On abstinence and avoidance
Maria Esipova (University of Oslo)

Intro I inspect two types of readings emerging, e.g., for negated imperatives, 'not want', and 'fear': (i) ABSTAIN readings, implying willingness to prevent someone from intentionally engaging in an activity, and (ii) AVOID readings, implying willingness to prevent an unintended outcome:

(1) a. Don't call anyone! / I don't want to call anyone. / I'm afraid of calling anyone.   ABSTAIN
    b. *In a potential butt-dialing context:* Don't (accidentally) call someone! / I don't want to (accidentally) call someone. / I'm afraid of (accidentally) calling someone.   AVOID

In English, the distinction manifests in, e.g., anti-/re-licensing of *some* (observed in Szabolcsi 2004): (1). I focus on aspect and indefinites in ABSTAIN vs. AVOID cases in Russian, but the proposed approach extends to English.

Core puzzles (2)–(4): 1. Across the three environments, verbs are in imperfective in ABSTAIN cases and in perfective in AVOID cases. 2. Under negated imperatives and 'not want', only *ni*-NPIs are licensed in ABSTAIN cases, but both *ni*-NPIs and dependent *nibud'* indefinites (discussed, e.g., in Pereltsvaig 2008) are licensed in AVOID cases. Under 'fear', only free choice indefinites (e.g., *libo*) are licensed in ABSTAIN cases, but both free choice and *nibud'* indefinites are licensed in AVOID cases.

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

(3) a. Ja ne xoču {nikomu / *komu-nibud'} {zvonit'   / *pozvonit'}.
    I not want {NI-who / *who-NIBUD'} {call.IPFV.INF / *call.PFV.INF}
    'I don't want to call anyone.'   ABSTAIN
    b. Ja ne xoču {nikomu / komu-nibud'} (slučajno)   {*zvonit'   / pozvonit'}.
    I not want {NI-who / who-NIBUD'} (accidentally) {*call.IPFV.INF / call.PFV.INF}
    'I don't want to (accidentally) call someone.'   AVOID

(4) a. Ja bojus' {komu-libo / *komu-nibud'} {zvonit'   / *pozvonit'}.
    I fear   {who-LIBO / *who-NIBUD'} {call.IPFV.INF / *call.PFV.INF}
    'I am afraid of calling anyone.'   ABSTAIN
    b. Ja bojus' {komu-libo / komu-nibud'} (slučajno)   {*zvonit'   / pozvonit'}.
    I fear   {who-LIBO / who-NIBUD'} (accidentally) {*call.IPFV.INF / call.PFV.INF}
    'I'm afraid of (accidentally) calling someone.'   AVOID

Prior work Aspect in negated imperatives in Slavic was recently analyzed in Goncharov 2018, which relied on an ad hoc intentionality operator in ABSTAIN cases. English *some* under 'not want' was independently analyzed in a more pragmatic way in Goncharov 2020. While I share some of Goncharov's insights, I propose a more principled and general analysis, with both the aspect and the indefinite facts following from distinct compositional structures in ABSTAIN vs. AVOID cases, and pragmatics affecting the choice between the two.

Proposal <u>Events vs. situations</u> I distinguish *events* from *situations*. Situations can be thought of as (potentially) complex events whose parts are situated within the situation's runtime a.k.a. the reference time (RT_s). For concreteness, I assume the following mereology: an event can be part of a situation ($e \subseteq s$) or a world, and a situation can be part of a world. $\exists$ binding the event variable always takes the lowest scope, which I assure by adopting (ontologically enriched) Champollion's (2015) quantificational events semantics, where verbs denote existential quantifiers over events (e.g., $[\![\text{'open'}]\!] = \lambda f_{vt}\lambda w_s.\exists e_v.f(e) \wedge e \subseteq w \wedge \mathsf{open}(e))$, and any further modification of e is done via the continuation f, eventually closed off via a trivial continuation, $\lambda e.\mathsf{T}$. In contrast, the situation layer is optionally introduced later in the derivation.

<u>Situations & aspect</u> Russian imperfective verbs can describe an event that is part of a situation, in which case the endpoints of the event's runtime (including the projected culmination of wannabe accomplishments like 'open.IPFV closet') are placed outside RT_s; but they can also describe events that are not situated relative to any RT_s. Russian perfective verbs always describe events that are part of a situation and culminate within RT_s.

<u>Cases at hand</u> AVOID cases involve situation descriptions, but ABSTAIN cases don't. An independent piece of evidence is that only AVOID cases allow 'once'/'one day', which I take to be a situation(-introducing) modifier:

(5) a. Ne {*otkryvaj / otkroj} odnaždy škaf!
     not {*open.IPFV.IMP / open.PFV.IMP} once closet
     'Don't once open the closet!' (only AVOID)

   b. Ja {ne xoču / bojus'} odnaždy {*otkryvat' / otkryt'} škaf.
     I {not want / fear} once {*open.IPFV.INF / open.PFV.INF} closet
     '{I don't want to / I am afraid that I will} once open the closet.' (only AVOID)

For concreteness, I assume that the imperative operator and 'want' compose with their complements in the same way in AVOID and ABSTAIN cases (this is not crucial): (6). As for 'fear', in ABSTAIN cases, it simply encodes a relation between its subject and its complement (propositional or not) in the world of evaluation, while in AVOID cases, it asserts the epistemic possibility of its propositional complement and presupposes the speaker's "fearful" attitude towards it (I think this at-issue vs. not-at-issue distinction is pragmatic and don't encode it lexically): (7).

(6) $[\![$ 'Don't open the closet!' / 'I don't want to open the closet'$]\!] = 1$ in w iff $\forall w' R_{imp/want} w$:
   a. ABSTAIN: $\neg[\exists e.e \subseteq w' \wedge \mathsf{open}(e) \wedge \mathsf{ag}(e) = \text{addr/sp} \wedge \mathsf{th}(e) = \iota x.\mathsf{closet}(x)]$
   b. AVOID: $\neg[\exists s.s \subseteq w' \wedge \exists t.t \subseteq \mathsf{RT}_s \wedge \exists e.e \subseteq s \wedge \mathsf{culm}(e,t) \wedge e \subseteq w' \wedge \mathsf{open}(e) \wedge (...)]$

(7) $[\![$ 'I am afraid (a.) of opening the closet / (b.) that I will open the closet'$]\!] = 1$ in w iff
   a. ABSTAIN: $\mathsf{fear}(\text{sp}, \lambda w'.\exists e.e \subseteq w' \wedge \mathsf{open}(e) \wedge \mathsf{ag}(e) = \text{sp} \wedge \mathsf{th}(e) = \iota x.\mathsf{closet}(x), w)$
   b. AVOID: $\exists w' R_{bel} w [\exists s.s \subseteq w' \wedge \exists t.t \subseteq \mathsf{RT}_s \wedge \exists e.e \subseteq s \wedge \mathsf{culm}(e,t) \wedge e \subseteq w' \wedge \mathsf{open}(e) \wedge \mathsf{ag}(e) = \text{sp/addr} \wedge \mathsf{th}(e) = \iota x.\mathsf{closet}(x)] \wedge \mathsf{fear}(\text{sp}, \lambda w''.\exists s.(...), w)$

<u>Indefinite licensing</u> I assume that (i) quantification over worlds in imperatives and 'want' licenses *nibud'*; (ii) *ni*-NPIs are licensed by negation and, when licensed, block *nibud'*; (iii) an intervening existential quantification over situations blocks *ni*-NPI licensing and re-licenses *nibud'*. Thus, in the ABSTAIN cases at hand involving negation, only *ni*-NPIs are licensed, but in the AVOID cases, either one can be licensed, depending on whether the indefinite scopes above or below the situation (*ni*: $\neg[\boxed{\exists x}\exists e]$ or $\neg[\boxed{\exists x}\exists s\exists e]$; *nibud'*: $\neg[\exists s \boxed{\exists x}\exists e]$). ABSTAIN-type 'fear' doesn't on its own license *nibud'* indefinites (nothing for them to depend on), but AVOID-type 'fear' does, thanks to the quantification over worlds.

<u>When to have situations</u> In all the three environments at hand, the speaker considers certain scenarios undesirable. In ABSTAIN cases, this attitude can be about a certain outcome (e.g., they don't want anyone to get called) or the activity (potentially) leading to it (e.g., they don't want the agent to engage in any calling, as they think cell phones are harmful). AVOID cases are unambiguously about the outcome. If the speaker wants to prevent a certain outcome and thinks it can be prevented by the agent not engaging in the activity of the relevant kind, they go for an unsituated event description (ABSTAIN). But if they don't think all such events can be prevented (e.g., the relevant activity can't be controlled or might not be recognized by the agent as leading to a certain end-state), they have to go for a situation description containing the end-state (AVOID). An argument for such a pragmatics-heavy story comes from complex situation descriptions. E.g., in (8), the part of the undesirable situation outside the agent's control is whether they see a monster or hear a scraping sound; the closet opening is intentional (as indicated by the purposive clause), and the aspect choice is determined solely by its placement relative to RT_s.

(8) a. Ja ne xoču odnaždy otkryt' škaf, čtoby dostat' noski, i uvidet' tam monstra.
     I not want once open.PFV.INF closet to get socks and see.PFV.INF there monster
     'I don't want to once open the closet to get socks and see a monster there.'

   b. Ja ne xoču odnaždy otkryvat' škaf, čtoby dostat' noski, i uslyšat' skrežet.
     I not want once open.IPFV.INF closet to get socks and hear.PFV.INF scrape
     'I don't want to once be opening the closet to get socks and hear a scraping sound.'

Expanding the discussion I also show that subject obviation in subjunctive (or indicative) clauses (Farkas 1992 et seq.) is distinct from the ABSTAIN vs. AVOID distinction, as the latter still holds when there is no obviation. In addition, I briefly discuss how the proposed approach extends to situations and lack thereof under some other predicates (e.g., 'hope') and root modals, and the connection between minimizers and aspect in Russian.

References Champollion. 2015. *L&P* 38(1). Farkas. 1992. In *Lexical Matters*. Goncharov. 2018. In *FASL 27*. Goncharov. 2020. In *SALT 30*. Pereltsvaig. 2008. In *WCCFL 27*. Szabolcsi. 2004. *NLLT* 22(2).