stankevič 2001: 465-466), the motion verb *đi* 'go, go ahead' combines with other verbs (including *đi* itself) to convey a directive meaning in which the motion component is not necessarily there (cf. (6b)):

- (6) Vietnamese (Austro-Asiatic, Mon-Khmer, Viet-Nuong; Bystrov & Stankevič 2001: 465-466)

- a. *mẹ đi ngủ đi, khuya rồi!*
 mother go sleep IMP late PRF
 'Go to bed, mother, it is late'
- b. *ăn đi, ăn cho hết bát canh, con ạ!*
 eat IMP eat for exhaust bowl soup chil IMP
 'Eat, sonny, eat the whole bowl of soup'

A similar construction is also attested in Cambodian (Spatar 1997), another Mon-Khmer language, where a verb meaning 'go' is the plausible source of a general (non-dislocative/deictic) imperative marker. In Cambodian, orders addressed to 2nd persons may be realized either by means of the bare verb form (identical to the indicative) or by means of the verb form accompanied by dedicated imperative markers (prepositional or postpositional, Spatar 1997: 119-121). One of these postpositional imperative markers, *daw*, is a homonym of the motion verb 'go'. Although no clear diachronic arguments are provided, Spatar (1997: 122) suggests that the directive verb form *daw* 'go!' (exemplified in (7a), followed by the imperative marker *chu*) and the postpositional imperative marker *daw* (exemplified in (7b), where the motion component is absent) may be etymologically related.⁶ Diachronic evidence from other genetically close languages (e.g. Vietnamese above) makes Spatar's hypothesis highly plausible.

- (7) Cambodian (Austro-Asiatic, Mon-Khmer, Khmer; Spatar 1997: 120, 121)

- a. *daw phsa r ja muay pang sri aeng chu*
 go market with sister you IMP
 'Go to the market with your sister.'
- b. *an su m a n pantic - p anheiya n daw*
 I beg read a little okay read IMP
 'May I read? Okay, read!'

Directive forms of 'go' may develop into general directive markers also when the performer is 1st person plural (cf. Table 1 in section 3.5). Yucatec, for instance, shows a rather complex system for 1st person plural directives, involving two suppletive directive forms of 'go' for 1st person plural (*ko'ox* 'let's go [you.and.I]' and *ko'on-e'ex* 'let's go [you.all.and.I]'). In directive situations addressed to the speaker + the addressee, the two suppletive forms are followed by a subordinate clause introduced by the subordinator *j*, forming a general (non-deictic) directive strategy (see (8a,b)). When the verb in the subordinate clause is transitive, as in

⁶ Cambodian also shows a general postpositional imperative marker *chu* probably derived from a directive verb meaning 'come!, descend!', thus confirming the close relation between the deictic dimension of motion and the directive function (Spatar 1997: 121).

(8c,d), the picture is slightly more complicated, because two constructions may be used which differ in patient marking suffixes. When the subordinate verb is marked by *-ik* (as in (8c)), the construction only encodes the directive situation, without any reference to motion. On the other hand, when the subordinate patient marker *-e* occurs (as in (8d)), the dislocative semantics is retained and the construction encodes a directive situation in which the realization of the desired SoA requires motion away from the place where the order is uttered.

(8) Yucatec (Hofling & Ojeda 1994: 284, 285)

- | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------|----|--------------------|----------|--------------|
| a. | <i>ko'ox</i> | <i>j</i> | <i>k'ay</i> | <i>(túun)</i> | b. | <i>ko'one'ex</i> | <i>j</i> | <i>k'ay!</i> |
| | HORT | SUBORD | sing | then | | HORT | SUBORD | sing |
| | 'Let's sing (then)' | | | | | 'Let's all sing' | | |
| c. | <i>ko'ox</i> | <i>j</i> | <i>il-ik!</i> | | d. | <i>ko'ox</i> | <i>j</i> | <i>il-e!</i> |
| | HORT | SUBORD | see-PPM | | | HORT | SUBORD | see-SPM |
| | 'Let's see (about) it!' | | | | | 'Let's go see it!' | | |

To sum up, data in our sample provide evidence for a number of paths involving 'go' as a source of directive markers (cf. Table 1, Section 3.5, for the frequency of occurrence of each path in our sample):

- (9)
- GO DO X > 2ND PERSON DEICTIC DIRECTIVE
 - GO DO X > DEICTIC DIRECTIVE FOR ALL PERSONS
 - GO DO X > 2ND PERSON NON-DEICTIC DIRECTIVE
 - GO.1PL (AND/IN ORDER TO) DO X > 1ST PERSON PLURAL DEICTIC DIRECTIVE
 - GO.1PL (AND/IN ORDER TO) DO X > 1ST PERSON PLURAL NON-DEICTIC DIRECTIVE

We do not have clear evidence to establish whether at least some of the paths in (9) can be conflated together. For instance, it is not clear whether the use of 'go' as a dislocative directive marker can be considered as an obligatory preliminary stage for the use of 'go' as a general, non-deictic directive marker: if this was the case, (9a) and (9c) could be thought of as two subsequent stages along the same path. Similarly, it is not clear whether the development of a deictic imperative out of a form originally meaning 'go' necessarily starts from 2nd person directives, and then extends to other performers: in this case, (9b) would represent the second step of the path in (9a).

A number of further questions arise as to the nature and motivations of the development of "go" into a directive marker. Firstly, it is debatable whether this development is an independent one or it is connected to the well-known pattern by which "go" grammaticalizes into an aspectual prospective marker. Craig (1991), for instance, discusses the case of Rama (an endangered Chibchan language spoken in Nicaragua), in which the same morpheme *ba(ng)*, a suppletive form of the verb *taak* 'go' (which nowadays only survives in the 1st person plural directive form *bang* 'let's go') undergoes grammaticalization as a prospective marker (e.g. "I'm going to look at the baby", "he's going to walk", etc.; cf. Craig 1991: 477) and as a marker of 1st person plural directive in which the meaning of motion is still retrievable (*mwaing yairi s-tuk-bang*, we soup 1PL-drink-IMP, 'Let's (go) drink our soup!'). According to Craig, although various analyses of the relative timing of the two grammaticalization paths are possible, the two paths are somehow interconnected, and the fact that the motion meaning is still preserved in 1st person plural directives formed with *-bang* suggests that "the use of *bang* in first person imperative ... is the closest link between the free lexical motion verb *bang* and a bound aspect/mood marker *-bang*" (Craig 1991: 485).

In the languages of our sample in which a "go" > directive path is attested, however, there are no cases in which the same verb is also the source of prospective and future markers. Therefore we may conclude that the existence of a path "go" directive in a language does not entail the existence of a path "go" > future/prospective in the same language, and that the two paths are only very loosely related, due to the inherent goal-orientation of verbs meaning "go": such verbs, representing the most basic encoding of the cognitive schema SOURCE-PATH-GOAL are good candidates for grammaticalization in functional domains (such as futurity and commands) in which the achievement of a goal is a salient component (Kuteva 2001: 22).

It is also tempting to think of the grammaticalization paths involving "go" as a source meaning as cases of serial verb constructions (henceforth SVCs) of the type 'go do X', i.e. as sequences of verbs "which act together as a single predicate, without any overt marker of coordination, subordination, or syntactic dependency of any other sort" (Aikhenvald 2006: 1), especially given the fact that some of the languages discussed in this section (e.g. Vietnamese, Tetun) have SVCs. Directional motion verbs are frequently involved in

SVCs, and these constructions may grammaticalize into aspectual constructions: in other words, it cannot be excluded that the SVC verb + “go” grammaticalizes first into an aspectual construction with a prospective/future meaning (much in the same way as “be going to” grammaticalizes into a future/prospective marker in English), and then, due to its inherent future-projection, the construction is used to encode directive situations.

An analysis of the patterns exemplified in this section as resulting from the grammaticalization of SVCs into aspectual constructions, however, is problematic. Take, for instance, Tetun. The motion verb *bá* in Tetun forms SVCs in which it follows other motion verbs indicating direction, as in the following example:

(10) Tetun (Hajek 2006: 243)

nia sae fali bá
 3SG ascend again go
 ‘He went up again.’

Bá participates in another type of SVC, exemplified in (11); in this type of construction it precedes another verb forming with it a non-contiguous structure, as demonstrated by the fact that postverbal adverbs can be optionally placed after either the first or the second verb:

(11) Tetun (Hajek 2006: 243)

sira [bá (fali) hariis] (fali) iha tasi
 3PL go again bathe again LOC sea
 ‘They went to swim in the sea again.’

The directive construction with *bá* differs from both these types of SVCs: on the one hand, *bá* appears after the other verb, as in (10) and unlike (11), but unlike the serial verb construction in (10) directive *bá* combines with all verbs and is not limited to motion verbs; on the other hand, adverbs in the directive construction (such as, e.g., *lai* ‘first’, and *dei* ‘only’) appear after *bá* (Lumien van Klinken 1999: 244), thus showing that this verb forms a tighter syntactic unit with the other verb than it does in SVCs such as those exemplified in (11).

To sum up, there are no reasons to think of the grammaticalization path “go” > directive as being necessarily related to other grammaticalization paths involving “go” as source meaning. In our view, the reason behind the process of grammaticalization described in this section has possibly to do with the fact that in directive situations the addressee is very frequently requested to move away from the place where the speaker utters his/her order in order to bring about the desired SoA. The high frequency of directive situations involving dislocation, which is also underscored by a number of other phenomena, such as the frequency of suppletive directive forms for verbs meaning ‘go’ and the frequency of dislocative affixes which are exclusively used in directives, may facilitate the reinterpretation of the verb expressing dislocation as a general directive marker. In other words, the frequency with which in directive situations the realization of the order implies a dislocation of the performer is a prerequisite for the construction [*go do X*] to be processed as a single unit and, subsequently, for the verb meaning ‘go’ to be reinterpreted as having a general directive (non-dislocative) function.

This conclusion is also corroborated by independent pieces of evidence. In a well-known language such as English, for instance, there is a construction (called the *go get* construction or the “double verb construction”) which encodes a single event made up of a main predicate with associated motion (*go* and the main verb in this construction behave syntactically as a single unit, see Nicolle 2007: 54ff.):

- (12) a. *We go watch a match every week.*
 b. *Did she go buy apples?*

Nicolle (2007: 58) analyses the *go get* strategy as deriving from “go and get” through conjunction elision, and identifies both a semantic and a structural change, leading to a tighter V+V construction where the motion verb is reinterpreted as marking the point of view of the speaker, rather than motion proper. Nicolle’s arguments show that this construction has its most likely source in imperatives (Nicolle 2007: 54), as a consequence of the salience of the deictic dimension in directive situations, and has only at a later stage extended to declarative clauses. In other words, although the *go get* construction does not instantiate the path

“go” > directive discussed above, nonetheless it provides further (independent) evidence for the frequent association between motion and directives, which makes directive situations a privileged context for the reinterpretation of motion verbs as bearing more (inter)subjective functions.

3.1.1.2. “Come” > directive

The 2nd person directive form of a verb meaning ‘come’ (strictly intended as *motion towards the speaker*) develops into a marker of directive situations with 1st person plural performers in which no motion towards the speaker is implied. The source constructions in this path are a family of complex constructions in which the addressee is invited to move towards the speaker, in order to undertake the desired action together with her/him (‘come [and] (we will) do X’, ‘come in order to do X’, ‘come do X’, etc.).

Let us consider Tetun again: besides the grammaticalization of *bá* as a directive marker for 2nd persons (example (5) in the preceding section), in this language there is also a directive strategy addressed to 1st person plural performers that derives from the grammaticalization of the 2nd person directive form of ‘come’, *mai* (13a-b). In the sentence in (13a), in which *mai* is followed by the verb *bá* used in its lexical value of ‘go’, the addressee is asked to join the speaker in performing the desired action, consisting in a displacement away from the speaker’s place, together with her/him. In (13b), instead, the situation does not presuppose any motion towards the speaker, and *mai* is simply employed as a general directive marker for 1st person plural performers.

(13) Tetun (Austronesian, Central Malayo-Polynesian; Lumien van Klinken 1999: 208)

- a. *ema* *tene* *ita* *r-ak* “*mai* *ita* *bá* *nebá*”
 person invite 1PL.INCL 3PL-say come 1PL.INCL go there
 ‘People invite us saying “Let’s go over there”’
- b. *mai* *ita* *hamulak*
 come 1PL.INCL pray
 ‘Let’s pray.’

A similar situation is attested in Leti, a language closely related to Tetun. As can be observed in (14), directives addressed to 1st person plural performers consist of two clauses conjoined by *=po* ‘and then’, the first of which shows the directive form of the verb ‘come’ inflected for person (2nd singular or plural), while the second one has a verb inflected for 1st person plural inclusive. In fast speech, the verb ‘come’ may occur uninflected, that is, without 2nd person singular or plural agreement markers.

(14) Leti (Austronesian, Central Malayo-Polynesian; van Engelenhoven and Williams-van Klinken 2005: 753)

mmüapo tamtiètano
mu-ma=po *ta-mtiètna=o*
 2SG-come=then 1PL.INCL-sit=IND
 ‘Let’s sit down.’

Ewe exemplifies the first stage of this diachronic path. In this language, directives addressed to 1st person plural performers are formed by means of the imperative of the verb ‘come’ followed by an optional linker and by a verb inflected for 1st person plural imperative or subjunctive. This biclausal structure still expresses a complex situation made up of two distinct events, as the translation of (15) also shows. Yet, this structure is systematically used to encode orders to 1st person plural performers:⁷

⁷ Ewe SVCs with *va* followed by another verb may “either express concrete motion or the fact that something eventually happened” (Essegbey 2004: 474), as in the following example:

- (ii) *Kofi* *va* *kpɔ* *nɔ vi-a*
 K. come see sibling-DEF
 ‘Kofi came and saw his sibling/Kofi eventually saw his sibling.’

Although Ameka (2008: 156) does not attach any significance to the lack of the overt linker in structures such as (15), it must be remarked that the structure without the linker cannot be equated with a SVC, since in this case the second verb in the chain would remain uninflected. Therefore, it must be excluded that *va* has an aspectual meaning also when used in combination with other verbs in 1st person plural directives.

(15) Ewe (Niger-Congo, Kwa; Ameke 2008: 155; see also Agbodjo & Litvinov 2001: 395)

vã/mi-vá (né) mí-ḍ u/mí-a-ḍ u-i nú
 come.IMP.2SG/2PL-come LK 1PL-eat/1PL-SBJV-eat-3SG thing
 ‘Let’s eat something/Come, let’s eat!’

In Standard Modern Hebrew, orders to the speaker + the addressee are conveyed by means of the future form of the verb, as in (16a):

(16) Modern Hebrew (Afro-Asiatic, Semitic; Glinert 1989: 123; see also Malygina 2001: 271)

a. “n-ikanes po” ... ve-’arba ’t-amnixns-u le-mis’ad-a
 FUT.1PL-enter here and-four-they enter-PST.3PL DIR-restaurant-F
 “‘Let’s drop in here’ ... and the four of them entered the restaurant”

In the colloquial language, the future can be used in combination with the imperative form of the verb *ba’* ‘come’. This form can distinguish number and gender in the singular (*bo’* ‘come:IMP.2SG.M’; *bo’i* ‘come:IMP.2SG.F’; *bo’u* ‘come:IMP.PL’), the choice depending on the number/gender of the addressee as in the following examples:

(16) Modern Hebrew (Glinert 1989: 289; see also Malygina 2001: 271)

b. *bo’* *n-ešev* *ba-mxonit*, *xom* *gehinom* *baxuc*
 come:IMP.2SG.M FUT.1PL-sit in-car hot hell outside
 ‘Let’s sit in the car, it’s hot like hell in the street’
 c. *’im* *ken*, *bo’* *n-itxalef* *ba-tafkid-im*
 if yes come:IMP.2SG.M FUT.1PL-exchange INSTR-role-PL.M
 ‘If so, let’s swap our roles’

The path described in this section can be schematized as in (17):

(17) COME_[DIRECTIVE.2PERSON] (AND/IN ORDER TO) DO_(1PL) X > 1ST PERSON PLURAL DIRECTIVE

Much like the diachronic path GO > DIRECTIVE, this change implies the grammaticalization of a biclausal construction into a monoclausal construction, in which the verb originally meaning ‘come’ is reinterpreted as a marker of 1st person plural directive. In other words, it is the whole configuration ‘come + 1st person plural verb’ that eventually conveys the directive meaning, and this is fostered by the fact that situations in which the addressee is invited to join the speaker (i.e. to move towards her/him) in order to bring about the desired SoA together and orders addressed to 1st person plural performers are functionally similar since both entail that the speaker and the addressee join one another before undertaking the requested action together. Such functional similarity motivates the processing of [*come* DO_[1PL] X] as a single unit, thus preparing the ground for the reinterpretation of the verb meaning ‘come’ as a 1st person plural directive marker. As in the case of “go” described above, the motion component becomes secondary in this grammaticalization path, and phenomena of loss of categorial status of the imperative of ‘come’ (e.g. loss of inflection, as in Tetun) may accompany its reinterpretation as a directive marker.

The structure “come_{IMP} + 1st person plural verb” is attested as a non-conventionalized way to convey orders to 1st person plural performers also in conversational data from some European languages. In spoken English, for instance, 1st person plural directives with *let’s* are sometimes reinforced by the imperative of ‘come’, as in (18), whereas in some vernacular varieties of English (e.g. in Jamaican English) “come + 1st person plural indicative” is used as a strategy to convey orders to the speaker + the addressee (exx. (19)-(20)):

- (18) *I’m naturally Scottish so that’s erm Come let’s hear your Scottish accent. No Why not? Hannah does that a lot, right, she goes to America and she comes back with an American accent, she goes to Scotland, she comes back with a Scottish accent* (British National Corpus; Chris, student, 15 years old, North-west Midlands)
 (19) *If skin is to cut with lash, then come we lash the skin till water come down and wet the land* (lyrics from a sacrifice chant of Pocomania rituals, St. Thomas, Jamaica; <http://www.fromjamaica.com/planet/blog/post/4949/>)
 (20) *Come we go down a Unity* (lyrics from a folk song; Cassidy 2007: 144)

Similarly, in colloquial French, the sequence *viens + on va faire x* (“come_{IMP.2SG} + we are going to do x”) is used as an expressive command strategy for 1st person plural performers, especially (but not necessarily so) in contexts in which the addressee is requested to move to the speaker’s site:

- (21) “*Ohlala, un tremblement de terre !!*”, “*Viens on va mettre à jour notre statut sur Facebook !!*” (title of a Facebook fan page)
- (22) *C’est facile à faire pour elle. Elle est l’adulte, elle a un grand pouvoir. Elle va créer des activités communes où elle va demander à l’enfant de participer innocemment : « viens on va faire des confitures ensemble », « viens on va faire la cuisine ensemble », « viens on va faire de la couture ensemble », « viens on va faire le ménage ensemble ».* (<http://le-zinc-du-matin.over-blog.com/article-petite-fable-educative-45683810.html>)

A structure with the imperative of the verb “come” + a purposive subordinate clause can be hypothesized to be the source of the insubordinated directive use of purposive clauses in *Tukang Besi* (see below, examples (55)-(56)). Moreover, an imperative form of the verb “come” can optionally accompany a 1st person plural future form used with a directive function, very much like the Modern Hebrew example discussed above (example (16b-c)): some of these cases will be mentioned in § 3.2.2 below.

3.1.2. From causative to directive

Structures involving the imperative of a causative verb + another verb are often reinterpreted as directive constructions across languages. Among causative verbs, by far the most frequent sources of directive strategies are permissive verbs, i.e. verbs whose basic meaning is ‘*X lets/allows Y (to) do something*’ (a sub-type of causative verbs, as argued for by Shibatani & Pardeshi 2001). There are however other causative constructions that can evolve into directive constructions: constructions employing the imperative of verbs meaning ‘give’ (which often has also permissive uses) and verbs meaning ‘say/tell’, or the imperative of verbs displaying a causative morpheme. Let us now examine some examples.

In *Mongsen Ao*, the imperative of a verb carrying the causative suffix can be interpreted either as a truly causative imperative with a 2nd person performer (‘make him drink the water!’) or can be used to encode a directive situation in which the performer is a 3rd person, as in the following example:

- (23) *Mongsen Ao* (Sino-Tibetan, Tibeto-Burman, Kuki-Chin-Naga; Coupe 2008: 398)

a-tɕə *tʃəm-iʔ-ɑŋ*
 NRL-water drink-CAUS-IMP
 ‘Make (him) drink the water/Let (him) drink the water!’

Example (24) from *Maltese* instantiates the use of an originally permissive construction to encode directive situations addressed to 3rd and 1st person plural performers. The form *ħalli* is the 2nd singular imperative form of the verb *ħalla*, ‘to let’ (Vanhove 2000: 235), and is commonly used to convey orders addressed to 3rd person and 1st person plural (24a-b) performers. The shortened form of this imperative, *ħa*, is only possible in 1st person plural directives (24c).

- (24) *Maltese* (Afro-Asiatic, Semitic; Vanhove 2000: 236)

- a. *ħalli nkɔ mplu da ʃ yn awn ʃ kk* b. *ħalli yɪkbɛ r ikún yāf*
 HORT we.go.on a.little here HORT he.grows.up he.is he.knows
 ‘Let’s go on a little here.’ ‘Let him grow up, he’ll know.’
- c. *ħa mmáʔ dru náʔ ra l-franċīzi*
 HORT we.despise a.bit the-French.PL
 ‘Let’s despise the French a little.’

In *Russian* too, orders addressed to 3rd and 1st person plural performers are expressed by means of causative constructions in which the 2nd person directive form of the verb *davajt* ‘to give, to let’ is followed by a clause denoting the desired SoA. As can be observed in (25), the imperative of ‘give/let’ is inflected for number depending on whether the addressee is singular or plural (‘you.SG’ vs. ‘you.PL’). When the intended performer is 3rd person, the verb in the second clause is inflected for 3rd person and an overt pronoun is present (cf. (25a)). The personal pronoun can be omitted, as in (25b) and (25c), but this is only possible with 1st person plural performers. In a similar construction, equally possible only with 1st person plural performers,

the imperative of ‘give’, inflected for number, is followed by the infinitive of the lexical verb (25d). ‘Give’ + a finite verb inflected for 1st person plural + an overt 1st person plural pronoun is interpreted as a 1st person plural exclusive directive, as in (25e):

(25) Russian (Indo-European, Slavic; Podlesskaya 2006: 278-281)

- a. *davajte on xleb porež-et*
 give.IPFV.IMP.2PL he.NOM bread.ACC cut.PRF-FUT.3SG
 ‘Let (you.PL) him cut the bread’
- b. *davaj sygra-em v futbol v etu subbotu*
 give.IPFV.IMP.2SG play.PRF-FUT.1PL in football on this Saturday
 ‘Let us (me/us and you.SG) play football this Saturday’
- c. *davajte sygra-em v futbol v etu subbotu*
 give.IPFV.IMP.2PL play.PRF-FUT.1PL in football on this Saturday
 ‘Let us (me/us and you.PL) play football this Saturday’
- d. *davaj igra-t’ v futbol po subbotam*
 give.IPFV.IMP.2SG play.IPFV-INF in football on.every Saturdays
 ‘Let us (me/us and you.SG) play football on Saturdays.’
- e. *davaj my xleb porež-em*
 give.IPFV.IMP.2SG we.NOM bread.ACC cut.PRF-FUT.1PL
 ‘Lets we cut the bread’ (exclusive reading)

In Chamalal, the 3rd person directive marker apparently derives from the imperative of a verb meaning ‘say’/‘speak’. 3rd person directives are formed by adding the affix *-t’ a* to the imperative form (Magomedova 2004: 45). This affix (glossed OPT in the following examples) is possibly connected to the imperative of the verb meaning ‘to speak’, *i t’ -a* (speak-IMP.TR).

(26) Chamalal (Nakh-Daghestanian, Daghestanian, Avar-Andic-Tsezic; Magomedova 2004: 45)

- a. *wun-abe-t’ a* b. *ih-a-t’ a* c. *wič’-abe-t’ a*
 go-IMP.INTR-OPT do-IMP.TR-OPT kick.the.bucket-IMP.INTR-OPT
 ‘Let him go!’ ‘Let him do!’ ‘Let him kick the bucket!’

Cases like (26) are rather rare if compared to causative constructions with verbs meaning ‘let’/‘give’ (Chamalal is the only language in our sample in which such a pattern is attested). Furthermore, the source construction at the basis of the Chamalal pattern can be argued to be different from the ‘give/let’ causative constructions discussed so far, mainly because the act of saying does not require the realization of what is said and does not imply any causation. However, in our view it is reasonable to treat the SAY > DIRECTIVE path just exemplified as a subtype of a general CAUSATIVE > DIRECTIVE path because a construction such as ‘say/tell X to do...’ can be easily reinterpreted as ‘order X to do...’, i.e. as having an inherently causative and manipulative value (‘let X do...’).

US colloquial English provides an instance of extension of an originally permissive construction (the well-known *let’s*) also to 2nd person directives, although in rather peculiar contexts, e.g. when the action by the 2nd person performer is contrasted with some other action to be carried out by someone else. As can be observed in (27), the clitic *’s* is no longer interpretable as referring to the 1st person plural and *lets* is employed as a general directive marker (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 11; see also van der Auwera & Taeymans 2004).⁸

(27) US Colloquial English (not a sample language; Hopper & Traugott 2003: 11)

lets you go first, then if we have any money left I’ll go.

⁸ A similar construction is possible in Russian too in the very same context (i.e. when there is a contrast between the action ordered to the addressee and an action carried out by someone else; Podlesskaya 2006: 281):

- (iii) *davaj ty xleb bud-eš reza-t’, a*
 give.IPFV.IMP.2SG you.SG.NOM bread.ACC be.AUX-FUT.2SG cut.IPFV-INF while
on-i bud-ut my-t posud-u
 they-PL.NOM be.AUX-FUT.3.PL wash.IPFV-INF dishes-ACC
 ‘Let you cut the bread and them do the dishes.’ Lit. ‘Let you will cut. . .and they will do. . .’

The construction “imperative of a causative verb + main verb” is first reinterpreted as a directive strategy with 3rd person performers. Once reinterpreted, it may be used to encode orders addressed to 1st person plural performers and, more rarely, 2nd person performers, in which the original causative meaning is *incompatible* (or at least less compatible) with the inclusion of the addressee into the set of performers (in the sense that one gives permission to do things more frequently to other people than to oneself). The steps of this diachronic path are sketched in (28a):

- (28) a. LET/MAKE_[DIRECTIVE.2SG/PL] (X_[3PERSON] DO...) > 3RD PERSON DIRECTIVE > 1ST PERSON PLURAL DIRECTIVE > 2ND PERSON DIRECTIVE

It is significant that in the languages of our sample phenomena of attrition (such as the development of *lets* out of *let's* < *let us*, and possibly also *há* < *hálli* in Maltese) and integration (such as, e.g., the use of *davajt'* in Russian with an infinitive complement – cf. (25d) – as opposed to finite complement clauses – cf. (25a-c)) start when the construction comes to be used as a 1st person plural directive, i.e. once it has already extended along the cline in (28a). In these communicative contexts the causative/permissive component of the construction is not transparent anymore, and the form is no longer interpretable as having a causative/permissive value. It is therefore plausible that the construction as a whole is treated as a non-compositional unit, which then undergoes reduction/integration processes.

Quite curiously, Aikhenvald (2010: 348) considers the cases in which a *let* verb is grammaticalized into a directive marker as instances of motion verbs evolving into directive markers, and speaks of a path “from LEAVE, ABANDON, LET to imperative”; in other words, she downplays the permissive semantics of these verbs and emphasizes their motion meaning (leave, abandon). She also considers cases in which a “give” verb is the source of grammaticalization as fundamentally different from cases in which a “let” verb is used (Aikhenvald 2010: 350) and, more importantly, she hypothesizes a path from *let* to 1st person plural and then to 3rd person commands (“The semantic path of development from “permissive” to first **and then** third person commands is intuitively clear”, Aikhenvald 2010: 350, our emphasis). The fact that in many languages “let” constructions are only grammaticalized as expressions of orders addressed to 3rd person performers, whereas there are no languages in our sample in which *let* grammaticalizes only as a marker of 1st person plural directives suggests instead that 3rd person directives act as bridgeheads in this grammaticalization path.

In our view, the ordering presented in (28a) is more feasible also in semantic terms. The grammaticalization path described above involves the conventionalization of pragmatic inferences: if the addressee is requested to allow a third party to do something, this request may easily be interpreted as an order directed to the third party, especially in those situations in which the addressee is requested to act as a simple transmitter of the order and has no effective control over the realization of the desired SoA by the third party. Once the whole construction has been reinterpreted on the basis of pragmatic inference, the original meaning of ‘let/make/say’ is heavily bleached because it is no longer necessary that a permission or order be issued by the addressee: the earlier notion of ‘permission’ becomes less specific and more general, including “a further one of suggesting or encouraging someone to do something” (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 11). At this stage, the originally complex causative construction may be reinterpreted as a simple one, as schematized in (28b):

- (28) b. 1. [[let_[DIRECTIVE.2PERSON]] [X_[3RD PERSON] do Y]]
 2. [let X_[3.SG/PL] do Y]_{DIRECTIVE}

Given the semantic bleaching of ‘let/make/say’, a re-mapping of form-function takes place: the verb originally meaning ‘let/make/say’ is reinterpreted as a marker of the directive function, and may extend to directives addressed to 1st person plural performers, in which the original causative meaning is less compatible with the inclusion of the addressee into the set of performers:

- (28) c. 3. [directive marker X_[3SG/PL] do Y]
 4. [directive marker X_[1ST PERSON PLURAL] do Y]
 5. [directive marker X do Y]

3.2. Cooptation

In the following subsections (3.2.1-3.2.3) we will discuss three patterns of cooptation of non-directive forms as directives. These three patterns involve source forms that can be employed as indirect speech acts on the basis of various Searle's felicity conditions: the Sincerity condition is at play in the use (and cooptation) of optatives as directives (3.2.1), whereas the so-called Propositional condition can be argued to have a role in the adoption of future and other temporally or aspectually marked forms (present/ongoing and past/perfective forms, 3.2.2) as directive strategies.

3.2.1. Optatives as directives

Constructions expressing the speaker's wish such as optative constructions (Bybee *et al.* 1994: 179; Chung & Timberlake 1985: 247) are often coopted to express directive situations. By *optative constructions* we mean forms primarily devoted to the encoding of *optative situations*, i.e. situations in which the speaker states his/her wish without any appeal to the addressee to help make the wish come true (e.g. *May she stay forever young*).⁹

In many languages of our sample, optative constructions are only coopted to express orders addressed to third persons. In Dolakha Newar, for instance, the only way to convey an order to a third party is by means of the optative marker *tha-* prefixed to the verb, a form "used to mean 'let it be thus'" (Genetti 2007: 185).¹⁰

(29) Dolakha Newar (Sino-Tibetan, Tibeto-Burman, Bodic; Genetti 2007: 339-340)

- | | |
|--|---|
| a. <i>thā-yā</i>
OPT-come
'Let him/her come!' | b. <i>chi tha-si</i>
2SG OPT-die
'May you die!' |
| c. <i>chana gwari gūlpunuj bāla-ku ju-en tho-cō</i>
2SG heel never good-NMLZR be-PART OPT-stay
'May your heels never be good!' | |

In Kusunda, a class of transitive verbs lacking a specialized imperative form their imperative by means of a construction including the imperative of the light verb 'do' preceded by a nominal contributing the predicative content, as in (30a). In directive constructions with 3rd person performers, the same class of verbs employs *ə-ge*, the optative of the light verb 'do', preceded by a verbal noun, as in (30c). Moreover, a handful of transitive and intransitive verbs has a suffix *-gya* in directives addressed to 3rd person performers. This *-gya* is homophonous with the 3rd person optative of the verb 'go' (30d), and therefore it can be hypothesized, as Watters (2006: 97) also suggests, that we have to do with the grammaticalization of an originally independent optative form into a 3rd person directive marker:

(30) Kusunda (isolate; Watters 2006: 90-91, 96-97)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| a. <i>pumba əgo</i>
beat make-IMP
'Beat (it)!' | b. <i>ə-ge</i>
make-OPT
'May he do it' | c. <i>pumba əge</i>
beat make-OPT
'Let him beat it' |
| d. <i>g-ya</i>
3-go.OPT
'May he go' | e. <i>bəl-gya</i>
descend-OPT
'Let him descend!' | |

⁹ This definition is to be intended as covering only forms/constructions whose main function is the expression of the speaker's wish, much in the spirit of Dobrushina *et al.* (2005): polysemous forms (variously labelled as *subjunctive*, *potential*, *irrealis* etc.) which have among their functions the expression of the speaker's wish will not count as instances of optative constructions (but see the discussion on (ir)realis in Section 3.5) unless it can be demonstrated on independent grounds that the other functions arose diachronically from the expression of the speaker's wish.

¹⁰ From the discussion in Genetti (2007: 340) one could get the impression that the prefix *tha-* is primarily a jussive marker (i.e. a marker dedicated to the expression of orders addressed to third persons) rather than an optative marker, given its near-complementarity with the imperative construction ("[t]he optative is generally not possible with either first- or second-person subjects" Genetti 2007: 340). The existence of examples such as (29b), however, shows that the prefixation with *tha-* in order to convey wishes, blessings or curses is a possibility for other persons as well, although limited to non-volitional verbs ("the optative cannot be used with a second-person subject when the verb involves a volitional action, e.g. **chi bik tha-na-u* (2SG.ERG poison OPT-eat-IMP) 'May you eat poison'. Here the imperative would be required", *ibidem*).

In Slave, the optative is coopted to convey orders to 3rd person and 1st person plural performers, as in (31a-b):¹¹

(31) Slave (Na-Dene, Athapaskan; Rice 1989: 1111, 1118)

- a. *tse* *táduíwee* b. *dezʔa kare* *náoguyeh*
 wood 1DU.OPT:cut child outside 3PL.OPT:play
 ‘Let’s cut wood!’ ‘Let the children play outside!’
- c. *?edemuhté* *sóné*
 1SG.OPT:fall_asleep PROH
 ‘(I hope) that I don’t fall asleep’

In our sample there are no cases in which an optative construction is coopted as the only strategy available to convey orders to 2nd person performers, although there are cases in which optative forms are used as polite directive strategies with 2nd person performers: in Limbu, for instance, in contrast to the imperative and the hortative, the optative can be used as an alternative way to express orders to 2nd person performers, resulting in less harsh commands (van Driem 1987: 134).

The cooptation of optative forms to encode directive situations can be regarded as a case of metonymic activation of the directive scenario by referring to one of its component parts, namely the speaker’s wish. The scenario behind this pathway can be summarized as follows: if the speaker expresses the wish that someone brings about a given SoA, without making any appeal to the addressee, this generally means that he/she has no expectation regarding the immediate fulfilment of his/her wish. Lack of expectation may be due to external factors such as the absence of the intended performer (3rd person) of the desired SoA. In these cases, the ambiguity between an optative and a directive situation is maximum: the speaker may be expressing his/her wish in order to induce the addressee to do something to facilitate the actualization of the desired SoA (e.g. transmitting the speaker’s wish to the third party who is supposed to perform the action). Therefore, in such contexts the addressee is entitled to assume that the speech act is not the expression of a wish but the expression of a command directed to a third party, and the optative construction can be reinterpreted as a directive construction with a 3rd person performer.

In other words, the use of optatives as directive strategies appears to be particularly motivated in those situations in which the speaker’s wish is focused on at the expense of the other components of directive situations. Our sample (see Table 1, Section 3.5) provides evidence for the hierarchy in (32a):

- (32) a. 3RD PERSON DIRECTIVE > 1ST PERSON PLURAL DIRECTIVE > 2ND PERSON DIRECTIVE
 b. OPTATIVE > 3RD PERSON DIRECTIVE > 1ST PERSON PLURAL DIRECTIVE > 2ND PERSON DIRECTIVE

This hierarchy may be read as a universal implication: if a language uses an optative construction to encode directive situations with a given performer, it uses optative constructions to encode directive situations with all the performers on its left. The question now arises whether the hierarchy in (32a) can be also interpreted as a diachronic path, i.e. whether optatives develop a directive sense with 1st person plural performers only after being reinterpreted as directive strategies with 3rd person performers (and, similarly, with 2nd person performers only after 1st person plural performers), as represented in (32b). Although diachronic data on the progressive cooptation of optatives as directives are difficult to obtain for the languages discussed in this section, we argue that a diachronic scenario following the path schematized in (32b) is not implausible: directive situations with 3rd person performers share many features with optative situations, as the “appeal” component of the directive situation is somewhat off-the-stage if compared with 2nd person and 1st person plural directives, and thus a reinterpretation of an optative strategy as a 3rd person directive may be more eas-

¹¹ We consider the so-called “optative mode” of Slave a *bona fide* instance of optative construction. When used in independent clauses, its main functions are the expression of the speaker’s wish, as illustrated in (31c) (Rice 1989: 1118), and the indication of unrealized actions in the past (when combined with a past morpheme; Rice 1989: 1119). Its use in purpose clauses to mark unrealized events with respect to some reference point, as in example (iv), can be thought of as an extension of its primary use in main clauses, as purpose clauses “have the special property of describing the content of the mental state of the agent of the associated matrix clause, i.e. they spell out the desire or intention for whose realization the main clause action is carried out” (Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 47):

- (iv) *segháyudá* *gha* *rahsʔdéhla*
 3OPT:see:1SG CPLTZR 3PRF:turn_around
 ‘He turned around to look at me’

ily available in this kind of directive situation, given the appropriate contextual conditions. An alternative hypothesis, however, should be mentioned: it might be argued that 2nd person directives might represent the last stage of diachronic processes such as the one schematized in (32b) simply because languages have dedicated 2nd person directives more often than dedicated directives for other persons (van der Auwera *et al.* 2003; Aikhenvald 2010: 77 and *passim*). While in principle this may not be excluded in some cases, it must be remarked that there are also some processes of grammaticalization that start from directive situations with 2nd person and 1st person plural performers, as has been discussed above.

3.2.2. Futures and other temporally/aspectually marked forms as directives

Future forms are often used with a directive illocutionary force. In Oriya, the 1st person plural inclusive future is used with a directive meaning. When there is more than one addressee, the directive meaning may be reinforced by using directive forms of motion verbs such as *cal-ɔ*, ‘walk-IMP.2PL’,¹² *as-ɔ*, ‘come-IMP.2PL’. When the 1st person plural future is used in combination with *calɔ/asɔ*, there is no ambiguity as to the interpretation of the clause as a command:

(33) Oriya (Indo-European, Indic; Neukom & Patnaik 2003: 223-224)

- a. *cal-ɔ randh-ib-a*
EXHORT cook-FUT-1PL:INCL
‘Let’s cook!’
- b. *ame bɔ hut kɔ tha kɔ h-il-e-ŋi; as-ɔ kamɔ arɔ mbhɔ kɔ r-ib-a*
we much matter speak-PST-1PL:INCL.MIR come-2PL work start do-FUT-1PL:INCL
‘We have talked a lot; come, let’s start working’

In Bilua (Obata 2003) using a future form is the only way to issue a command addressed to the speaker + the addressee and to 3rd person performers:¹³

(34) Bilua (Solomons East-Papuan; Obata 2003: 314, 316)

- a. *niania ju a=q=a zari=a tu kala*
mother water 1SG=3SG.F.OBJ=VAL want=PRS IRR INDEF.SG.M
o=pa l=a tobet=o
3.SG.M=PROS 1SG.OBJ=VAL get.water=NR FUT
‘Mother, I want water, so someone should go and get water for me.’
- b. *uri qe=zio=vou qe=pa tauve=k=ou*
good 1DU.INCL=go=FUT 1DU.INCL=PROS help=3SG.F.OBJ=FUT
‘Good, we will go, we will go and help her’ (= let’s go and help her)

In Limilngan¹⁴ the realis future is employed for orders addressed to all persons except the 2nd person singular:

¹² Neukom & Patnaik (2003: 197) gloss *cal-ɔ* as ‘walk-HAB.2PL’, but do not provide any clear explanation for the development from a supposed habitual form to a marker of exhortation/encouragement. Since the 2nd person plural form of the imperative in Oriya also has an ending *-ɔ* (as in *as-ɔ*, ‘come-IMP.2PL’), it is equally possible to interpret *cal-ɔ* as the second person plural form of the imperative of a verb meaning ‘walk’.

¹³ The irrealis marker *tu* in example (34a) is not directly connected to the directive function, but rather with the fact that two clauses are juxtaposed. *Tu* “is not a complementizer but rather a morpheme which indicates that the clause which follows presents an unrealised situation” (Obata 2003: 215): as such, it may occur between independent clauses as well (Obata 2003: 247), indicating that the second clause describes the result of the first clause, as in the following example:

- (v) *[o=ki=lo] tu [maba a aive=v=o anga]*
3SG.M=come=NR FUT IRR truly 1SG scold=3SG.M.OBJ=NR FUT 1SG
‘he will come, and truly (that will result in that) I will scold him’

¹⁴ The realis future is marked by a combination of a realis subject prefix + a future suffix. The same suffix, when combined with irrealis subject prefixes, yields different future-projecting meanings (e.g. potential, evitative), as in the following examples:

- (vi) a. *w-in-a-yi* b. *ngiliyi da-na-k bi-rr-a-wa-yi*
3I-FUT-go-FUT dog DEF-II-DIST 2M<3-IRR-bite-FUT
‘he will/should/must go’ ‘that dog might bite you’

(35) Limilngan (Australian, Limilngan; Harvey 2001: 94)

- a. *anbayk Ø-um-in-mildinyu-k*
wind IV<1+2M-FUT-leave-FUT
'Let us leave the wind'
- b. *ja-wi-k b-alkgan mimilung m-an-yi*
DEF-I-DIST 3I-small tucker III-FUT-eat
'Let that kid eat the tucker!'
- c. *ngaykgi=nijani Ø-nga-n-mimi-ya da-ga-n*
1M=alone IV<1-FUT-sit-FUT DEF-IV-PROX
'Let me sit here (quietly) by myself!'
- d. *wunguyi uginy Ø-anga-lakbi*
2AG woman IV-2AG-sit.FUT
'You women sit down!'

Finally, in Erromangan a 2nd person singular future can be interpreted as a polite imperative, and in Önge the only way to encode a directive situation in which there is a 2nd person singular performer is the 2nd person form of the future.

(36) Erromangan (Austronesian, Eastern Malayo-Polynesian, Oceanic; Crowley 1998)

- a. *Ø-tovop* b. *ko-ntovop*
2SG:IMP-BR:laugh 2SG:FUT-MR:laugh
'Laugh!' 'Laugh!' (polite)

(37) Önge (South Andamanese; Dasgupta & Sharma 1982: 34)

n-ilokowale-nene
2SG-eat-FUT
'You will eat/eat!'

Very much like the optative strategies discussed in 3.2.1, our sample allows us to posit the hierarchy in (38a):

- (38) a. 1ST PERSON PLURAL > 3RD PERSON > 2ND PERSON PLURAL > 2ND PERSON SINGULAR
b. FUTURE > 1ST PERSON PLURAL > 3RD PERSON > 2ND PERSON PLURAL > 2ND PERSON SINGULAR

The hierarchy in (38a), supported by the distribution of future forms across different performers in the languages of our sample (see below, Table 1, Section 3.5), can be read as a synchronic generalization (if future strategies are used to encode a directive meaning with one of the performers on the hierarchy, then they are used with a directive meaning with all the performers on its left), and the question arises whether a diachronic interpretation (as represented in (38b)) also holds. We argue that such an interpretation is semantically plausible: the cooptation of futures as directives can be thought of as a case in which the directive scenario is evoked through reference to one of its components, namely the speaker's expectations of imminent actualization of the order; if a speaker declares the intention to do something together with the addressee (using a 1st person plural form of the future), this may imply (i) that he/she wishes that the SoA at issue occurs, and (ii) that he/she will do something to realize it, i.e. he/she will be the performer together with the addressee. In specific interactional contexts, the assertion of a future intention may be easily re-interpreted as having some directive illocutionary force: the form can be therefore reinterpreted as a directive addressed to 1st person plural performers, characterized by a strong intentional/auto-prescriptive value. Once a future form has been reinterpreted on the basis of pragmatic inferences, it may acquire a general directive function available for all persons. This process may be schematized as follows:

- (39) 1. [X]_[1ST PERSON PLURAL] do Y]_[FUTURE/INTENTIONAL]
2. [X]_[1ST PERSON PLURAL] do Y]_[DIRECTIVE]
3. [X]_[1,2,3] do Y]_[DIRECTIVE]

In our sample, directive clauses in which a future form is used remain often ambiguous between a future and a directive interpretation, and in most cases there are no formal clues that exclude a future interpretation. In some cases, however, it is the discourse configuration that triggers a directive interpretation while disfavouring a future one. Take, for instance, the following passage from Mongsen Ao:

(40) Mongsen Ao (Sino-Tibetan, Tibeto-Burman, Kuki-Chin-Naga; Coupe 2008: 390)

təm-pàʔ *ɿ à-aj* *a-ki* *nə* *tʃ huwa-ɿ ù* *tə̀* *sa-ùʔ* *tʃ u*
 friend-M come-IMP NRL-house ALL emerge-IMM.FUT thus say.PST-DECL DIST
 ‘‘Come friend, we will go home (disfavoured) / let’s go home (preferred)!’’ he said like that.’

In this passage, the directive interpretation arises as a side-effect of the presence of an imperative in the immediately preceding clause, namely the imperative of a ventive motion verb, which triggers the inference that the addressee is invited to join the speaker in performing some desired action. The configuration ‘‘come.IMP + V_{FUT.1PL}’’ is not conventionalized in Mongsen Ao (Coupe 2008: 390), but may become so in other languages (recall, for instance the Tetun 1st person plural directive in (13), and the colloquial Hebrew pattern exemplified in (16)). When this happens, we may assume that the directive meaning is conveyed by the whole configuration, which can be conceived as an emerging construction, in which the future form contributes its particular meaning, namely the future-projecting component of a directive situation, and in which the meaning of the whole does not correspond to the meaning of the parts.

The use of future forms to encode directive situations is a typical case of cooptation, i.e. the more or less systematic reinterpretation of a form without structural changes. It must be remarked, however, that there are also cases in which a future form undergoes structural changes that give rise to a new dedicated form: one such case is attested in Modern Hebrew, in which truncated future forms are used exclusively for orders (Bat-El 2002: 657ff.).

Besides futures, there are other non-directive aspectually and/or temporally marked forms that are systematically used for the expression of orders. Forms and constructions variously labeled as imperfective, perfective, present or past are indeed frequently used across languages as a strategy to convey orders. In all these cases, the desired SoA is presented as if it were happening or as if it had already happened.

In many languages, for instance, forms associated with the on-going occurrence of an event (whether temporal or aspectual in nature) are used to convey orders. Example (41) shows the case of Wardaman, where the present tense marker *-n*, referring to ‘‘that which is always so, that which is presently so, and that which is imminent’’ (Merlan 1994: 176), can be used to express a straight command addressed to the speaker + the addressee:

(41) Wardaman (Australian, Gunwinyguan, Yangmanic; Merlan 1994: 183)

worroman-bi ngayi-yo-n
 fast-ART 1DU.INCL-spear-PRS
 ‘Let’s spear it quickly!’

Forms associated to the on-going occurrence of a SoA at the moment of speech are good candidates for the expression of orders because they present the desired SoA as already in progress, thus making it closer to the moment of the speech, as argued by Birjulin & Xrakovskij (2001: 41), and as widely exemplified by the directive use of non-directive forms in familiar languages (cf. (42) and (43), in which present progressive forms are used with a clear directive meaning and with urgency/imminence overtones):

(42) *I had got my back almost round to the steps by this time but I knew I’d never get my parka open and the front door key out unless I had an edge. ‘‘You’re coming with us. Now.’’ And as he said it, shifty-eyes-with-dandruff (and I’ll throw in bad breath) put out a hand for my arm. (British National Corpus; M. Ripley, Angel hunt, London: Fontana Press, 1991)*

(43) *Come on darling now be a good boy. Now pick up the skateboard. Come on. Come on. Pick it up. Come on pick it up. here you are. Oliver now come on darling be a good boy give me that. Now you’re coming in now because we’re going to have a bath and we’re going out. Now will you pick this up for me? Pick it up now! Oliver in a moment I’m going to get very angry with you. Now pick this pick it up now! (British National Corpus; Nicola, 33 years old, housewife, Home Counties)*

In our sample, there is also a handful of languages in which past or perfective forms are coopted to express directive situations. In Kartvelian languages, for instance, the use of past perfective constructions to express directive situations addressed to 2nd person performers is common (Hewitt 1995: 571-572 for Georgian; Anderson 1963: 57 for Laz). Example (44) shows the case of Laz, in which the same form is ambiguous between a past perfective interpretation and a directive interpretation.

(44) Laz (Kartvelian; Anderson 1963: 57)

/mómč'i/

'You gave (it) to me/Give (it) to me!'

A directive form connected to the perfective aspect is attested also in Galo, where "the most general ... imperative is in *-tó*, a form which appears to derive historically from Perfective suffix *-tó*" (Post 2008: 598):

(45) Galo (Sino-Tibetan, Tibeto-Burman, Mirish; Post 2008: 598, 578)

- a. *ám ... ə□ə, ám laakáa tó, kainə, kozúu gə.*
əəm əə əəm làa-káa-tó kaí-nà kozúu=gə
 ANAP.ACC bamboo ACC take-tent-IMP.ODIR big-NMLZR:SBJ awhile.ago-GEN
 'Go ahead/try and get that bamboo, the big one from just before.'
- b. *korúm ogò...accj ə a□n igò kaatót.*
korúm ogò aci=əə a,n ì=go káa-tó=(ə)í
 ancients DIST.LOC elder.brother=TOP two=INDIV have/exist-PRF=ETAG
 'Once upon a time... there were two brothers.'

Perfective *-tó* in (45b) marks a predicate describing a completed event or state which is construed as a punctual, self-contained occurrence "with few or no lingering effects, which does not obviously result in a particular state, and/or with little or no immediate bearing on any subsequent events or states" (Post 2008: 579). Abrupt and "matter-of-fact" nuances are also possible with this form. As Post (2008: 598) notes, "imperative *-tó* only very rarely occurs alone, with speakers possibly preferring additional hortative marking to avoid confusion with the homophonous Perfective suffix. However, in high-context situations (as when giving an extended set of directions), such uses are possible".

In the absence of diachronic evidence, it is not straightforward to establish why past/perfective strategies are adopted to encode directive situations, and various possibilities have been suggested in the literature in this respect: this may happen because particular aspectual properties are better candidates than others for the expression of orders. Van der Auwera *et al.* (2009: 100), for instance, argue that imperatives have a *pragmatic perfectivity bias*, since they "involve an appeal to the addressee(s) to [...] perform the action as a whole", being most often 'result-oriented', and therefore triggering a perfective construal of the desired SoA. Such perfectivity bias would not only motivate the use of perfective constructions as directive constructions, but also the use of temporally marked forms that most typically align with a perfective construal of the action, such as, e.g., past and anterior forms. Alternatively, it may be assumed that the use of past tense forms to convey a not-yet-actualized meaning is motivated the fact that the past tense, which typically describes an immutable and bounded event, is particularly eligible for future reference in contexts in which there is high certainty as to the imminent actualization of the event. Past forms are indeed used with a modal (future-projecting) function in various languages: in modern standard Persian, for instance, the past tense may be used "as a grammaticalized exponent of subjective epistemic and deontic modalization" (Tavangar & Amouzadeh 2009: 860), and in these cases (exemplified below in (46)) it invariably has imminence overtones:

(46) Modern standard Persian (Indo-European, Iranian; not a sample language; Tavangar & Amouzadeh 2009: 861)

- a. A: *mitunæm beræm birun ye dæqiqe?*
 IPFV.can.1SG SBJ.go.1SG out one minute
 'Can I go out for a minute?'
- B: *ræfti-yo zud bærgæšti-ya*
 go.PST.2SG-and quick return.PST.2SG-DP
 'Go and come back quickly!'

- b. A: *ma ziyad væxt nædarim, bayæd 'æjæle konim.*
 we much time not.have.NPS.1PL must hurry SBJ.do.1PL
 'We haven't got much time. We must hurry up.'
- B: *negæran næbaš mæn qæza xordæm-o umædæm.*
 worried not.IMP.be.2SG I food eat.PST.1SG-and come.PST.1SG
 'Don't worry. I'll eat and come back (in no time).'

Such modalized future-projecting uses of the past tense might be interpreted as resulting from a process of conventionalization of conversational implicature: by using a past form, the speaker attributes a feature of past events, namely certainty of occurrence, to an imminent future SoA; this association, which is based on a process of deictic projection (i.e. a process by which “future events, states or processes are envisaged as having already materialized”, Tavangar & Amouzadeh 2006: 98), becomes part of the meaning of the past form in specific environments such as, e.g., highly assertive (e.g. promises or bets) or directive contexts.

The directive use of forms originally denoting aspectual and/or temporal properties of the event is only attested in our sample for 2nd and 1st person plural performers (see Table 1, Section 3.5). This is fully understandable, as only speech act participants are entitled to draw the relevant inference as to the not-yet-actualized (and hence desired) character of a SoA that is presented as occurring or as already occurred.¹⁵

3.3. Constructionalization: insubordination as a source of directives

In this section we will discuss cases in which directive strategies grow out of complex bi-clausal constructions in which a formerly subordinate clause is used as a main clause with a directive value (i.e. cases of insubordination): in terms of Searle's classification, the source constructions in these processes are all instances of indirect speech acts formed by a sentence embedding one directive element inside another one.

Various types of subordinate clauses may be used as main clauses with directive function. They all represent instances of insubordination, intended, following Evans (2007: 367), as “the conventionalized main clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses”. The contexts in which the directive interpretation arises can be quite various. In most cases, the ellipsed main clause expresses the speaker's wish or intention (“[I wish] that...”, “[it would be nice] if...”), or contains a manipulative speech act such as an order or a question (“[Come here,] so that...”; “[Do you mind] if...?”; “[What would you think] if...?”).

Insubordination is defined by Evans as a four-step process. The first stage is simply “the normal situation in which a subordinate clause is used as such” (Evans 2007: 371). When the main clause is ellipsed, insubordination proper begins. This is the second stage, in which any grammatically compatible main clause can be “reconstructed” by the speaker. The insubordinated clause is conventionalized when restrictions concerning the possible range of ellipsed main clauses arise (3rd stage). In the end of the process it may not be possible to restore any ellipsed material (4th stage, called ‘constructionalization’ by Evans 2007: 374), and the formerly subordinate clause may no longer be perceived as such. As Evans states, “the commonest type of insubordination is found in various types of clause concerned with interpersonal control—primarily imperatives and their milder forms such as hints and requests, but also permissives, warnings, and threats” (Evans 2007: 387), and the main trigger of insubordination processes is the tendency to avoid the face-threatening component of such manipulative clauses (see the discussion in section 4). In what follows, we will provide a survey of the most frequent patterns of insubordination giving rise to directive strategies based on their resemblance to subordinate clauses.

A serious methodological problem when dealing with alleged cases of insubordination is the lack of relevant diachronic data that unequivocally show that the direction of change is from subordinate to main clause, and not vice versa, especially if we consider that “the extensive literature on morphosyntactic change – whether as grammaticization or reanalysis – largely concentrates on diachronic developments in the opposite direction, i.e. the development of subordinate constructions from material in main clauses” (Evans 2007: 375). In what follows, we basically trust our primary sources, which treat these cases under the rubric of subordinate clauses, on the basis of formal features (such as, e.g., the use of typically subordinate verb

¹⁵ The extension of perfective/imperfective (or past/present) forms to directive situations might also be explained on the basis of formal reasons, as mentioned, among others, by van der Auwera *et al.* (2009). It is widely recognized that imperatives tend to be cross-linguistically simple constructions, and therefore they tend to be expressed by the simplest verb form available in a language. Hence, if in a given language the simplest form is the one employed for past/present events, or for the perfective aspect, it is plausible to hypothesize that such form may be exploited for directives also by virtue of its being morphologically simple.

forms) that do not characterize main clauses in a given language. It should be added, however, that sometimes the analysis of a given clause as insubordinated, though argued for by the grammarian, can be easily demonstrated to be fallacious, or at least questionable. Take, for instance, Eades's (1979) analysis of 3rd person directives of Gumbaynggir as representing an instance of insubordination (from purpose clause to directive). In Gumbaynggir there is what Eades calls a 'facilitative conjunction', *baya*, which is used as a purpose conjunction in examples such as (47a). The same *baya* is used as a directive marker in independent clauses with 3rd person performers (47b):

(47) Gumbaynggir (Australian, Pama-Nyungan; Eades 1979: 322)

- a. *ŋaŋ'i:ŋa* *ŋura:ŋ* *duŋa:r* *baya* *gula:du* *ŋambi:la*
 brother-in-law:OBJ give:PST honey:OBJ FAC.CONJ 3SG.AG drink:IMP
 'Brother-in-law was given the honey to drink, so that he would drink it'
- b. *baya* *n* *ami:yu* *yi:lala*
 FAC.CONJ woman:A cook:IMP
 'Let the woman cook (it)'

The fact that the verb in the subordinate clause is marked as imperative suggests that the subordinate purpose clause headed by *baya* is the result of the grammaticalization of a formerly asyndetic construction in which an independent imperative clause is juxtaposed to another clause. The Gumbaynggir development would be then better interpreted as an instance of the pathway "directive (main clause) > purposive (subordinate clause)", similar to those discussed below (see footnote 19).

In Koiari, 3rd person directives are formed with the so-called hortative mood preceded by a particle, *ene*, which is also said to introduce complement clauses (Dutton 1996: 71), i.e. they look like insubordinated clauses belonging to one of the types labelled below as COMPLEMENT CLAUSE AFTER UTTERANCE PREDICATE > DIRECTIVE or COMPLEMENT CLAUSES AFTER MODAL PREDICATES > DIRECTIVE. However, as the only example of *ene* as a complementizer is (48c), in which the main verb is a manipulation predicate (tell someone to do x), it could equally well be the case that we have to do with the opposite scenario, in which an independent clause with a directive function has evolved into a complement clause of a manipulation verb (tell him: 'do x!' > tell him to do x). The lack of a clear etymology for *ene* is a sufficient reason not to count the Koiari examples in (48a-b) as instances of insubordination:

(48) Koiari (Trans-New Guinea, Koiarian; Dutton 1996: 27, 71)

- a. *ene* *ahu* *m-e* (< *ma-e*) b. *ene* *yabu* *erev-ari* (< *ereva-ari*)
 CPLTZR he get-HORT CPLTZR they see-HORT
 'Let him get it!' 'Let them see it!'
- c. *oti* *Dumo=ni* *roi-ege* *ene* *ahu* *orov-e*
 go:SS Dumo=to say-DS CPLTZR he come-HORT
 'Go and tell Dumo to come!'

Indirect questions. In Awa Pit there is a directive form arising diachronically from a process of insubordination in which the ellipsed main clause expresses a question by the speaker ('[I'm wondering] if you would...'), according to Curnow (1997: 247). In this language, the polite imperative is formed with the affix *-naka/-nka*, as in (49a). This affix can be decomposed into two morphemes. The first of them (*-na/-n*) is the infinitive. The other morpheme is the non-future complementizer *ka*. This analysis is supported by two facts:

- the allomorph *-nka* is attested precisely for those verb stems whose infinitive ends in *-n* rather than in *-na* (e.g. *a-* 'come', *i-* 'go', and *ku-* 'eat')
- a similar construction, involving the infinitive combined with a different complementizer (the future complementizer *sa*) is attested in indirect questions with future reference (see ex. (49b)); the complementizer *ka*, on the other hand, is attested in indirect questions with present/past reference (ex. (49c)) in combination with the imperfective and perfective participles.¹⁶

¹⁶ Curnow explains the apparent mismatch between the inherently future semantics of directives and the use of a non-future complementizer as follows: "an imperative is irrealis, similar to future, but also non-future in intent. It is thus possible to speculate that the Infinitive and the non-future complementizer have fused in main clauses to create an imperative" (Curnow 1997: 247).

(49) Awa Pit (Barbacoan; Curnow 1997: 246-247, 257)

- a. *ayna-t kwa-nka!*
 cook-SV eat-PLT:IMP
 ‘Cook and eat it!’ [when giving a friend or relative a gift of food which needs to be cooked]
- b. *kutnya domingo paa-ma-ti, Santos=ta mi ma-ta-w Ricaurte=mal*
 three Sunday become-COMP-TERM Santos=ACC ask-PST-LOCUT:SBJ Ricaurte=LOC
mizhaka=ma puz-na sa
 when=INTER go:out-INF FUT:CPLTZR
 ‘Three weeks ago I asked Santos when he would go out to Ricaurte.’
- c. *na shi pyan ki-s a-mtu mizha=ma*
 1SG.(NOM) NEG know.(IMPFPART) be.NEG-LOCUT come-IMPFPART how=INTER
ka ka
 be:permanently.(IMPFPART) NFUT:CPLTZR
 ‘I don’t know if he is coming or what.’¹⁷

Complement clauses after utterance predicates. In Basque directive forms with 3rd person performers (as in (50a)) may make use of the suffix *-(e)la*, the unmarked declarative complementizer (cf. (50b)).

(50) Basque (Oyharçabal 2003: 282)

- a. *eta ez badago etxian, datorr-ela bere andria*
 and not if.is home.at come.3SG-CPLTZR his wife
 ‘And if he’s not at home, let his wife come!’
- b. *udaltzainek ukatu dute Rubioren bizkartzain zir-ela*
 policemen.ERG deny AUX Rubio.GEN bodyguard were-CPLTZR
 ‘The town policemen have denied that they were Rubio’s bodyguards.’¹⁸

Complement clauses after modal predicates (including desiderative predicates). As an illustration of this path of insubordination, we shall briefly discuss the cases in which a main clause with a directive sense is headed by a so-called “irrealis” complementizer. A number of languages code the distinction between “realis” and “irrealis” complement clauses in the interclausal connective (Frajzyngier 1995, Ammann & van der Auwera 2004, among others). So-called irrealis complementizers generally introduce clauses governed by a

¹⁷ A similar insubordination scenario is possibly to be reconstructed in Basque. In this language commands with 1st person plural performers are expressed with present subjunctive verbs or synthetic present forms followed by the complementizer *-en*, the unmarked interrogative complementizer (cf. (vii.a-b)):

(vii) Basque (isolate; Artiagoitia 2003a: 635)

- a. *esanak esan, goaz-en harira*
 say.DET.PL say go-CPLTZR thread.ALL
 ‘Having said what has been said, let us go to our topic’
- b. *ez dakit guztiak ohartu dir-en*
 not know all.DET.PL realize AUX- CPLTZR
 ‘I don’t know if all have noticed’

It should be remarked, however, that subjunctive clauses headed by *-en* also occur after volitional verbs (*want, desire*), manipulative verbs (*command, forbid, order, permit*, etc.), and predicate adjectives such as ‘it is good that, it is necessary that’ (Artiagoitia 2003a: 640), so that in the absence of a diachronic account of how *-en* came to be used in main clauses with a directive function it is not entirely clear whether we have to do with an insubordination pattern involving a formerly interrogative subordinate clause.

¹⁸ The complementizer *-ela* can also introduce subordinate clauses with a temporal (simultaneity) value, as in (viii) (Artiagoitia 2003b: 712):

- (viii) *aspaldi, artean gazte eta berde gin-ela, erretrato bat egitera*
 long.ago still young and green were-ela portrait one do:NMLZR.ALL
hotsegin ziguten eskola ttikian genbiltzan guztioi
 call AUX school small:LOC walked:en all:DAT
 ‘Long time ago, when we were still young and green, they called all of us who were at the small school to do a portrait.’

However, as Artiagoitia (2003b: 712) mentions that this temporal *-ela* is not exactly homophonous with the completive *-ela*, since the two have two different accentual patterns, we consider the insubordinated use of *-ela* as an instance of the insubordination path leading from complement clauses after declarative verbs to directives.

subset of complement taking predicates including modal predicates (*ought to, must, be necessary that*), manipulative predicates (*order, persuade, etc.*), and desiderative predicates (*want*; Noonan 1985; see also Cristofaro 2003: 99). Insubordinated clauses containing an irrealis complementizer may thus in principle presuppose an ellipsed main clause with one of these predicates, and, in the absence of a thorough diachronic analysis, it is often impossible to determine exactly what type of main clause has been ellipsed. This is also the reason why it is preferable to treat the cases of insubordinated clause with an irrealis complementizer under a very general rubric “Complement clauses after modal predicates”.

Balkan languages provide many cases of insubordinated clauses headed by irrealis complementizers and used for a variety of functions, including the directive function (Ammann & van der Auwera 2004). In Albanian, for instance, the modal complementizer *të* introduces main clauses with a directive function addressed to 2nd, 3rd and 1st person plural performers.

(51) Albanian (Indo-European, Albanian; Buchholz & Fiedler 1987: 134; Ammann & van der Auwera 2004: 297-298)

- a. *ti, Agim, shko te nëna dhe Rexhepi të rrijë këtu!*
 you Agim go.IMP.2SG to mother.NOM.DEF and Rexhep IRR.CPLTZR stay.SBJV.3SG here
 ‘You, Agim, go to your mother, and Rexhep is to stay here!’
- b. *hajde të ikim!*
 come.on IRR.CPLTZR go.1PL
 ‘Come on, let’s go!’
- c. *sapo të vijë ky shoku, ta marrësh*
 once IRR.CPLTZR come.SBJV.3SG that comrade IRR.CPLTZR+him take.SBJV.2SG
 ‘Once that guy comes, take him...’

For Albanian, an insubordination scenario in which a desiderative or, more generally, a modal predicate has been dropped, leaving the (irrealis) complementizer-headed subordinate clauses alone with a directive function has been proposed in the literature, and is preferable to the opposite scenario postulating a reverse path, from independent main clause to subordinate clause (see the discussion in Ammann & van der Auwera 2004: 306).

Free standing infinitives. The main clause use of infinitives as commands is well-known from a number of European languages (see the Italian example in (52), in which the infinitive has urgency overtones). The degree of conventionalization of this use in many cases does not allow to restore the ellipsed main clause. In principle, the ellipsed main clause could be any clause containing a manipulation or modal predicate (‘request’, ‘order’, ‘it is necessary to’ etc.) which is syntactically compatible with an infinitive in the governed subordinate clause (see the discussion in Evans 2007: 391-392):

(52) Italian (Indo-European, Romance; personal knowledge)

- anda-re! muove-r-si!*
 go-INF move-INF-REFL
 ‘Go, move away (from here)!’

Purpose adverbial clauses. Purposive constructions are subordinate constructions in which an action/event is presented as happening “by virtue of some earlier action, referred to in the previous clause” (Dixon 2004: 71). The prior action can be volitional (“performed in order that the purpose-marked action should follow”, *ibidem*) or non-volitional (i.e. a natural consequence of the prior action). In some languages purposive constructions, which have a clear future-projecting semantics, may insubordinate and acquire a future meaning and/or an advisory/directive value. The two developments are possibly two independent developments, as there are languages in which the purposive clause develops into a directive construction without being used as a future strategy.

In Arabana (Hercus 1994) the insubordinated purposive can be used to express an order to 1st person plural performers:

(53) Arabana (Australian, Pama-Nyungan; Hercus 1994: 189, 182)

- a. *antha yuka-rnda puntyu mani-lhiku*
 I go-PRS meat get-PURP
 ‘I am going to get some meat.’
- b. *arimpa kudnala-lhukei! Wadlhu ngurku-nga*
 we.two.INCL sleep-PURP place good-LOC
 ‘Let’s camp in this good spot (here)!’

In *Tukang Besi* (Donohue 1999), *ako* ‘purpose’ is used as a sentence-initial particle or as a verbal suffix in 1st person plural directives (54e-f). The same *ako*, glossed as ‘do.for’, appears “in either a contiguous constructions (54a) (*sic*) or a non-contiguous constructions (54b), the second of these functioning similarly to the ‘prepositional’ role, introducing new arguments into the clause” (Donohue 1999: 187, adapted). Moreover, it may appear: (i) as a verbal suffix, functioning as an applicative (54c), i.e. introducing arguments in dative, instrumental, theme, cause or purpose semantic roles (Donohue 1999: 225), and (ii) as a sentence-initial particle introducing purpose clauses (54d).

(54) *Tukang Besi* (Austronesian, Western Malayo-Polynesian, Sulawesi; Donohue 1999: 187, 201, 409, 456)

- a. *no-wila kua daoa ako te ina-no*
 3R-go ALL market do.for CORE mother-3POSS
 ‘They went to the market for their mother.’
- b. *no-wila kua daoa no-ako te ina-no*
 3R-go ALL market 3.R-do.for CORE mother-3POSS
 ‘They went to the market, all the while doing it for their mother.’
- c. *no-wila-ako te ina-no kua daoa*
 3R-go-do.for CORE mother-3POSS ALL market
 ‘They went to the market for their mother.’
- d. *no-kulia ako na-j[um]ari guru*
 3R-study.at.university PURP 3IRR-become.SI teacher
 ‘She studied so that she could become a teacher.’
- e. *ako to-wila i lapanga*
 PURP 1PL.R-go OBL sport.field
 ‘Let’s go the sports field’
- f. *to-manga-ako*
 1PL.R-eat-APPL
 ‘Let’s eat.’

While the sentence-initial use of *ako* in (54e) is a crystal-clear example of an insubordinated purpose clause, it is not entirely clear whether the use of *-ako* as an applicative suffix with directive meaning in (54f) can be considered as an instance of insubordination. Donohue’s grammar has no examples of purpose clauses in which *-ako* is suffixed to the verb in the dependent clause. However, verbs suffixed with *-ako* may appear after an imperative clause containing the imperative verb form *mai* ‘come’, as in (55). These structures could represent the original biclausal construction whose subordinate clause has undergone a process of insubordination. This might also explain why both the insubordinated clause introduced by *ako* and the independent verb suffixed with *-ako* are used as directives for 1st person plural performers: this pattern would originate from an earlier structure in which a ventive motion verb was used, similar to the cases discussed in Section 3.1.1.2 (*come* > 1st person plural directive), and to the Oriya and Mongsen Ao cases discussed, respectively, in (33) and (40).

(55) *Tukang Besi* (Donohue 1999: 456)

- mai to-rambi-ako*
 come 1PL.R-play_music-APPL
 ‘Let’s go and join in the orchestra.’

Finally, Even provides an instance of insubordination *PURPOSIVE* > *DIRECTIVE* in which the originally dependent clause has taken on some properties of main clauses. The so-called imperative paradigm 2 (Malchukov 2001: 164; glossed *IMP2* in (56)) is formally identical to the conjugating purposive converb, as demon-

strated by (56a) and (56b). Only in their main clause use, however, imperatives derived from purposive constructions can combine with the free 2nd person pronouns *hi* ‘you’ and *hu* ‘you[pl]’ (cf. (56c) vs. (56d)):

(56) Even (Altaic, Tungusic; Malchukov 2001: 165, 167)

- a. *ilan dolbani-v bi-sid'i emu-de-j*
 three night-ACC be-ANT.CONV bring-IMP2-REFL.SG
 ‘Bring it in three days!’
- b. *ama, edu tegeci-d-li, nokle-de-j*
 father here sit-PROG-IMP.2SG shoot-PURP-REFL.SG
 ‘Father, sit here in order to shoot [afterwards]!’
- c. *tiek hu=de min-gecin muka-vur tet-te-vur*
 now you.PL=CLIT me-EQUAT coat-REFL.PL take.on-IMP2-REFL.PL
 ‘Now put your coats on as I [did]!’
- d. *mer (*hu) oj-u tet-te-vur ga-d*
 self’s (you.PL) clothes-ACC take.on-PURP-REFL.PL take-AOR.3PL
 ‘They took their clothes to put them on.’¹⁹

3.4. Irrealis and directives

In languages marking a distinction between actualized and unactualized situations by means of a binary morphosyntactic opposition between so-called *realis* (or neutral) and *irrealis* markers,²⁰ directive situations happen to be frequently encoded by irrealis markers.²¹ The preferential association between directive situations and irrealis markers has long been recognized in the literature on (ir)realis (Mithun 1995: 376; Chafe 1995: 350), and in her typological survey of imperatives Schalley (2008: 98ff.) lists irrealis forms among the most common indirect (i.e. morphologically non-dedicated) imperative strategies.

Languages using an irrealis marker for directives usually employ the very same form also for other functions (future, complementation after desiderative verbs etc.). In other words, the coding of directive situations is but one of the functions of irrealis-marked structures in these languages. There are two possible explanations for why such irrealis-marked structures are used to express a directive situation: (i) we might suppose that directives are marked as irrealis by virtue of the non-actualization of the desired SoA in the directive situation, or (ii) we can argue that the presence of the irrealis marker is (primarily) motivated by the other functions for which the structure is used (future, optative, potential, etc.). The reader is referred to Mauri & Sansò (2011), who opt for the second explanation and hypothesize that in these cases an irrealis-marked structure has spread to other contexts such as the directive situation following one of the paths described above (from future to directive, from optative to directive, etc.), and therefore the irrealis marker is only indirectly connected to the logical irrealty implied by the directive situation.

¹⁹ It is also worth noting that the path PURPOSIVE > DIRECTIVE is not unidirectional, and in some languages directive markers may develop a purposive value. In Maltese, for instance, *ħalli* (and its shortened form *ħa*) is used as a directive marker for 1st plural and 3rd persons, as in (23) above. The same form can be used in the second clause in a sequence to mark a purposive relation between the first and the second clause, as in (ix).

(ix) Maltese (Afro-Asiatic, Semitic; Vanhove 2000: 236, 238)

għidtlek dan kollu ħalli/ħa tagħraf tilqa' ruħek
 I said-to-you this all so.that you.know you.meet soul-your

‘I told you all that so that you’ll know how to protect yourself’ (< I told you all that; may you know how ...)

²⁰ The linguistic relevance of “(ir)realis” as a grammatical category or as a notion relevant to the grammatical organization of the world’s languages has been questioned at least since Bybee *et al.* (1994) and Bybee (1998). This question is far beyond the purposes of this paper, but the reader is referred to de Haan (to appear) for an up-to-date survey of the debate on irrealis, and to Cristofaro (to appear) for a recent attempt to question the validity of irrealis as a grammatical category and as a semantic dimension mostly based on diachronic arguments.

²¹ Cases in which directive situations are encoded by means of **realis** markers are also attested. The reader is referred to Mauri & Sansò (to appear) for a survey of the coding of directive situations in languages with a realis-irrealis distinction.

3.5. Frequency

The patterns discussed in sections 3.1-3.4 are not evenly distributed across languages: some constructions are more often than others the source of directive constructions, and although the sample of the present study is rather restricted to draw any conclusion on the cross-linguistic diffusion of the various patterns, some tendencies emerge with sufficient clarity.

Source	Attested in ... languages	Performers
Optative	11	3 only: 4 lgs (36.36%) 3, 1pl: 3 lgs (27.27%) 3, 1pl, 2: 4 lgs (36.36%)
<i>Go</i>	11 (motion directive: 2 lgs; non-motion directive: 9 lgs)	2 only: 5 lgs (45.45%) 1pl only: 3 lgs (27.27%) 2, 1pl: 2 lgs (18.18%) [1 motion, 1 non-motion directive] 2, 1pl, 3: 1 lg (9.09%) [motion directive]
<i>Come</i>	9	1pl: 9 lgs (100%)
Causative	16	3 only: 11 lgs (68.75%) 3, 1pl: 5 lgs (31.25%)
Future	19	1pl only: 6 lgs (31.58%) 1pl, 3: 1 lg (5.26%) 1pl, 3, 2: 10 lgs (52.63%) Incomplete data: 2 lgs
Present/imperfective	12	2 only: 6 lgs (50%) 1pl only: 3 lgs (25%) 2, 1pl: 2 lgs (16.67%) Incomplete data: 1 lg
Past/perfective	6	2 only: 2 lgs (33.33%) 1pl only: 2 lgs (33.33%) Incomplete data: 2 lgs
Irrealis	23	3 only: 3 lgs (13.04%) 2 only: 1 lg (4.35%) 3, 1pl: 3 lgs (13.04%) 3, 1pl, 2: 8 lgs (34.78%) Incomplete data: 8 lgs
Realis	2	1+2, 2, 3: 2 lgs (100%)
Insubordination:		
Complement clause after utterance predicate	6	
Complement clause after modal predicate	6	
Conditional protasis	5	
Indirect interrogative	3	
Purpose clause	9	
Infinitive/nominalization	6	

Table 1. *The frequency of the diachronic patterns identified in §§ 3.1 to 3.4.*

Table 1 summarizes the frequency of the various sources of directive constructions in our sample, with the indication, whenever relevant, of the different persons involved in each pattern. Although overall the figures are quite low, and the vast majority of directive constructions have no clear source, some tendencies emerge rather strikingly, and the distribution of the various strategies across different performers corroborates the hierarchies proposed in (28), (32), and (38). Leaving aside the case of irrealis constructions used as directive strategies, by and large the most common source of directive constructions are future constructions, a pattern attested in 19 languages out of 200, causative constructions (16 languages) and present/imperfective constructions (12 languages). These figures should be taken as an approximation, as in general the grammars of single languages tend to overlook alternative or emerging directive strategies, especially if the language in question has a dedicated directive.

4. Conclusions: factors at work in the development of directive constructions

The aim of this paper was to reconstruct the diachronic scenarios leading to the emergence and development of directive markers and constructions. The analysis has shown that it is possible to identify a limited set of sources that are recurrent across languages and tend to develop their directive function following similar pathways. Three major claims can summarize the findings of this work: (i) **person** plays a crucial role in the coding of directive situations, both in synchronic and diachronic terms; (ii) a further central aspect in the

development of directives is the widespread tendency to **avoid face-threatening acts**, or explicit requests, by means of indirect speech acts (that, in the long run, may become conventionalized ways of expressing orders in a given language); (iii) the analysis of the sources of directive strategies may also account for the **synchronic variation** attested in the coding of directive situations. Let us now discuss these three issues in detail.

First of all, there are diachronic pathways in which source constructions develop into directive markers starting from specific performers, thus showing that in directive situations PERSON is not merely an epiphenomenon, but rather a *functional factor*. The *identity of the performer* (1st plural, 2nd or 3rd person) indeed crucially determines the type of directive speech act conveyed by the sentence, and it is possible to explain some diachronic pathways on the basis of the functional contiguity existing between specific source constructions and particular types of directive speech act, as identified by the person of the performer. A major demarcation line can be drawn between *speech act participants* on the one hand and *third parties* on the other hand.

If the P(erformer) coincides with the addressee(s) (2nd person), the speech act is a *prototypical* command, whereas if P coincides with the addressee plus the speaker (1st person plural) the speech act can be conceived as a *mediated* command, in which the addressee is invited to join the speaker in order to bring about the desired SoA (i.e. the real intended receiver of the order is the addressee, but the speaker may include herself/himself within the set of performers). The fact that both the speaker and the addressee(s) are present when the speech act is uttered explains why the cooptation of aspectually and/or temporally marked non-directive forms as directives (section 3.3.2) is generally attested only with 2nd person and 1st person plural performers. When non-directive forms referring to the present or the past are used to refer to a desired (and hence unactualized) SoA it is the addressee that is entitled to draw the relevant inferential enrichments, because s/he necessarily knows that the desired SoA has not occurred yet and thus understands that the speaker's choice of a form referring to the present or the past is motivated by his/her high expectations of imminent actualization of the desired SoA.

Moreover, commands addressed to the addressee(s) or to the addressee(s) + the speaker often imply a displacement away from the place of the speech act in order to perform the order (e.g. '*go and catch it!*', '*let's go and catch it!*'); the same does not hold true for 3rd person performers, who might already be distant from the place where the directive speech act is uttered. The frequency of directive situations implying a displacement and the fact that addressees have direct access to the spatial deictic information of the speech act allow for the reinterpretation of the verb meaning 'go' in constructions [*go do X*] as a general, non-dislocative directive marker, as discussed in Section 3.1.1.1.

Directive speech acts addressed to 2nd person or 1st person plural performers thus share a number of properties, which make them possible bridgeheads for some diachronic pathways discussed above. However, they also show a number of differences, first and foremost with respect to which components of the directive situation are in focus and how the speech act is construed. For instance, directive situations with 1st person plural performers can be construed as complex events in which (i) the addressee is first ordered to join the speaker ('*come!*') and then (ii) the intention to bring about the desired SoA together is expressed. In such a twofold structure, COME tends to be reinterpreted as a directive marker (see Section 3.1.1.2).

Furthermore, if the set of performers includes the speaker and the addressee, the speech act has a future-projecting, auto-prescriptive component, which focuses on the speaker's expectations that s/he will bring about the desired SoA together with the addressee. The fact that the cooptation of future forms as directives seems to start from 1st person plural future forms is therefore perfectly comprehensible: orders addressed to the speaker + the addressee are the only directive speech acts in which the speaker has some control over the actualization of the order and this allows him/her to use a future form to evoke the request through metonymy (section 3.2.2).

If the intended P is a third party (3rd person directive) the speech act is an exhortation to somebody who is typically absent from the communicative situation to bring about the desired SoA, and the directive situation may be construed in at least two different ways, depending on the role assigned to the addressee. In case the appeal to the addressee is left off-stage, an indirect speech act can be used consisting of the expression of the speaker's wish that the third party realizes the SoA. Such an indirect speech act is encoded by optative constructions across languages, i.e. by constructions that are devoted to the expression of the speaker's wish. Optative constructions may be coopted to serve a directive function because they metonymically evoke the abstract cognitive schema of orders and requests, as argued by Thornburg & Panther (1997). The fact that this happens more easily when the performer is a third party can be explained by invoking the functional contiguity between optative situations and directive situations addressed to third person performers (in which

the control of the communicative dyad over the realization of the order is quite low with respect to other directive situations). On the other hand, in case the appeal to the addressee to help make the desired SoA true is explicit, the speech act may be construed as a complex *causative/permissive* event, in which the addressee is ordered (*let!*, *say!*, etc.) to make/allow the third party to bring about the desired SoA. The addressee may be simply a transmitter or may have some authority over the performer, which explains why imperative of causative verbs grammaticalize into directive markers starting from 3rd person directives (3.1.2).

In other words, person proves to be a crucial functional factor both in synchrony, distinguishing the various types of directive speech acts, and in diachrony, determining which performers are more likely to act as bridgeheads in diachronic processes of grammaticalization and cooptation. Once a given source construction acquires a directive function starting from a given performer, it may then extend to other persons along non-random clines (cf. also van der Auwera *et al.* 2003), following the paths summarized in Table 2:

- <i>go</i>	> 2 nd person (motion or non-motion) directive, 1 st person plural (motion or non-motion) directive
- <i>past/present</i>	> 2 nd person directive, 1 st person plural directive
- <i>come</i>	> 1 st person plural directive
- <i>future</i>	> 1 st person plural > 3 rd person > 2 nd person plural > 2 nd person singular directive
- <i>optative</i>	> 3 rd person directive > 1 st person plural directive > 2 nd person directive
- <i>causative</i>	> 3 rd person directive > 1 st person plural directive > 2 nd person directive

Table 2. *The role of person in the development of directive constructions.*

The data discussed above show that the identity of the performer and the tendency to use indirect speech acts to convey orders may conspire together towards the emergence and entrenchment of new directive strategies. Furthermore, in section 3.3 we discussed a number of recurrent pathways that apparently do not correlate with specific persons, but rather highlight the tendency to avoid face-threatening acts in directive situations by softening the face-threatening component and leaving it unexpressed, as an up-hanging inference in the background.

The insubordination cases discussed in section 3.3 are indeed the result of what Evans (2007: 387) effectively describes as putting the face-threatening act ‘off the record’. The avoidance of the threat is perceived as a successful strategy which increases the manipulative force of the speech act in a socially acceptable way. Although insubordination patterns appear to be triggered by reasons of politeness, this does not mean that the resulting constructions necessarily show a reduced degree of threat and authority. As Evans (2007: 393) correctly observes, there are oversimplifications connected to the idea that insubordinated directives “are favoured in requests for reasons of politeness by virtue of playing down the explicit interpersonal control made evident in imperatives and other direct commands”. Indeed, once the directive function of an insubordinated strategy is conventionalized, its pragmatic connotations depend on a number of language-specific and culture-specific factors. In some cases (as, e.g., in the Italian free-standing infinitives exemplified in (52)) the insubordinated directive may even sound more imperious than other imperative constructions of the same language.

The diachronic pathways discussed in section 3 can also provide an explanation for the variation attested at the synchronic level under at least two respects. First of all, as widely exemplified throughout the paper, directive situations are most frequently coded by means of different strategies depending on the person of the performer, to such an extent that different labels are often used in descriptive grammars, such as imperative, hortative, jussive, etc. Yet, there are also several languages in which a unified directive paradigm exists (cf. van der Auwera *et al.* 2003, 2005), and this points to the fact that a functional core common to all the directive situations can be identified, in spite of the diversity existing between directive speech acts addressed to different persons.

The analysis of the diachronic sources of directives can shed some light on the reasons motivating both the use of different forms encoding different directive situations, and, at the same time, their unified perception as different sub-cases of the same functional domain. On the one hand, the properties differentiating directive situations addressed to different performers and the crucial role of person are one (perhaps not the less important) motivation for the variation attested synchronically. On the other hand, the regular diachronic paths through which a given directive form may gradually extend across persons (see Table 2) prove the existence of a unified directive functional domain. The synchronic cross-linguistic and intra-linguistic variation attested in the coding of directives may therefore be ascribed, at least partly, to the existence of different diachronic paths that start from different sources and have the potential for extending to the whole directive domain to different degrees.

Caterina Mauri
Dipartimento di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata
Università di Pavia
Corso Strada Nuova 65, I-27100, Pavia
caterina.mauri@unipv.it

Andrea Sansò
Dipartimento di Diritto, Economia e Culture
Università dell'Insubria
Via S. Abbondio, 9 – I-22100 Como
andrea.sanso@uninsubria.it

Acknowledgements

This paper is the result of joint work by the two authors. Caterina Mauri has written Sections 1, 3.1.1.2, 3.1.2, and 4; Andrea Sansò has written Sections 2, 3.1.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5. The bulk of this paper has grown out of a seminar at the Department of Linguistics of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology at Leipzig (February 2008). We wish to thank Martin Haspelmath for providing us with an ideal research environment and for giving us the occasion to present our on-going research. Parts of this paper were also presented at various conferences (NRG 4, Leuven 2008; SWL 3, Berlin 2008; 41st Annual Meeting of the SLE, Forlì 2008). We thank the audience at these conferences for many insightful comments and remarks. Johan van der Auwera, Alexandra Aikhenvald, Sonia Cristofaro, and two anonymous referees read and discussed various parts of this article at different stages, and were very helpful in improving the argumentation and the discussion of data. The usual disclaimers apply.

Appendix – Language Sample

The classification is based on the *World Atlas of Language Structures* (Haspelmath et al. 2005). **Families** are in bold, **GENERA** in small capitals.

Afro-Asiatic: BERBER: Tamasheq; EASTERN CUSHITIC: Dhaasanac, Somali; BIU MANDARA: Hdi, Mina; WEST CHADIC: Hausa; SEMITIC: Arabic (Cairene), Hebrew (Modern), Maltese. **Algic**: ALGONQUIAN: Ojibwa (Severn), Passamaquoddy-Maliseet. **Altaic**: MONGOLIC: Mangghuer; TURKIC: Kazakh, Turkish, Tuvan; TUNGUSIC: Even, Manchu, Udihe. **Andamanese**: SOUTH ANDAMANES: Önge. **Arauan**: Jarawara, Paumarí. **Araucanian**: Mapudungun. **Arawak**: Apurinã, Baure, Tariana. **Australian**: PAMA-NYUNGAN: Arabana, Diyari, Gumbaynggir; Kugu Nganhcara, Kuku Yalanji, Nyangumarta, Pitjantjatjara, Pitta-Pitta; GUNWINYGIC: Bininj Gun-Wok; NUNGGUBUYU: Nunggubuyu; YANGMANIC: Wardaman; GAAGUDJU: Gaagudju; LIMILNGAN: Limilngan; TANGKIC: Kayardild, Yukulta; WEST BARKLY: Jingulu. **Austro-Asiatic**: MUNDA: Santali; ASLIAN: Jahai; VIET-MUONG: Vietnamese. **Austronesian**: SUNDIC: Javanese, Madurese, Mualang; SULAWESI: Tukang Besi; MESO-PHILIPPINE: Tagalog; NORTHERN PHILIPPINE: Yami; YAPESE: Yapese; OCEANIC: Araki, Erromangan, Efate (South), Hoava, Kokota, Kwamera, Maori, Mwotlap, Patep, Tawala, Tokelauan, Toqabaqita, Tuvaluan; SOUTH HALMAHERA – WEST NEW GUINEA: Taba; CENTRAL MALAYO-POLYNESIAN: Leti, Tetun (Fehan); TSOUC: Tsou. **Barbacoan**: Awa Pit. **Bosavi**: Edolo. **Caddoan**: Caddo. **Cariban**: Apalai, Trio. **Chapacura-Wanhan**: Wari[?]. **Chibchan**: ARUAK: Ika; TALAMANCA: Teribe. **Chukotko-Kamchatkan**: NORTHERN CHUKOTKO-KAMCHATKAN: Chukchi. **Dravidian**: CENTRAL DRAVIDIAN: Kolami; SOUTH-CENTRAL DRAVIDIAN: Koṇḍa; SOUTHERN DRAVIDIAN: Kodava, Malayalam, Tamil. **Eskimo-Aleut**: Kangiryuarmiut. **Guahiban**: Guahibo (Sikuani). **Guaicuruan**: Mocoí. **Hmong-Mien**: Mien. **Hokan**: YUMAN: Tiipay (Jamul). **Indo-European**: ALBANIAN: Albanian; ARMENIAN: Armenian; BALTIC: Latvian; CELTIC: Scottish Gaelic; GERMANIC: German; INDIC: Bagri, Oriya; IRANIAN: Zazaki; ROMANCE: Italian, Mesocan, Portuguese, Romanian; SLAVIC: Russian, Upper Sorbian. **Iroquoian**: NORTHERN IROQUOIAN: Tuscarora. **Kartvelian**: Laz. **Keresan**: Laguna Keres. **Khoisan**: NORTHERN KHOISAN: Ju|'hoan. **Kiowa-Tanoan**: Jemez. **Lower Mamberamo**: Warembori. **Macro-Ge**: GE-KAINGANG: Apinayé. **Marind**: SOUTH BIRD'S HEAD: Inanwatan. **Mayan**: Sipakapense Maya, Tzutujil, Yucatec. **Mixe-Zoque**: Chimalapa Zoque (San Miguel). **Muskogean**: Koasati. **Na-Dene**: ATHAPASKAN: Dëne Sų-łiné, Slave. **Nakh-Daghestanian**: AVAR-ANDIC-TSEZIC: Chamalal, Godoberi, Hunzib, Khwarshi; LAK-DARGWA: Icarí Dargwa; LEZGIC: Lezgian. **Nambikuaran**: Nambikuara, Sabanê. **Niger-Congo**: NORTHERN ATLANTIC: Noon; SOUTHERN ATLANTIC: Kisi; BANTOID: Babungo, Chichewa, Chingoni, Kitalinga, Lingala, Makonde; PLATOID: Fyem; EASTERN MANDE: Boko; KWA: Ewe. **Nilo-Saharan**: KUNAMA: Kunama; BONGO BAGIRMI: Mbay; NILOTIC: Lango, Pokot. **Northwest Caucasian**: Abkhaz. **Oto-Manguean**: MIXTECAN: Chalcatongo Mixtec. **Penutian**: SAHAPTIAN: Nez Perce. **Quechuan**: Quechua (Ecuadorean). **Salishan**: CENTRAL SALISH: Upriver Halkomelem; INTERIOR SALISH: Lillooet. **Sepik**: EAST SEPIK: Manambu; YELLOW RIVER: Namia. **Sino-Tibetan**: CHINESE: Cantonese; BODIC: Athpare, Limbu, Manange, Newari (Dolakha), Sherpa, Tamang, Thakali; KUKI-CHIN-NAGA: Ao (Mongsen), Hakha Lai, Meithe; RGYALRONG: Caodeng rGyalrong; QIANGIC: Qiang; TANIC: Galo. **Solomons East-Papuan**: Bilua, Lavukaleve. **Tacanan**: Cavineña. **Tai-Kadai**: KAM-TAI: Lao. **Totonacan**: Misantla Totonac. **Torricelli**: KOMBIO-ARAPESH: Bukiyip. **Trans-New Guinea**: AWJUDUMUT: Korowai; BINANDEREAN: Korafe, Suená; CHIMBU: Golin; DANI: Dani (Lower Grand Valley); KOIARIAN: Koiari; KUTUBUAN: Fasu; MADANG: Kobon, Tauya. **Tucanoan**: Siona. **Tupian**: TUPI-GUARANI: Tapiete. **Uralic**: FINNIC: Finnish; UGRIC: Hungarian, Vogul (Mansi). **Uto-Aztecan**: AZTECAN: Pipil; NUMIC: Northern Paiute, Timbisha; TAKIC: Cupeño. **Wappo-Yukian**: WAPPO: Wappo. **Yukaghir**: Kolyma Yukaghir. **Isolates**: Ainu, Basque, Burushaski, Chitimacha, Japanese, Korean, Kusunda, Kwaza, Mosestén, Movima, Nivkh, Puinave, Urarina.

References

- Agbodjo, Kofi H., and Viktor P. Litvinov. 2001. Imperative sentences in Ewe. In: Xrakovskij (ed.), 390-403.
Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., and Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial Verb Constructions. A Cross-linguistic Typology*, 1-68. Oxford: Oxford University Press

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ameka, Felix K. 2008. Aspect and modality in Ewe: A survey. In: Ameka, Felix K., and Mary E. Kropp Dakubu (eds.), *Aspect and modality in Kwa languages*, 135-194. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ammann, Andreas, and Johan van der Auwera. 2004. Complementizer-headed main clauses for volitional moods in the languages of South-Eastern Europe: A Balkanism?. In: Mišeska Tomić, Olga (ed.), *Balkan syntax and semantics*, 293-314. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Anderson, Ralph D. 1963. A grammar of Laz. PhD Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Artiagoitia, Xabier. 2003a. Complementation. In: Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 634-656.
- Artiagoitia, Xabier. 2003b. Adjunct subordination. In: Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), 711-761.
- Asher, Nicholas, and Alex Lascarides. 2001. Indirect speech acts. *Synthese* 128: 183-228.
- Barrett, Edward R. 1999. A grammar of Sipakapense Maya. PhD Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Bat-El, Outi. 2002. True Truncation in Colloquial Hebrew Imperatives. *Language* (78): 651-683.
- Birjulin, Leonid A., and Viktor S. Xrakovskij. 2001. Imperative sentences: theoretical problems. In: Xrakovskij (ed.), 3-50.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buchholz, Oda, and Wilfried Fiedler. 1987. *Albanische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.
- Bybee, Joan. 1998. "Irrealis" as a grammatical category. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40 (2): 257-271.
- Bybee, Joan. 2006. *Frequency of use and the organization of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar. Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bybee, Joan, and Suzanne Fleischman (eds.) 1995. *Modality in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bystrov Igor S., and Nonna V. Stankevič. 2001. Imperative in Vietnamese. In: Xrakovskij (ed.), 461-474.
- Cassidy, Frederic G. 2007. *Jamaica Talk. Three hundred years of the English language in Jamaica*. Kingston: University of West Indies Press.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1995. The realis-irrealis distinction in Caddo, the Northern Iroquoian languages, and English. In: Bybee & Fleischman (eds.), 349-365.
- Chung, Sandra, and Alan Timberlake. 1985. Tense, aspect, and mood. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, Vol. 3: *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, 202-258. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, Herbert H. 1979. Responding to indirect speech acts. *Cognitive Psychology* 11: 430-477.
- Coupe, Alec. 2008. *A grammar of Mongsen Ao*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Craig, Colette G. 1991. Ways to go in Rama: a case study in polygrammaticalization. In: Traugott, Elizabeth C., and Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 455-492. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. To appear. Descriptive notions vs. grammatical categories: unrealized states of affairs and 'irrealis'. *Language Sciences*.
- Croft, William. 2000. *Explaining Language Change*. London: Longman.
- Croft, William. 2010. The origins of grammaticalization in the verbalization of experience. *Linguistics* 48 (1): 1-48.
- Crowley, Terry. 1998. *An Erromangan (Sye) grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Curnow, Timothy J. 1997. A grammar of Awa Pit (Cuaiquer): An indigenous language of south-western Colombia. PhD Dissertation, Australian National University.
- Danielsen, Swintha. 2007. *Baure. An Arawak language of Bolivia*. Leiden: CNWS Publications.
- Dasgupta, Dipankar, and Sameer R. Sharma. 1982. *A hand book of Onge language*. Calcutta: Anthropological Survey of India, Government of India.
- de Haan, Ferdinand. To appear. Irrealis: fact or fiction? *Language Sciences*.
- Diewald, Gabriele. 2002. A model for relevant types of contexts in grammaticalization. In: Wischer & Diewald (eds.), 103-120.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 2004. *Australian languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dobrushina, Natalia, and Valentin Goussev. 2005. Inclusive imperatives. In: Filimonova, Elena (ed.), *Clusivity. Typology and case studies of the inclusive-exclusive distinction*, 179-211. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dobrushina, Natalia, Valentin Goussev, and Johan van der Auwera. 2005. The optative. In: Haspelmath *et al.* (eds.), 298-301.
- Donohue, Mark. 1999. *A grammar of Tukang Besi*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dutton, Tom. 1996. *Koiari*. Munich: LINCOM Europa.
- Eades, Diana. 1979. Gumbaynggir. In: Dixon, Robert M. W., and Barry J. Blake (eds.), *The Handbook of Australian Languages*, Vol. I, 245-361. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Essegbey, James. 2004. Auxiliaries in serializing languages: on COME and GO verbs in Sranan and Ewe. *Lingua* 114: 473-494.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In: Nikolaeva, Irina (ed.), *Finiteness. Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 366-431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1995. A functional theory of complementizers. In: Bybee & Fleischmann (eds.), 473-502.

- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt, and Bill Jirsa. 2006. The Principle of Indirect Means in language use and language structure. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (4): 513-542.
- Genetti, Carol. 2007. *A grammar of Dolakha Newar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Givón, Talmy. 1981. Typology and functional domains. *Studies in Language* 5: 163-193.
- Givón, Talmy. 2000. Internal reconstruction: as method, as theory. In: Gildea, Spike (ed.), *Reconstructing grammar: comparative linguistics and grammaticalization*, 107-159. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Glinert, Lewis. 1989. *The grammar of Modern Hebrew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, Herbert P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In: Cole, Peter, and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Grice, Herbert P. 1989. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hajek, John. 2006. Serial verbs in Tetun Dili. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., and Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial Verb Constructions. A Cross-linguistic Typology*, 239-253. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, Mark. 2001. *A grammar of Limilngan, a language of the Mary River Region, Northern Territory, Australia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The grammaticization of passive morphology. *Studies in Language* 14: 25-72.
- Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil, and Bernard Comrie (eds.). 2005. *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd. 2002. On the role of context in grammaticalization. In: Ilse Wischer, and Gabriele Diewald (eds.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, 83-101. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hercus, Louise A. 1994. *A grammar of the Arabana-Wangkangurru language, Lake Eyre basin, South Australia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Hewitt, George. 1995. *Georgian*. London: Routledge.
- Hofling, Charles A., and Fernando L. Ojeda. 1994. Yucatec Maya imperatives and other manipulative language. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 60 (3): 272-294.
- Hopper Paul J., and Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hualde, José Ignacio, and Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.). 2003. *A grammar of Basque*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jaggard, Philip J. 2001. *Hausa*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- König, Ekkehard, and Peter Siemund. 2007. Speech act distinctions in grammar. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description*, Vol. 1: *Clause structure*, 2nd ed., 276-324. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuteva, Tania. 2001. *Auxiliation: An enquiry into the nature of grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 2008. *A grammar of Toqabaqita*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lumien van Klinken, Catherine. 1999. *A grammar of the Fehan dialect of Tetun*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Magomedova, Patimat T. 2004. Chamalal. In: Job, Michael (ed.), *The indigenous languages of the Caucasus*, Vol. 3: *The North East Caucasian Languages, Part 1*, 1-65. Ann Arbor: Caravan Books.
- Malchukov, Andrej. 2001. Imperative constructions in Even. In: Xrakovskij (ed.), 159-180.
- Malygina, Ljudmila V. 2001. Imperative sentences in Modern Hebrew. In: Xrakovskij (ed.), 268-299.
- Mauri, Caterina, and Andrea Sansò. To appear. The reality status of directives and its coding across languages. *Language Sciences*.
- Merlan, Francesca. 1994. *A grammar of Wardaman*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1995. On the relativity of irrealis. In: Bybee & Fleischman (eds.), 367-388.
- Mosegaard Hansen, Maj-Britt. 2008. *Particles at the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface: Synchronic and Diachronic Issues. A Study with Special reference to the French Phasal Adverbs*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Neukom, Lukas, and Maniddepa Patnaik. 2003. *A grammar of Oriya*. Arbeiten des Seminars für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Zürich.
- Nguyễn, Đình-Hoà. 1997. *Vietnamese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nicolle, Steve. 2007. The grammaticalization of tense markers: A pragmatic reanalysis. *Cahiers Chronos* 17: 47-65.
- Noonan, Michael. 1985. Complementation. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, 42-140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Obata, Kazuko. 2003. *A grammar of Bilua, a Papuan language of the Solomon Islands*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Oyharçabal, Beñat. 2003. Tense, aspect and mood. In: Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina, 249-284.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe, and Linda Thornburg. 1998. A cognitive approach to inferencing in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30: 755-769.
- Pensalfini, Rob. 2003. *A grammar of Jingulu, An Aboriginal language of the Northern Territory*, Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Podlesskaya, Vera I. 2006. Auxiliation of 'give' verbs in Russian. Discourse evidence for grammaticalization. In: Tsunoda, Tasaku, and Taro Kageyama (eds.), *Voice and grammatical relations. In Honor of Masayoshi Shibatani*, 271-298. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Post, Mark. 2008. A grammar of Galo. PhD Dissertation, Research Center for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University.
- Rice, Keren. 1989. *A grammar of Slave*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ringe, Don. 2003. Internal reconstruction. In: Joseph, Brian D., and Richard D. Janda (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, 244-261. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schalley, Ewa. 2008. Imperatives. A typological approach. PhD Dissertation, University of Antwerp.
- Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten. 2009. *A Typology of Purpose Clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John R. 1975. Indirect speech acts. In: Cole, Peter, and Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, 59–82. New York: Academic Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi, and Prasant Pardeshi. 2001. The causative continuum. In: Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.), *The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation*, 85-126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Spatar, Natalja M. 1997. Imperative constructions in Cambodian. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 27: 119-27.
- Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol. 2000. A construction-based approach to indirect speech acts. In: Panther, Klaus-Uwe, and Linda Thornburg (eds.), *Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing*, 105-126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tavangar, Mohammad, and Manoochehr Amouzadeh. 2006. Deictic projection: An inquiry into the future-oriented past tense in Persian. *Studia Linguistica* 60 (1): 97-120.
- Tavangar, Mohammad, and Manoochehr Amouzadeh. 2009. Subjective modality and tense in Persian. *Language Sciences* 31: 853-873.
- Thieberger, Nicholas A. 2004. Topics in the grammar and documentation of South Efate, an Oceanic language of Central Vanuatu. PhD Dissertation, University of Melbourne.
- Thornburg, Linda, and Klaus-Uwe Panther. 1997. Speech act metonymies. In: Liebert, Wolf-Andreas, Gisela Redeker, and Linda Waugh (eds.), *Discourse and perspective in cognitive linguistics*, 205-219. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2003. From subjectification to intersubjectification. In: Hickey, Raymond (ed.), *Motives for Language Change*, 124-139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2004. Historical pragmatics. In: Horn, Lawrence R., and Gregory Ward (eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics*, 538-561. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2010. Dialogic motivations for syntactic change. In: Cloutier, Robert A., Anne Marie Hamilton-Brehm, and William Kretschmar (eds.), *Variation and Change in English Grammar and Lexicon*, 11-26. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C., and Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van der Auwera, Johan, Nina Dobrushina, and Valentin Goussev. 2003. A semantic map for Imperative-Hortatives. In: Willems, Dominique, Bart Defrancq, Timothy Coleman, and Dirk Noël (eds.), *Contrastive Analysis in Language. Identifying linguistic units of comparison*, 44-68. New York: Palgrave.
- van der Auwera, Johan, and Martine Taeymans. 2004. Let's, in English and Dutch. In: Bergh, Gunnar, Jennifer Herri-man, and Mats Möbärg (eds.), *An International Master of Syntax and Semantics. Papers presented to Aimo Sep-pänen on the occasion of his 75th birthday*, 239-247. Göteborg: University Press.
- van der Auwera, Johan, Nina Dobrushina, and Valentin Goussev. 2005. Imperative-Hortative systems. In: Haspelmath et al. (eds.), 294-297.
- van der Auwera, Johan, Andrej Malchukov, and Ewa Schalley. 2009. Thoughts on (im)perfective imperatives. In: Helmbrecht, Johannes, Yoko Nishina, Yong-Min Shin, Stavros Skopeteas, and Elizabeth Verhoeven (eds.), *Form and Function in Language Research. Papers in Honour of Christian Lehmann*, 93-106. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- van Driem, George. 1987. *A grammar of Limbu*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- van Engelenhoven Aone, and Catherine Williams-van Klinken. 2005. Tetun and Leti. In: Adelaar, Alexander, and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.), *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 735-768. London: Routledge.
- Vanhove, Martine. 2000. Future, injunctive and purpose subordinating conjunctions. The case of Maltese *ħalli*, *ħa* and *biex*. In: Mifsud, Manwel (ed.), *Proceedings of the Third International Conference of AĊDA, Association Internazionale de Dialectologie Arabe* (Malta 29 March - 2 April 1998), 235-240. Malta: Salesian Press.
- Veselinova, Ljuba N. 2007. Suppletion from a typological perspective. In: Miestamo, Matti, and Bernhard Wälchli (eds.), *New challenges in typology. Broadening the horizons and redefining the foundations*, 127-151. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Watters, David E. 2006. Notes on Kusunda Grammar. *Himalayan Linguistics Archive* 3: 1-182.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1991. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Williams-van Klinken Catherine, John Hajek, and Rachel Nordlinger. 2002. *Tetun Dili. A grammar of an East Timorese language*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Wischer, Ilse, and Gabriele Diewald (eds.). 2002. *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.). 2001. *Typology of imperative constructions*. Munich: Lincom Europa.