

## A Reanalysis of the Biloxi Causative\*

JOHN KOONTZ

**1. Introduction.** Biloxi is the best documented of the several Southeastern Siouan languages. The only others with any degree of documentation are Ofo and Tutelo.<sup>1</sup> For Biloxi, the principal source of information is Dorsey & Swanton 1912, a dictionary and text collection prepared for publication by John R. Swanton using material originally collected by James O. Dorsey.<sup>2</sup> Recently the Dorsey & Swanton dictionary and texts have been analyzed by Paula Einaudi, to produce a grammar (Einaudi 1976; reviewed in Rankin 1986). The present paper is a revision of Einaudi's analysis of the Biloxi morphological causative, based on a critical re-examination of the data in Dorsey & Swanton.

Before proceeding, it is necessary to say something about Biloxi orthography. The Biloxi of the Dorsey & Swanton dictionary is in a phonetic transcription which is Swanton's modification and in some instances mutilation of Dorsey's usage in his fieldnotes. Neither the original nor its modification were on modern principles. Representation of vowel nasalization and stop aspiration, for example, were variable and context dependent. In addition, Dorsey's background as an English speaker resulted at least occasionally in difficulty in distinguishing aspirate and inaspirate stops, and simultaneously inclined him to overdifferentiate vowels.

Einaudi elected to normalize stop and vowel transcriptions largely by eliminating diacritics (1976:14-24). It has since been shown by Rankin (1982) that the somewhat variable opposition of aspirate vs. inaspirate recorded by Dorsey and suppressed by Einaudi was probably contrastive, though it is not always easy to determine the proper status of a particular graph. In addition, comparative evidence sometimes also suggests that normalizing the vowels by eliminating the diacritics does not always produce an accurate mapping of graphs onto phonemes.<sup>3</sup> In the examples cited below Einaudi's normalization is the basis of the orthography is used, but aspiration is restored where there is evidence of it, and vowels may be revised judgmentally. All examples are attributed to their immediate source to facilitate retrieval of the originals.

Nasality is also a problem in Biloxi, as in other Siouan languages. Einaudi elected to convert some of Dorsey & Swanton's varied representations of vowel nasalization to vowels accompanied by a nasal hook diacritic (Y), but retained other representations as in-line n graphs (Vn), apparently in those cases where Dorsey used in-line n before a dental stop to represent nasality (Einaudi 1976:21-22). In the interests of consistency and convenience, the in-line n is used consistently below in the environments v\_\_c and #\_\_c, while superscript n is used elsewhere: thus, VnC and #nC, but VnV and Vn#.

In so doing, two aspects of Biloxi nasalization are somewhat concealed. First, some morphemes begin with a floating nasalization, as morpheme boundaries will show. This floating nasalization is now represented segmentally, as an initial n, even though in many cases it was realized in pronunciation supersegmentally, as nasalization of the preceding vowel. Second, some potential issues in pronominal allomorphy are suppressed notationally. Thus, what Einaudi writes as -hi<sup>n</sup>ye 'I cause you to . . .', in which she perceives the pronominal as -i<sup>n</sup>-, becomes in this paper -hinye, in which the pronominal is taken to be -ny-. Both -i<sup>n</sup>- and -ny- are attested as word initial variants of the A1P2 portmanteau (Einaudi 1976:71).

**2. Preliminaries.** Einaudi identifies the Biloxi causative auxiliary as a morpheme  $\gamma\epsilon$  (1976:158). More precisely, causative constructions have the morphosyntactic form (1) (1976:159).

- (1) VERB + (ha) + PRONOUN + YE

In this formula parenthetical **ha** represents a morpheme whose presence is conditioned by the shape that PRONOUN takes; **y** represents a **y** -  $\emptyset$  alternation similarly conditioned; and **e** represents the Biloxi ablaut vowel, a stem final alternation of **e** - **a** - **i**, conditioned by the identity of the following morpheme (cf. Rood 1983). This paper is concerned with the interactions of **ha**, PRONOUN and **y**.

**2.1 The ha morpheme.** The **ha** morpheme is present, according to Einaudi, when PRONOUN is a first or second person (1976:159). From the examples supplied (159-160), it is plain that this description is intended to encompass first and second agents with all possible patients. See (2) for example, cf. Dorsey & Swanton 1912:273b.4

- |     |                |                       |
|-----|----------------|-----------------------|
| (2) | <b>tehanke</b> | 'I kill him'          |
|     | <b>te-</b>     | <b>ha- nk- e</b>      |
|     | <b>die</b>     | <b>ha</b> A1 CAUSE    |
|     | <b>tehaye</b>  | 'you kill him'        |
|     | <b>te-</b>     | <b>ha- y- e</b>       |
|     | <b>die</b>     | <b>ha</b> A2 CAUSE    |
|     | <b>tehinye</b> | 'I kill you'          |
|     | <b>te-</b>     | <b>ha- in- ye</b>     |
|     | <b>die</b>     | <b>ha</b> A1P2 CAUSE  |
| but | <b>teye</b>    | 'he kills him'        |
|     | <b>te-</b>     | $\emptyset$ <b>ye</b> |
|     | <b>die</b>     | (A3) CAUSE            |

It turns out that the proposed conditioning for **ha** does not quite account for the facts, for **ha** also occurs in the circumstance of a third person agent acting on a second person patient (3) (cf. Dorsey & Swanton 1912:272:a).5

- |     |               |                      |
|-----|---------------|----------------------|
| (3) | <b>tehiye</b> | 'he kills you'       |
|     | <b>te-</b>    | <b>ha- iy- e</b>     |
|     | <b>die</b>    | <b>ha</b> A3P2 CAUSE |

Since the various portmanteau combinations of first and second person with each other, third person, and case marking all have a non-zero form, while third person acting on third person is a zero-form, another possible statement of the conditioning might be that **ha** is present when there is an explicit surface form for PRONOUN; when PRONOUN is implicit (a zero-form), **ha** is omitted. In other words, **ha** occurs with all pronominal combinations but A3P3, the only zero-form.

This approach also fails, since a third person agent acting on a first person patient precludes **ha**, even though it employs the explicit pronominal **yank** A3P1. What is striking in this instance is that the homophonous pronominal **yank** A2P1 does require **ha**.

- |     |                     |                            |
|-----|---------------------|----------------------------|
| (4) | <b>kicuehiyanke</b> | 'you lend it to me'        |
|     | <b>ki-</b>          | <b>cue- hi- yank- e</b>    |
|     | <b>DAT</b>          | <b>lend ha6 A2P1 CAUSE</b> |
|     | <b>kicueyanke</b>   | 'he lends it to me'        |
|     | <b>ki-</b>          | <b>cue- yank- e</b>        |
|     | <b>DAT</b>          | <b>lend A3P1 CAUSE</b>     |

These examples are from Dorsey & Swanton 1912:266b.

Thus neither of the two generalizations proposed actually accounts for the presence of **ha**, though both come close.

**2.2 The y morphophoneme.** The conditioning of **y**, the **y** -  $\emptyset$  alternation, is essentially identical to that of **ha**, but inverted. In Einaudi's formulation the  $\emptyset$ -alternant occurs when a first or second person pronominal precedes; **y** occurs otherwise. Thus it seems that **y** should be absent when **ha** is present, and present when **ha** is absent. That is, **y** and **ha** are in complementary distribution (as are **y** and explicit pronominals). This has already been illustrated in (2) and (3).

The fact that **y** and **ha** are in complementary distribution suggests immediately that they might be allomorphs. Arguing against this would be their disparity in form, and the fact that a pronominal slot seems to intervene between the slots for **y** and **ha**. Also arguing against an allomorphic analysis is the fact that the **ha** morpheme is unique to the causative construction, while **y** is not. It also occurs, for example, in the verbs **Yehon** 'know' and **Yihi** 'think'.

- |     |               |               |
|-----|---------------|---------------|
| (5) | <b>yehon</b>  | 'he knows it' |
|     | $\emptyset$   | <b>yehon</b>  |
|     | (A3)          | <b>know</b>   |
|     | <b>nkehon</b> | 'I know it'   |
|     | <b>nk-</b>    | <b>ehon</b>   |
|     | <b>A1</b>     | <b>know</b>   |

These examples are from Dorsey & Swanton 1912:291a.

**y** is morphophonemically distinct from simple **y** (6) (Einaudi 1976:43-43), which does not disappear following the first and second person pronominals.

- |     |                          |  |
|-----|--------------------------|--|
| (6) | <b>nkyao<sup>n</sup></b> | 'I sing', from <b>yao<sup>n</sup></b> 'sing' |
|     | <b>nkyan</b>             | 'I sleep', from <b>yan</b> 'sleep'           |

**2.3 The ha ~ hi alternation.** An interesting fact about **ha** is that it sometimes appears as **hi** (as in example 3 as above). As Einaudi puts it, "Morphophonemic rule 8 accounts for **ha** being reduced sometimes to **h**" (1976:159). Rule 8 is the standard Siouan vowel sequence reduction rule, which reduces **V<sub>1</sub>V<sub>2</sub>** to **V<sub>2</sub>** (1976:39). Rule 8 is "optional with compounds and across word boundaries and mandatory otherwise" (39).

The substitution of **h(i)** for **ha** occurs optionally in forms where first or second person agents act upon third person patients (7), cf. Dorsey & Swanton 1912:273b-274a.

- (7) **-hanke** ~ **hinke** 'I cause him to ...'  
**-haye** ~ **hiye** 'you cause him to ...'

It occurs obligatorily in **ha**-forms where the patient is not a third person (8), cf. Dorsey & Swanton 1912:203a, 273b-274a.

- (8) **-hinye** 'I cause you to ...'  
**-hiyanke** 'you cause me to ...'  
**-hiye** 'he causes you to ...'

3. **Reanalysis.** A preliminary reanalysis of the full paradigm of the Biloxi causative may now be presented.

(9)	P1	P2	P3
A1	----	<b>-hi-ny-E</b>	<b>-hi/a-nk-E</b>
A2	<b>-hi-yank-E</b>	----	<b>-hi/a-y-E</b>
A3	<b>-Ø-yank-E</b>	<b>-hi-y-E</b>	<b>-Ø -Ø -yE</b>

Examples of all these forms can be found in Dorsey & Swanton 1912:266b-267a, 285b, 291b. Plurals are omitted because plurality is marked in Biloxi (as in other Siouan languages) with a system of verbal suffixes quite distinct from the pronominals.

The analysis used in (9) (i.e., the placement of morpheme boundaries) is designed to maximize the separation of **ha** ~ **hi** and **ye** (E ~ **ye**) from the pronominals, and especially to enhance the frequency of the E allomorphs of **ye**. The sequence **hi/a** represents free variation between **hi** and **ha**. This analysis differs somewhat from that of Einaudi 1976:159-160, where the use of underlining in examples suggests that Einaudi evaluates what is here **-hi-ny-E** 'he causes you' as **-h-in-yE** (per the comment in section 1); **-hi-y-E** 'he causes you' as **-h-i-yE**; and the **-hiyE** alternant of **-hi/a-y-E** 'you cause him', again, as **-h-i-yE**. Unfortunately, that analysis, though consistent with Einaudi's explanation of **-h(i)** forms as the Rule 8 contraction of **-ha-i** ... forms, does not work very well. Apart from the problematical distribution of **ha** (or **hi**, as the case may be), it violates the generalization that first and second person (agent?) forms have E, not **ye**, and it offers no explanation for the **i** vowel of **-hi** in **-hiyankE** 'you cause me' or **--hinke** 'I cause him', or **hinkE** 'I cause him', the **hi** alternant of **-hi/a-nk-E**.

Paradigm (9) should be compared with the ordinary transitive paradigm in (10), based on Einaudi 1976:70-73.

(10)	P1	P2	P3
A1	----	<b>ny</b>	<b>nk</b>
A2	<b>yank</b>	----	<b>ay</b>
A3	<b>yank</b>	<b>iy</b>	<b>Ø</b>

The forms given here are mostly Einaudi's underlying forms, for which she employs the prevocalic allomorphs of a rather variable set of pronominals. The A3P2 form **iy**, however, is the present author's, elected on a basis of numerous examples in Dorsey & Swanton 1912 (e.g., 190b, 215b, 265a).

- (11) **iy-ukhade** 'he talks to you'  
**i-khu** 'he gives it to you'  
**yi-dakacke** 'he ties you'

Einaudi assumes to the contrary that the A3P2 and A2P3 forms are both **ay** (1976:72), though she supplies no **ay**-forms for the former.<sup>7</sup> The allomorphs of A3P2 that actually appear are **iy** ~ **i** ~ **yi**, more or less paralleling Einaudi's A2P3 (~A3P2) set **ay** ~ **i** ~ **ya** ~ **aya**. The prevocalic **iy**-allomorph of the newly recognized A3P2 forms has been selected as underlying, by analogy with Einaudi's practice.

Comparing the causative and transitive paradigms reveals that of the two causative forms in which **hi** alternates with **ha** - A1P3 and A2P3 - one, **-haye** A2P3, corresponds to the single transitive pronominal, **ay** A2P3, recognized as beginning with the vowel **a**. The other, **-hanke** A1P3, corresponds to **nk** A1P3, which begins with a floating nasalization realized as **n** in initial position. Morpheme initial prenasalized stops are a rare phenomenon in Biloxi, though not unparalleled (cf. Dorsey & Swanton 1912:234b, 237b, 238b). Usually they are found in a free variation of **nC** with **inC** or **naC**. In other words, there is a strong probability that initial **nC**-forms are all fast speech variants of **VnC-** or **nVC**-forms. It may therefore be hypothesized that first person **nk** is a fast speech variant of some underlying shape **Vnk**. The A1P3 form of the causative paradigm, **-hanke**, plainly suggests that **Vnk** is **ank**, a form which corresponds well with such other Siouan forms as Dakotan **u(k)** 'first person inclusive; Dhegiha **ə(g)** 'first person plural agent'; or Winnebago **wəgəg-a** 'first person inclusive patient.'

If this hypothesis is adopted, it becomes easy to explain the **hi** ~ **ha** alternation in the causative paradigm. In fact, the prenominal **ha**-morpheme should be analyzed as **hi**. The **ha**-allomorph occurs only when **hi** contracts with a following a-initial pronominal: **hi + ank => hank** and **hi + ay => hay**, with vowel contraction governed by Einaudi's Rule 8 for vowel contraction: **V1V2 => V2**. The alternative forms with **hink** and **hiy** can be explained as over-generalizations of the surface principle that the causative always has **hi** before an explicit pronominal. There is, in fact, no allomorph with the shape **ha** at all. Einaudi has simply misanalyzed the contraction of **hi + a** as **ha**- and concluded too hastily that **ha** not **hi** is the basic form.

This produces the revised causative paradigm of (12).

(12)	P1	P2	P3
A1	----	<b>-hi-ny-E</b>	<b>-hi-(a)nk-E</b>
A2	<b>-hi-yank-E</b>	----	<b>-hi- (a)y-E</b>
A3	<b>-Ø -yank-E</b>	<b>-hi-iy-E</b>	<b>-Ø - Ø-yE</b>

In (12), (a) indicates a regular initial a-vowel which is sometimes deleted by analogy with non-a forms.

There are still two obvious anomalies in the paradigm. First, the absence of **hi** in the A3P1 and A3P3 forms; second, the presence of **ye**, not **e**, as the auxiliary stem in the A3P3 form. The A3P1 form is doubly peculiar, though, because as noted in section 2 it is the only one with an explicit pronominal to lack **hi**. Implicit in the regular homophony of the A2P1 and A3P1 markers **yank** is another peculiarity of the A3P1 form, for it seems surprising that A3P1 should lack **hi** while the A2P1 form, with an identical pronominal, does not.

Why, in fact, should the regular A2P1 and A3P1 forms both be **yank** in Biloxi? The A2P1 form clearly suggests **ay** 'you' + **ank** 'me.' Given that the preconsonantal **ya**-alternant of the second person is probably the original Siouan form, with the prevocalic **ay**-alternant arising through



pattern is widespread in the Siouan family as a whole, for verbs with locative complementary incorporated nominals, and so forth.

In support of this analysis of the Biloxi morphological causative as a reduced causative construction, it is possible to cite another *hi* complement construction in Biloxi, which has not been reduced. The Dorsey & Swanton dictionary glosses *hi* as "a particle used to modify other verbs when they occur before [i.e., are governed by] verbs of saying or thinking." (1912:197b)

(20)	<i>teye</i>	<i>hi</i>	<i>axkiye</i>	<i>di</i>
	he kills it	COMPLEMENTIZER	I tell him	DECLARATIVE
	'I told him to kill it' (Dorsey & Swanton 1912:143.18)			
	<i>ua</i>	<i>hi</i>	<i>nkihi</i>	
	she boils it	COMPLEMENTIZER	I think it	
	'I think she ought to stew it' (Dorsey & Swanton 1912:143.22)			

Since the causative, 'tell', and 'think one ought' all three carry a sense of obligation, it is possible that *hi*-complements are specifically restricted to expressing obligation, though there is so far no conclusive evidence bearing on this.

**5. Conclusion.** In summary it appears that Einaudi's analysis of the Biloxi transitive and causative paradigms should be modified in certain respects. The revised transitive paradigm is given in (21).

(21)	P1	P2	P3
A1	----	-ny-	-ank-
A2	-ya-ank-	----	-ay-
A3	-i-ank-	-iy-	-(i)-

The variants of the pronouns given are the prevocalic ones, which are also used in the causative construction because the causative auxiliary *E* is vowel-initial. The causative construction's morphosyntax has already been given in (17) and (19), and will not be repeated here. The analysis offered for this construction rests on phonological rules exemplified in (15) and (16) (some new over Einaudi 1976), and upon recognition of the *hi* complement construction (expressing obligation?) discussed in the preceding section.

The analysis also has important implications for the Proto-Siouan causative, but these will not be elaborated upon here.

#### Notes

\*This paper is based on work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant no. BNS-8406236 and by the National Endowment for the Humanities under grant no. RD-20477-84. The original train of thought had its inspiration in a pair of papers on the Hidatsa and Mandan causative, by A. Wesley Jones (to appear; 1981), followed by an exchange of letters on the subject between Dr. Jones and myself. I thank Dr. Jones for giving me the benefit of his advice. Naturally, he is not responsible for the form or content of the present paper, and might not agree with some of the conclusions drawn. An abbreviated version of this paper, with more attention to

the implications of the Biloxi causative for the proto-Siouan causative, was delivered at the 6th Annual Conference on Siouan and Caddoan Linguistics, Wisconsin Rapids, 1986.

The following abbreviations are used in glossing Biloxi pronominals: A = agent; P = patient; 1,2,3 = first, second, third person.

<sup>1</sup>The inclusion of Tutelo in the same Siouan subgroup as Biloxi and Ofo is considered debatable (cf., e.g., Carter 1981 and Rood 1979). Besides the three languages mentioned, there are some early materials labeled Saponey, which may be either early Tutelo or a closely related dialect, and various data suggest that other Southeastern Siouan languages now extinct may have existed at the time of contact.

<sup>2</sup>This is also the principal source of data on Ofo. The Ofo material is wholly the work of Swanton.

<sup>3</sup>For example, Dorsey & Swanton's <stüp> 'black' might be better treated as /sap/ than as /sup/, given cognates like Dakota /sapa/, Omaha /sabe/, etc.

<sup>4</sup>These are Einaudi's analyses, which will be altered below.

<sup>5</sup>Again, this is Einaudi's analysis and will be modified below.

<sup>6</sup>The discrepancy in the vowel of *ha* will be dealt with below.

<sup>7</sup>One potential example is *iyanoxté di* 'she wishes to chase you' (cf. Einaudi 1976:72). However, Einaudi's underlining shows that she herself believes the pronominal to be *iy*. Since the stem is *noxé*, it is not quite clear what a following *iy* is.

#### References

- Campbell, Lyle, and Marianne Mithun, eds. 1979. *The languages of Native America: Historical and comparative assessment*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Carter, Richard T. 1981. The classification of Tutelo. Paper read at the 1st Annual Conference on Siouan and Caddoan Linguistics, Boulder, Colorado.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. Southeastern Siouan. State of the Art Presentation at the Comparative Siouan Workshop, Boulder, Colorado.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. The syntax of causative constructions: Cross-linguistic similarities and divergences. In Shibatani 1976:261-312.
- Dorsey, James Owen, and John R. Swanton. 1912. *A dictionary of the Biloxi and Ofo languages*, accompanied with thirty-one Biloxi texts and numerous Biloxi phrases. BAE Bulletin 47.
- Einaudi, Paula Ferris. 1976. *A grammar of Biloxi*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Haas, Mary R. 1969. Swanton and the Biloxi and Ofo dictionaries. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 35:286-90.
- Holmer, Nils. 1947. An Ofo phonetic law. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 13:1-8.
- Jones, A. Wesley. To appear. Development of the causative in Hidatsa. *Proceedings of the second annual symposium on historical linguistics and philology*.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. Some archaisms and innovations in Hidatsa. *Na'pao* 13:8-10.
- Koontz, John E. 1983. Siouan syncopating \*r-stems. *Na'pao* 13:11-23.
- Rankin, Robert L. 1982. On the establishment of two series of stop consonants in Ofo, Biloxi, and Tutelo: Philological evidence. Paper read at the 2nd Annual Conference on Siouan and Caddoan Linguistics, Medora, North Dakota.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. Further observations on Biloxi phonology and morphology. Paper read at the 4th Annual Conference on Siouan and Caddoan Linguistics, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986. Review of *A grammar of Biloxi* (Einaudi). *International Journal of American Linguistics* 52.77-85.
- Rood, David S. 1983. A preliminary consideration of Proto-Siouan ablaut. *Na'pao* 13.24-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1979. Siouan. In Campbell & Mithun, 1979.236-98.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Allan R. Taylor. To appear. Lakhota sketch. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 17.
- Shibantani, Masayoshi, ed. 1976. *The grammar of causative constructions*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wolff, Hans. 1950-51. Comparative Siouan I-IV. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 16.61-66, 113-21, 168-78; 17.197-204.

## Politeness and Subjunctive in Spanish and Japanese

ANTHONY LOZANO  
KUMIKO TAKAHARA

1. The objective of this paper is to investigate the uses of the subjunctive and its illocutionary effect in Spanish and Japanese. The syntactic representations of the notion of subjunctive is quite different in these totally unrelated languages, yet when their distributional patterns are compared with respect to the accompanying communicative situations a certain similarity seems to surface. The notion of subjunctive is possibly tied to the socio-cultural background of the speakers and its linguistic realization is constrained by socio-linguistic factors rather than purely linguistic rules. One of such factors is assumed to be the speaker's politeness for communicative effect and, subsequently the interactions of the politeness consideration and the system of subjunctive will be observed through the data from these languages. The selection of Mexican Spanish and Japanese for our comparative study of subjunctive is neither arbitrary nor accidental, since the patterns of interpersonal relationships in the speech communities of these languages have some resemblance and for this reason any common characteristics in the uses of the subjunctive should be accountable systematically on the similar semantic and socio-cultural bases.

2. A language speaker can talk about things in the real world as well as in the non-real, hypothetical world. Traditionally, the illocutionary force of these utterance types are grammatically abstracted and designated by the three moods of indicative, subjunctive, and imperative. The indicative mood refers to statements in declarative or interrogative forms which assert or question about a fact or near-fact. In contrast, the subjunctive mood represents non-fact or counter-fact or fact of varying degrees of possibility. Of the two subcategories of the subjunctive, optative and potential, we are interested in optative subjunctive (Curme 1966: 235-37) which is primarily concerned with the desideratives such as a speaker's desire, wish, hope, will and thought about the yet unrealized world. The imperative mood refers to the directive actions such as command, demand, request, entreaty, prohibition, but the independent status of this modality is questionable, since it is hard to draw a clear boundary between the notions of desideratives and directives in that both manifest in essence a speaker's mood to have the non-factual world to come true. As a matter of fact, when they are reduced to abstract formulae such as in 'I want x to bring about p' and 'Let x bring about that p' (Lyons 1978: 826), they are strikingly similar. In fact, in many languages the functions of subjunctive and imperative seem to merge and the notions of possibility and obligations are associated with the same non-factive, or subjunctive mood, and this is commonly also the mood of prediction, supposition, intention, and desire' (Lyons 1978: 817).

In fact after a speaker conceives of the non-factual world, through the process of his merely desiring it, intending to have it become fact, and commanding the hearers to cooperate with him to realize his desire, there may be a point at which the modality of 'will' in the form of 'I want it to come true' in disguise of the likelihood mood of 'May it come true'. Of all the dimensions of these desiderative and directive speech acts, this transitional stage where the optative subjunctive and imperative beginning to converge seems to be the most exploited linguistically, since the effective linguistic means for directives guarantee the successful interpersonal execution of desideratives. As we see later, the communicative interactions become very complex and the degrees of complexity increases proportionate to the intricacy of interpersonal relationships generated by the particular social structure. In this respect, we may generalize that the subjunctive and imperative share the same semantic domain in common and the imperative can be treated by a single semantic notion of 'subjunctive'. Accordingly, throughout the present study, the term 'subjunctive' is used in this sense and it refers to the notions ranging from desideratives at one end to directives at the other end.