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1. Aim, sample, definitions

Three basic questions:

(i) What is the reality status of directives?
(ii) What does the presence of (ir)realis markers in directives mean?
(iii) How relevant is realisness as such to the cross-linguistic coding of directive situations?

Sample → a typological sample of 180 languages (July 2008).

Definitions

• *Realisness*: a semantic dimension with at least two values,-REALIS and IRREALIS, defined, for the time being, in purely logical terms on the basis of the realization vs. non-realization of a given state of affairs (Givón 1984: 285ff.; Chung & Timberlake 1985: 241ff.; Mithun 1995; Elliott 2000).

--- Alternative views: realisness as a gradient (Foley & Van Valin 1984: 213); (ir)realis as (pragmatic) inference (Bendix 1998: 250ff.); realisness as a parameter relevant to the grammatical organization of the world’s languages (Chafe 1995).

• *The directive situation* will be defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ The SPEAKER wants a state of affairs to become true and conveys an appeal to the HEARER(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 hearer, (ii) with the speaker, (iii) with a third party or (iv) with any possible combination of (i)-(iii).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ The set of forms associated with this function will be called directives (= imperative-hortative system in van der Auwera et al. 2004; see also Birjulin & Xrakovskij 2001).
The most typical PERFORMERS are: the hearer (second person singular: 2), the hearer + a third party (second person plural: 2+3), the hearer + the speaker (first person plural inclusive: 1+2), and a third party (third person singular or plural: 3, 3+3).

-- Go away! (2, 2+3) ------ Let’s go! (1+2) ------ Let him/her/them go! (3, 3+3)

By definition, the hearer must be physically present when the appeal is uttered. In order to be successful, a directive situation minimally comprises the speaker and the hearer, who may or may not coincide with the performer. If the hearer does not coincide with the performer he/she may be intended as the mediator of the request/command.

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.

The desired SoA in directives has not occurred yet and hence is, in purely logical terms, irrealis. However, a directive situation is also deeply rooted in the deictic here-and-now in which the speech act takes place, and typically the speaker has high expectations as to the immediate fulfilment of his/her desire.

Is the logical irreality of the desired SoA mirrored in the cross-linguistic coding of directives? Or do instead the expectations as to the immediate fulfilment of the SoA play some role in grouping directives together with other realis situations?

2. Realis and irrealis markers in directives

A typological survey of directives in languages with overt (ir)realis markers shows that the picture is quite complex and hardly predictable. All the possibilities are attested:

- directives are treated as irrealis
- directives are treated as realis
- directives are insensitive to the realis/irrealis dichotomy
- different types of directives have different reality status

2.1. Irrealis markers

(1) Tsou (Austronesian, Tsouic; Zeitoun 2005: 279)

Basic dichotomy between a realis and an irrealis auxiliary. Besides conveying a range of (epistemic and deontic) modal meanings (see the box below), the irrealis auxiliary can occur in (affirmative and negative) directives. The irrealis auxiliary in second person directives does not carry any person marker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. mi-ta</th>
<th>etamaku</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV.R-3SG,NOM AV.smoke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He is smoking’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. te-to-n’a | mimo |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV.IRR-1PL,NOM-again AV:drink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Let’s have (another) drink’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. te | mimo | to | emi |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV.IRR AV:drink OBL</td>
<td>wine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Drink wine!’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other functions of the irrealis auxiliary in Tsou: (i) habitual; (ii) predictive future; (iii) hypothetical; (iv) counterfactual.
Languages using an irrealis marker for directives usually employ the very same form also for other future-projecting functions (future, optative, potential, etc.). In other words, the coding of directive situations is but one of the functions of structures with irrealis markers in these languages.

Problem: how can we be sure that the irrealis marker in these structures encodes directly the irreality of the desired SoA in a directive situation?

The presence of the irrealis marker could be (primarily) motivated by the other functions for which the structure is used (future, optative, potential, etc.). In other words, an originally future/optative/etc. structure marked as irrealis might have spread to other contexts such as the directive situation. If this was the case, is the irrealis marker directly connected to the logical irreality implied by the directive situation?

2.2. Realis markers

Realis subject prefixes: ku- (1sg); u- (2sg); no- (3); ko- (1paucal); to- (1pl); i- (2pl)
Irrealis subject prefixes: ku- (1sg); ko- (2sg); na- (3); ka- (1paucal); ta- (1pl); ki- (2pl)

Other functions of realis subject prefixes in Tukang Besi: (i) past; (ii) present/progressive; (iii) predictive future.

→ Distinction between realis and irrealis verbal inflectional clitics (VICs). 2nd person directives make use of the realis (future) VIC.

Other functions of the realis future VIC in Wari: predictive future.
(5) Caddo (Caddoan; Chafe 1995: 350, 358; Melnar 2004)

“Mood in the TAM system is divided into two superordinate categories, realis and irrealis. TAM markers that index a realis situation obligatorily occur with the realis set of pronominal prefixes” (Melnar 2004: 82)

There are six overt imperative morphemes co-occurring with the realis pronominal prefixes. In addition, “a realis verb construction that lacks … an overt tense or inflectional aspect suffix, but includes a second person agent, is interpreted as a command” (Melnar 2004: 87)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ďáyʔbah</td>
<td>hitciwthahsaʔ</td>
<td>cilbäwčah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yahʔ-yi=bah</td>
<td>hit#ci-binah-saʔ</td>
<td>ci-yi=bahw-čah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.AG.R-see</td>
<td>PST#1.AG.R-fight-IMPFV</td>
<td>1.AG.R-see-FUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Look at it!’</td>
<td>‘I fought’</td>
<td>‘I’ll look at it’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other functions of realis pronominal prefixes in Caddo: (i) present; (ii) past imperfective, (iii) past perfective, (iv) future.

Languages using a realis marker for directives usually employ the same form also for (on-going) present/progressive and/or immediate future situations.

| Problem: how can we be sure that the realis marker in these structures encodes directly the expectations as to the immediate fulfilment of the SoA in a directive situation? |
| o The presence of the realis marker could be (primarily) motivated by the other functions for which the structure is used (on-going activities, immediate future, etc.). A realis-marked structure with present/future semantics might have then spread to other contexts such as the directive situation. If this was the case, is the realis marker directly connected to the strong expectations as to the immediate fulfilment of the desired SoA in a directive situation? |

2.3. Both or none: directives out of the realis/irrealis dichotomy

(6) Caodeng rGyalrong (Sino-Tibetan, Tibeto-Burman, rGyalrong; Sun 2007)

“Imperatives and cohortatives (1st-person imperatives), which present events for immediate realization or participation by the addressee, are generally evaluated as realis in Caodeng” (Sun 2007: 808), while an irrealis marker is used for 3rd person directives, “which present propositions for action by a non-locutor” (Sun 2007: 810).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ɐ-vzər</td>
<td>rtənmuʔ</td>
<td>ɐ-tən</td>
<td>e-te-pədzə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-nejέja</td>
<td>pe-təsa</td>
<td>ɐ-tən</td>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG:POSS-side IMP-go.away</td>
<td>marriage do-1DL SFP</td>
<td>IMPFV-2-want</td>
<td>IRR1-IRR2-succeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Get away from me’</td>
<td>‘Let’s get married!’</td>
<td>‘Let her/him eat it!’</td>
<td>‘May whatever you wish for come true!’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) Bukiýip (Torricelli, Kombio-Arapesh; Conrad & Wogiga 1991: 18, 95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nabotik</td>
<td>kaman</td>
<td>nabotik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch-a-Ø-nú</td>
<td>ch-ú-naki</td>
<td>wo n-ú-naki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yesterday 3PL.MIX.SBJ-sbj-HIT-3SG.OBJ.M</td>
<td>tomorrow 3PL.MIX.SBJ-IRR-come</td>
<td>yesterday PST.NEG 3SG.M.SBJ-IRR-come PST.NEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.M.SBJ-R-hit 3SG.OBJ.M</td>
<td>‘They will come tomorrow.’</td>
<td>PST.NEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Yesterday they hit him, and he died.’</td>
<td>‘They will come tomorrow.’</td>
<td>‘Yesterday he didn’t come.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>IMP-go.out</td>
<td>Kwa-(taglú)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ‘Go out.’ | }
(8) Limilngan (Australian, Limilngan; Harvey 2001)

→ Two prefixes (a realis and an irrealis one) that combine with an array of tense/aspect suffixes (past imperfective, past perfective, future, present) yielding different meanings (past perfective/imperfective, counterfactual, negative past, negative present, negative future, apprehensive etc.)

→ A third prefix (labelled FUTURE, allomorphs: –i–, –in–) that combines with a future suffix yielding definite intention, obligation, desire, and hortative meanings (= directives for all persons except the 2nd singular).

→ The future suffix alone (allomorphs: –yuk, –k, –yi, …) conveys orders addressed to a 2nd person singular performer

a. langan ni-yuk
   meat cook-IMP(FUT)
   ‘Cook some meat!’

b. nginyi gurdumardi l-iny-i-ni-yuk
   2M catfish II<2M-FUT-cook-FUT
   ‘Are you going to cook catfish?’

c. anbayk Ø-um-in-mildinyu-k
   wind IV<1+2M-FUT-leave-FUT
   ‘Let us leave the wind / We will leave the wind’

d. ja-wi-k b-alkgan mimilung m-an-yi
   DEF-I-DIST 3i-small tucker III-FUT-eat
   ‘Let that kid eat the tucker! / That kid will eat the tucker!’

e. w-in-a-yi
   3i-FUT-go-FUT
   ‘Let him go / He will/should/must go’

f. ngiliyi da-na-k bi-rr-a-wa-yi
   dog DEF-II-DIST 2M<3-IRR-bite-FUT
   ‘That dog might bite you’

Limilngan Prefix-Suffix combinations in the Future domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Resulting meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>2nd person singular directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future/directive (except for second person singular)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Evitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) Tawala (Austronesian, Western Malayo-Polynesian, Oceanic; Ezard 1997)

→ Three morphologically distinct moods: realis (morphologically unmarked); irrealis (-ta-) and potential (-na-). The free form future tense marker apo is often used in conjunction with the potential mood to mark the future. The potential mood is also used to express directives (with 2nd person singular performers the subject prefix is often omitted):

a. meka i-#-nae?
   where 3SG-R-go NEG 3SG-IRR-go FUT 3SG-POT-go
   ‘Where has he gone?’ ‘He didn’t go’ ‘He will go’

b. ega i-ta-nae
   ‘He has gone’

c. apo i-na-nae
   ‘He will go’

d. o-na-lowo!
   2PL-POT-run 2SG-POT-run
   ‘Run away (you lot)!’

e. #-na-bulili
   ‘Run (fast)!’
3. Broadening the scope: the lesson of diachrony

What has been identified as a problem in the preceding sections might turn out to be a key to understanding:

(i) what languages code when they code the realisness of directives, and
(ii) to what extent the notion of realisness is relevant to the coding of directive situations.

Cases in which no (ir)realis markers are present and cases in which both realis and irrealis markers are possible (section 2.3) suggest that realisness is but one of the factors at play in the coding of the directive function, perhaps not even a central one.

Multifunctionality patterns (sections 2.1 and 2.2) point to possible diachronic extensions of a specific form to new functions (e.g. the presence of (ir)realis markers might be due to an originally optative or future strategy which has acquired also a directive function).

Why are directive situations coded as both realis and irrealis across languages? Two current explanations:

1. **Inherent hybridness** of directive situations: on the one hand the desired SoA has not occurred yet and has a clear future-projecting semantics, but on the other hand there may be a high expectation of immediate realization, which draws the SoA near to the here-and-now of the speech act.

   • Chafe (1995: 358): reality can be conceived of as a gradient, rather than as a binary dimension, and directives are located between the two extremes of realis and irrealis, because they “express ideas that are judged to be relatively more in accord with reality than, say, yes-no questions or negations. Speakers may have a relatively stronger expectations that commands will be obeyed or that predicted events will take place”

   • Mithun (1995: 377): the use of realis markers in directives might have to do with the high expectation of compliance that characterizes these situations. Speakers might intentionally mark commands as realis in order to convey a “strong certainty of their immediate realization”.

2. **Diachronic paths** behind the grammaticalization of directives.

   • Mithun (1995: 377, on Maricopa): “several kinds of diachronic developments could lead to a categorization of imperatives as Realis. One possible explanation could come from the order in which an emerging Irrealis form might be applied to new contexts over time”;

   • Chafe (1995: 359, on Caddo): “Imperatives and futures … may stem from a more ancient layer of Caddo morphology. Already entrenched in the language, they would then have failed to participate in the more recent grammaticalization of irreality in the pronominal prefixes”

→ Both Mithun and Chafe postulate the rather recent emergence of irrealis markers, which have not spread to all the typical irrealis domains yet.

**Our hypothesis**: What if the distribution of (ir)realis markers in directives was connected to particular paths of semantic change and to the specific sources of grammaticalization that characterize the emergence of directive constructions?

3.1. The sources of directive constructions

3.1.1. Paths of grammaticalization

The directive situation is a situation characterized by three main components:

1. the speaker wishes that a state of affairs become true;
the speaker conveys an appeal to the addressee(s) to *help make* this SoA true;
(3) the speaker *expects* the desired SoA to be brought about in the next future.

The paths of grammaticalization leading to directive constructions may be ascribed to three main types, which focus on the three components of the directive situation itself (see Mauri & Sansò 2008 for a detailed discussion):

*** TYPE A ***

The source of grammaticalization is a construction expressing the *wish* of the speaker that the desired SoA take place → it focuses on the speaker’s *wish* (component 1).

(I) *Optative > directive*

- Optative forms (i.e. forms encoding an **optative situation**, defined as a situation in which the speaker wishes that a SoA become true but does not convey any appeal to the hearer to help make this SoA true) are often attested in the expression of directive situations. Their directive use typically starts in those situations in which the speaker’s wish is focused on at the expenses of the appeal to the hearer. This normally happens when the performer of the action coincides with a *third party* (3rd persons), which is typically absent from the speaker’s here-and-now.
- Once the whole construction has been reinterpreted as directive, it may extend to 1st persons and even to 2nd persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTATIVE &gt; 3RD PERSON DIRECTIVE &gt; 1ST PERSON DIRECTIVE (&gt; 2ND PERSON DIRECTIVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(10) Kusunda (isolate; Watters 2006: 81-82)

→ The optative form *ə*-ge ‘may he do it’ grammaticalizes as a suffix which follows transitive verbs in directive constructions addressed to 3rd persons; the optative form *g*-ya ‘may he go’ grammaticalizes as a suffix which follows certain intransitive verbs in directive constructions addressed to 3rd persons.

a. *ə*-ge
   - make-OPT
   - ‘May he do it’

b. *pumba* *ə*-ge
   - OPT
   - ‘Let him beat it’

c. *g*-ya
   - 3-go.OPT
   - ‘May he go’

d. *bol*-gya
   - descend-OPT
   - ‘Let him descend!’

(II) **Compleitive subordination > directive**

- Compleitive clauses (i.e., subordinate clauses introduced by a complementizer) are often used as main clauses with directive function. This is a typical case 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 are those in which the ellipsed main clause expresses the speaker’s wish (“I wish that…”, “it would be nice if…”). Under this respect, this construction typically conveys an optative function. Once they come to be used as optative main clauses, insubordinated clauses expressing the speaker’s wish can spread to directive situations following the path already depicted for the development *optative > directive*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPLEITIVE CLAUSE &gt; OPTATIVE &gt; 3RD PERSON DIRECTIVE &gt; 1ST PERSON DIRECTIVE &gt; 2ND PERSON DIRECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(11) Koiari (Trans-New Guinea, Koiarian; Dutton 1996: 27, 38)

→ *Ene*, a complementizer, obligatorily introduces 3sg and 3pl forms of the “hortative” mood; the same hortative mood is used **without** the complementizer in orders addressed to the speaker + the hearer (1st person plural inclusive)
The source is a construction referring to a preliminary action which is necessary for the desired SoA to be brought about. This action may consist of a displacement (‘go’, ‘come’) or of a permission (‘let’) → it focuses on the appeal to the addressee to do something in order for the SoA to be brought about (component 2).

---

--- The source constructions belonging to this type include a directive form addressed to a 2nd person, which is then reanalyzed as a general directive marker.

(II) Go > directive

- When it grammaticalizes as a marker of the directive function, the directive form of ‘go’ typically starts from directive situations in which the performer moves away from the speaker. Proto-typically, it is a 2nd person performer that can be invited to move away from the here-and-now of the speech act in order about the desired state of affairs

GO (AND…) > 2ND PERSON (MOTION) DIRECTIVE > 2ND PERSON (SIMPLE) DIRECTIVE (> OTHER PERSONS’ DIRECTIVE)

(12) Baka (Niger-Congo, Adamawa-Ubangian; cited in Heine & Kuteva 2002: 160)

a. gɔ̀-ɛ na ja ndɔ́!
   go-IMP INF take banana
   ‘Go and fetch bananas!’

b. gɔ̀ ja ndɔ́!
   go take bananas
   ‘Fetch bananas!’

(13) Jingulu (Australian, West Barkly; Pensalfini 2003: 230-231)

Æ The irrealis marker -mi is the most common means of marking directive situations. There is another directive construction which is insensitive to the realis/irrealis distinction. In this construction, the imperative of motion -/yirri/ (lit. ‘go.IMP’) is used, mainly (but not exclusively) when the command involves motion away from the site of commanding (‘go and…!’).

a. jama-rni wilwili-kaji ya-ju karningka wirriyi-mi
   that-FOC hang-through 3SG-do lest fall-IRR
   ‘It’s hanging, swinging, might fall’

b. kalarra ngaja-mi
c. Ngibi-yirri
d. Ngabarnda ngibi-yirri
   west see-IRR hold-go.IMP shoulder have-go.IMP
   ‘Look west!’ ‘Take it!’ ‘Carry him on your shoulders!’

(IV) Come > directive

Æ The directive form of come typically grammaticalizes as a marker of the directive function in those situations in which the hearer is invited to move towards the speaker in order to undertake the desired action together with her/him. It is thus reinterpreted as a directive addressed to a 1st person plural inclusive.
COME[DIRECTIVE.2SG] (AND…) > 1ST PERSON PL.INCL. DIRECTIVE (> OTHER PERSONS’ DIRECTIVE)

(14) Tetun (Austronesian, Central Malayo-Polynesian; van Engelenhoven and Williams-van Klinken 2005: 753; Lumien van Klinken 1999: 208; Williams-van Klinken et al. 2002: 68)

a. maia ita hamulak
   come 1PL.INCL pray
   ‘Let’s pray.’

b. ema tene ita r-ak “maia ita bá neba”
   person invite 1PL.INCL 3PL-say come 1PL.INCL go there
   ‘People invite us saying “Let’s go over there”’

(V) Permissive > directive

- The directive form of *let* grammaticalizes as a marker of the directive function in those situations in which the hearer is ordered to allow someone else (typically a third party) to do something. The construction is reinterpreted as a directive construction addressed to 3rd persons, and may then spread to 1st person plural inclusive (1+2) directives, in which the original permissive meaning is incompatible with the inclusion of the hearer into the set of performers:

LET[DIRECTIVE.2SG/PL] (X[1PS,3PS] DO…) > 3RD PERSON DIRECTIVE > 1ST PERSON PL.INCL. DIRECTIVE (> 2ND PERSON)

(15) Maltese (Afro-Asiatic, Semitic; Vanhove 2000)

- “*ħalli* is originally the imperative singular form of the verb *ħalla*, ‘to let’, a verb still used in Maltese, the normal outcome of Arabic *xalla*” (Vanhove 2000: 235). *ha* is the shortened form of this verb, only possible with first person plural directives.

a. ħǎlli nk ámblu đa’kéyn awnék‘
   HORT we go on a little here
   ‘Let’s go on a little here’

b. ħǎlli yikber ikáin yāf‘
   HORT he grows up he is he knows
   ‘Let him grow up, he’ll know’

c. ħu mmá ātru ná ħa l-frančēzi
   HORT we despise a bit the-French.PL
   ‘Let’s despise the French a little’

*** TYPE C ***

The source is a construction which depicts the desired SoA as imminent. The imminence can be expressed by (i) a future/intentional strategy or by (ii) a present, progressive strategy ➔ type C focuses on the speaker’s intentions and expectations that the SoA will be brought about in the next future (component 3).

(VI) Future/intentional > directive

- Future and intentional forms are often attested in the expression of the directive function. Their directive use typically starts in those situations in which the intention to bring about the desired SoA is in focus, and this normally happens when the performer (or one of the performers) of the action coincides with the speaker. In specific contexts, the assertion of a future intention may be easily reinterpreted as having some directive illocutionary force: the whole construction is therefore reinterpreted as a directive construction addressed to 1st persons (characterized by a strong intentional/auto-prescriptive value). It may then be reanalyzed as a general directive strategy available for all persons.
Gaagudju (Australian, Gaagudju; Harvey 2002: 254)

→ “For forms other than those involving the 3rd person Absolutives of intransitive motion and stance verbs, Hortative meanings are conveyed by the future.” (Harvey 2002: 254)

**marree-**ni

1+2.FUT-sit

“Let’s sit! / We will sit”

**Present/progressive > directive**

- Present and progressive forms are often attested in the expression of the directive function. Their directive use typically starts in those situations in which the expectation that the desired SoA will be brought about immediately is very high and is in focus, and this normally happens when the performer (or one of the performers) of the action coincides with the addressee(s) (2nd person). Present or progressive forms designate actions that are either already in progress at the moment of the speech or are to be completed after the moment of the speech and are thus good candidates for the expression of the notion of imminence (Birjulin & Xrakovskij 2001: 41).

**Apurina (Arawakan, Maipuran; Da Silva Facundes 2000: 543)**

a. xamuna **pu-taka xââ-poki-ã**

‘Put firewood in the fire’

b. ìporâà **pu-suka-no**

‘Bring me water’

c. a-makkxaka-ru

‘We take it out’

**3.1.2. Different persons as different “doors” to the directive function**

- The different source constructions grammaticalize into markers of directive situations starting from specific persons: in directive situations, person is not an epiphenomenon, but rather a functional factor. The identity of the performer (1st, 2nd or 3rd) crucially determines the type of directive speech act conveyed by the sentence:

  a) If the P(erformer) coincides with the hearer, or a group of hearers – 2nd person directive – the speech act conveyed is a prototypical command, in which the speaker has a high control over the actualization of the SoA. The command often refers to an already ongoing action which needs to be continued, stopped, modified, etc. (PRESENT/PROGRESSIVE > DIRECTIVE) and/or implies a displacement away from the speaker in order to bring about the desired action: ‘go and catch it!’ (GO > DIRECTIVE).
b) If P coincides with the hearer + the speaker – 1st person plural inclusive directive – the speech act is a mediated command, in which the hearer is typically invited to join the speaker in order to bring about the desired SoA. The directive situation addressed to 1st person plural inclusive is typically construed as a complex event in which (i) the hearer is first ordered to move toward the speaker (‘come!’) and then (ii) the intention to bring about the desired SoA together is expressed (COME > DIRECTIVE).

c) If P includes the speaker – 1st person – the speech act has typically a future-projecting auto-prescriptive component (FUTURE/INTENTIONAL > DIRECTIVE).

d) If the intended P is a third party – 3rd person directive – the speech act is an exhortation to somebody who is typically absent to bring about the desired SoA. The speaker has lower control over the realization of the SoA, and the directive situation may be construed in at least two different ways, depending on the role assigned to the hearer:

- If the appeal to the role of the hearer is not explicit, the speech act typically consists of the expression of the speaker’s wish that the third party realizes the SoA; the request to do something for this to happen is left to inference and the hearer is treated as a pure witness (OPTATIVE, COMPLETIVE SUBORDINATION > DIRECTIVE)
- If the appeal to the hearer to help make the desired SoA true is explicit, the speech act is typically construed as a complex causative construction, in which the hearer is ordered (‘let!’) to make/allow the third party to bring about the desired SoA (PERMISSIVE > DIRECTIVE)

➢ Once a given source construction has acquired a directive function addressed to a given person, it may extend to other persons (cf. van der Auwera et al. 2004):

- go > 2nd person directive > (other)
- come > 1st person directive > (other)
- let > 3rd person directive > 1st person directive > (2nd person directive)
- present/progressive > 2nd directive > (other)
- future/intentional > 1st person directive > 3rd, 2nd person directives
- optative > 3rd person directive > 1st person directive > (2nd person directive)
- completive subordination > 3rd person directive > 1st person directive > 2nd person directive

3.2. Neighbouring domains: the functional space around (and behind) the directive function

➢ The directive situation is characterized by different functional properties, depending on the person of the performer (cf. van der Auwera et al. 2004; Birjulin & Xrakovskij 2001);
➢ Each of the source constructions examined “enters” the directive functional domain from the “door” that is closer to its semantics;
➢ Once a source construction has entered the directive functional domain, it may extend to different persons in a non-random order, following the paths sketched in Figure 1.
Can the source constructions in Fig. 1 motivate the hybrid reality status of directives across languages, i.e. can they explain the presence of realis markers, the presence of irrealis markers, the presence and the absence of both?

- Optative > directive
- Completive > directive
- Future/intentional > directive
- Present/progressive > directive

OPTATIVE and COMPLETIVE constructions may show
---irrealis markers (example (6d)) or
---no reality status markers. (examples (10), (11))

FUTURE/INTENTIONAL constructions may show
---irrealis markers (examples (1), (2)),
---both (examples (3), (4), (5)),
---no reality status markers (example (8))

PRESENT/PROGRESSIVE constructions may show
---realis markers (examples (3), (4), (5))
---no reality status markers. (example (17))

Go > directive
Come > directive
Permissive > directive

Type B constructions are characterized by the following structure: directive\[go, come, permissive\] + main verb referring to the desired SoA

The resulting constructions are generally insensitive to the realis/irrealis distinction!

The hybrid reality status of directives across languages may be at least partially derived from the constructions encoding neighbouring domains, such as optative, future/intentional or present/progressive constructions, which may be the source of grammaticalization of directives addressed to different persons:

- if the source construction does show overt (ir)realis markers, these are normally inherited and kept in the directive (example (1)-(5));
- if the source construction does not show any overt (ir)realis markers, the derived directive form does not show any (ir)realis marker either and falls outside the realis/irrealis dichotomy (examples (7), (8), (17));
- if the source constructions are heterogeneous (i.e. different sources for different persons, some with (ir)realis markers and others without), the derived directive constructions will mirror this heterogeneity (examples (6) and (13)).

Is the coding of realisness in directives always “inherited” from the coding of realisness in the neighbouring functional domains?
How relevant is the notion of realisness as such in the coding a directive speech act?

4. Conclusions: realisness as an inherited status

Our data show that the hybrid distribution of (ir)realis markers in the cross-linguistic coding of directive situations is to be explained in diachronic terms:

- The reality status of directives is inherited from the constructions that constitute the sources of grammaticalization;
- the distribution of (ir)realis markers in directives is not random, but follows the paths represented in Fig. 1 and confirms the crucial role played by Person in directive situations.

Why is a diachronic explanation preferrable to an explanation based on the inherent semantics of directive situations?
(i) The diachronic explanation proposed in this paper treats the cases described in sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 as sub-cases of a single complex process, namely the grammaticalization of directives. The source constructions in the specific sub-cases at issue are characterized by (ir)realis markers that come to be inherited by the derived directives.

(ii) The diachronic explanation can be empirically proved, because it is based on observable paths of linguistic change. By contrast, an explanation that is solely based on the inherent “hybrid realisness” of directive situations cannot be empirically proved.

(iii) An explanation that focuses on the conflict between the high expectation of actualization and the non-realized semantics of directives is not incompatible with the diachronic analysis proposed here. On the contrary, it supports and motivates individual paths of semantic change (i.e. future/intentional > directive, present/ongoing > directive, optative > directive). However, if it is not integrated with an independent diachronic survey, it fails to capture the regularities attested in cross-linguistic variation.

►► A more general question: to what levels of grammar is realisness relevant? ◄◄

→ The realisness dimension is no doubt relevant to modality, classically intended as the functional domain concerned with ‘the degree of commitment by the speaker to what he/she is saying’ (Palmer 2001: 51).

→ Directives fall outside this (strict) definition of modality, and pertain to another functional domain, that of illocution or communicative intention, concerned with the function of the clause as an illocutionary speech act (cf. also van der Auwera & Plungian 1998: 83).

→ The domain of illocution encroaches upon the domain of modality: markers of some sub-types of modality are better candidates than others to develop (post-modal, cf. van der Auwera & Plungian 1998) functions falling within the realm of illocution or communicative intention (see Figure 1). Realisness is thus a secondary, inherited dimension in the encoding of directive situations, which possibly shows up only when the markers used to encode the directive situation originally participated in a system of morpho-syntactic contrasts based on realisness.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 = 1st, 2nd, 3rd person; 2M = second person, minimal; I, II, III, IV… = noun classes; AG = agent; AV = actor voice; CLF = classifier; COMP = complementizer; CONT = continuous; DEF = definite; DIST = distal; DL = dual; EMPH = emphatic; FOC = focalizer; FUT = future; HORT = hortative; IMP = imperative; INCL = inclusive; INF = infinitive; IMPFV = imperfective; INSTR = instrumental; IRR = irrealis; M = masculine; MIX = mixed gender; N = neuter; NEG = negation; NOM = nominative; NPST = non-past; OBJ = object; OBL = oblique; OPT = optative; PL = plural; POSS = possessive; POT = potential; PROX = proximal; PST = past; R = realis; SBJ = subject; SG = singular; SFP = sentence-final particle.
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