

**Overview** This talk investigates the embedding of imperatives under the reportative evidential *je* and the verb of saying *he'i* in Mbyá (Tupí-Guaraní), a rare phenomenon cross-linguistically (see Aikhenvald 2005). Such constructions are interpreted as commands on behalf of another person (neither speaker nor addressee), yet they are not quotations, as evidenced by the lack of indexical shifting. It is argued that *je* and *he'i* are speech act modifiers conveying that the person that is responsible for the embedded speech act is not the speaker.

**Imperatives in Mbyá** are expressed with a special paradigm of person agreement on verbs. Characteristic features of imperatives (see Kaufman 2012) are (i) a presupposition that the speaker has the authority required to carry out the command, see (1), (ii) a presupposition that the speaker does not know in advance that the command will not be followed, see (2) and (iii) a presupposition that the speaker approves of the command, see (3):

- (1) A: T-ere-o che-ro gui. B:# Añete-'ỹ. Nd-a-a-i va'erã.  
 Imp-A2-go my-house from. true-neg A3-neg-A1-go-neg have-to  
 'Go away from my house!' '# That's not true. I don't have to go away.'
- (2) A-ikuaa nd-ere-o mo'ã-i-a. # T-ere-o! (3) A-ipota re-pyta. # Tereo!  
 A1-know neg-A2-go fut-neg-nlz imp-A2-go A1-wish A2-stay imp-A2-go  
 'I know you won't go (away). # Go (away)!' 'I wish you would stay. # Go (away)!'

**Reportative evidentiality and verb of saying** The particle *je* is used to express reportative evidentiality. A proposition *p* modified by *je* (henceforth '*p je*') conveys that the speaker heard from someone else that the proposition is true. *Je* is an illocutionary operator rather than a modal operator (see Matthewson et al. 2007), as shown by the fact that a speaker can assert *p je* even though she believes that *p* is false, as in (5). This is a hallmark of illocutionary evidentials, (see Faller 2002). Moreover, *je* scopes over negation and cannot be semantically (or syntactically) embedded in complements of verbs of attitude report (*-ovia*, 'believe') and antecedents of conditionals, which are necessary (though not sufficient) properties of illocutionary evidentials.

- (4) A: Aureliano o-ĩ je Aristobulo py.  
 Aureliano A3-be JE Aristobulo in  
 'Aureliano is in Aristobulo [I heard].'
- (5) Maria omenda je, va'eri a-ikuaa n-o-menda-i-a.  
 Maria A3-marry JE but A1-known neg-A3-marry-neg-comp  
 'Maria is married [I heard], but I know she isn't married.'

The verb of saying *he'i* can be used to make direct or indirect reports. When making indirect reports, *he'i* can be used sentence initially, the complementizer *-a* must be suffixed to the main verb of its complement, and indexicals are not shifted, see (6). When making direct reports, *he'i* must be used sentence finally, the complementizer *-a* is not used and indexicals are interpreted with respect to the context in which the reported sentence was asserted, see (7):

- (6) A: He'i a-ipota-a cho'o.  
 A3.say A1-like-comp meat  
 'He said that I like meat.'
- (7) A: "A-ipota cho'o" he'i.  
 A1-like meat A3.say  
 "'I like meat", he said'

**Embedding Imperatives** Imperatives can be embedded under *je*. In that case, the speaker reports that another person (neither speaker nor addressee) commanded the addressee to perform the action described by the sentence. Contrary to unreported imperatives, the speaker can express his desire that the addressee do not carry out the order, see (8). Note that indexicals (including 1st and 2nd person pronouns and locative adverbs) are not shifted in these constructions. Imperatives can also be embedded under *he'i*, in which case the authority underlying command is shifted to the subject of the matrix verb. *He'i* is used sentence initially, and indexicals are not shifted, which indicates that this is not a quotation. The speaker can express his desire that the

addressee do not carry it the order, see (9). Note that the complementizer *-a* cannot be used on the embedded verb.

(8) E-me'ẽ je chevy pe ka'ygua, va'eri nd-a-i-pota-i.  
 imp-give JE me.obl to mate, but neg-A1-want-neg  
 '[She/he said] that you must give me the mate, but I don't want it.'

(9) He'i e-me'ẽ chevy pe ka'ygua, va'eri nd-a-i-pota-i.  
 A3.say imp-give JE me.obl to mate, but neg-A1-want-neg  
 'She/he said that you must give me the mate, but I but I don't want it.'

**Analysis** Linguistic expressions are evaluated with respect to a context of utterance *c* (which determines at least a speaker  $c_s$  and an addressee  $c_a$ ) and a world-time index *i*. Propositions are properties of world-time indices. Following Krifka ('Embedding Speech Acts', t.a.), LFs are headed by a ForceP, which determines the type of speech act that the LF can be used to perform. A ForceP is headed by a speech act operator, such as ASSERT and DIRECT (for imperatives). I simplify the analysis here for ease of presentation:

(10)  $\llbracket \text{ASSERT} \rrbracket^c = \lambda p.\lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda i.x$  has assertive commitments with respect to *p* towards *y* in *i*

(11)  $\llbracket \text{DIRECT} \rrbracket^c = \lambda p.\lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda i.x$  has directive commitments with respect to *p* towards *y* in *i*

The second argument of a ForceP head must be a rigid designator of the speaker  $c_s$ , and the third argument must be a rigid designator of the addressee  $c_a$ . This is a syntactic stipulation. The complete ForceP determines what kind of speech act the sentence can be used to perform. I argue that *je* is a speech act modifier. Given a speech act operator *P* as input, it outputs a speech act operator *Q* such that  $Q(p)(x)(y)(i)$  is true iff there is a *z* different from *x* such that  $P(p)(z)(y)(i)$  is true. In other words, *je* shifts the person that is responsible for the speech act to some individual other than the speaker. This explains why the speaker is not responsible for imperatives embedded under *je*. Note however that any indexical that occurs inside the IP, e.g. first person pronouns, is not shifted and has its normal reference. *Je* also encodes the source of evidence of the resulting speech act (hearsay). This is not represented in (12) for reasons of space, but see Faller (2002). The verb of saying *he'i* is ambiguous between a proposition embedding  $he'i_1$  and a speech act embedding  $he'i_2$ .  $he'i_2$  selects a speech act operator *P*, a proposition *p* and a subject *x*, and outputs a proposition true at an index *i* iff *x* has P-commitments with respect to *p* towards the addressee  $c_a$  in *i*. This predicts that the first person form  $ha'e_2$  of the verb  $he'i_2$  can be used to report orders that the speaker herself produced ( $Ha'e_2 eme'ẽ ka'ygua$ , 'I said give the mate'), contrary to *je*. This prediction is borne out.

(12)  $\llbracket je \rrbracket^c = \lambda P.\lambda p.\lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda i.\exists z[z \neq x \wedge P(p)(z)(y)(i)]$

(13)  $\llbracket he'i_2 \rrbracket^c = \lambda P.\lambda p.\lambda x.\lambda i.P(p)(x)(c_a)(i)$

As noted, the complementizer *-a* cannot be used with  $he'i_2$ . Similar facts have been observed in English with embedded imperatives (*Mary said call John*), see Crnic and Trinh (2009), and in German, see Krifka (t.a.). Krifka argues that this is because the complement of verbs of saying that embed speech act is not a CP but a root clause, i.e a ForceP. In the present analysis,  $he'i_2$  does not select a ForceP but rather a ForceP head and an IP. Insofar as *-a* is a complementizer, its absence is predicted nonetheless.

**Other theories of imperatives** I will argue that these facts are problematic for Portner's (2007, 2011) theory of imperatives, according to which imperatives denote properties that are added to the To-Do-List of the addressee by a rule of discourse update, predicting no embedded imperatives. This raises the question whether the benefits of Portner's theory can be integrated to a theory using speech acts operators. I will also argue that while Crnic and Trinh's (2009) analysis of embedded imperatives in Kaufmann's framework can account for embedding under  $he'i$  in Mbyá, it is less clear that it can deal with embedding under the evidential *je*.