

OXFORD
LINGUISTICS

The Morphosyntax of Imperatives

DANIELA ISAC

linguistics

language

semantics

interface

morphology

phonetics

phonology

cognition

grammar

syntax

OXFORD STUDIES IN THEORETICAL LINGUISTICS

computation

The Morphosyntax of Imperatives

OXFORD STUDIES IN THEORETICAL LINGUISTICS

GENERAL EDITORS

David Adger and Hagit Borer, Queen Mary, University of London

ADVISORY EDITORS

Stephen Anderson, Yale University; Daniel Büring, University of California, Los Angeles; Nomi Erteschik-Shir, Ben-Gurion University; Donka Farkas, University of California, Santa Cruz; Angelika Kratzer, University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Andrew Nevins, University College London; Christopher Potts, Stanford University; Barry Schein, University of Southern California; Peter Svenonius, University of Tromsø; Moira Yip, University College London.

Recent Titles

43 Genericity

edited by Alda Mari, Claire Beyssade, and Fabio Del Prete

44 Strategies of Quantification

edited by Kook-Hee Gil, Steve Harlow, and George Tsoulas

45 Nonverbal Predication

Copular Sentences at the Syntax–Semantics Interface

by Isabelle Roy

46 Diagnosing Syntax

edited by Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver

47 Pseudogapping and Ellipsis

by Kirsten Gengel

48 Syntax and its Limits

edited by Raffaella Folli, Christina Sevdali, and Robert Truswell

49 Phrase Structure and Argument Structure

A Case Study of the Syntax–Semantics Interface

by Terje Lohndal

50 Edges in Syntax

Scrambling and Cyclic Linearization

by Heejeong Ko

51 The Syntax of Roots and the Roots of Syntax

edited by Artemis Alexiadou, Hagit Borer, and Florian Schäfer

52 Causation in Grammatical Structures

edited by Bridget Copley and Fabienne Martin

53 Continuations and Natural Language

by Chris Barker and Chung-chieh Shan

54 The Semantics of Evaluativity

by Jessica Rett

55 External Arguments in Transitivity Alternations

by Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou, and Florian Schäfer

56 Control and Restructuring

by Thomas Grano

57 The interaction of Focus and Givenness in Italian Clause Structure

by Vieri Samek-Lodovici

58 The Morphosyntax of Gender

by Ruth Kramer

59 The Morphosyntax of Imperatives

by Daniela Isac

For a complete list of titles published and in preparation for the series, see pp. 279–80.

The Morphosyntax of Imperatives

DANIELA ISAC

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Daniela Isac 2015

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2015

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014959663

ISBN 978-0-19-873326-3 (Hbk.)

978-0-19-873327-0 (Pbk.)

Printed and bound by

CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Contents

<i>General preface</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	x
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xi
1 Introduction and aims	1
2 Descriptive properties of imperatives	5
2.1 True vs. surrogate imperatives	6
2.1.1 Morphological differences	6
2.1.2 Relative position with respect to clitics	7
2.1.3 Negation	9
2.2 Two classes of true imperatives	9
3 Previous analyses	12
3.1 The ‘true’ vs. ‘surrogate’ contrast	12
3.1.1 Position with respect to clitics	12
3.1.2 The ban on negative imperatives	13
3.2 The Class I vs. Class II contrast	16
3.2.1 Different locations of the imperative features	17
3.2.2 Different types of negation	17
4 Why a new analysis?	22
4.1 Negation and surrogate imperatives	22
4.1.1 Negation and interrogatives	25
4.2 Different uses of subjunctive and infinitive particles	26
4.3 Differences across imperatives	28
4.4 The view proposed in this book	32
5 Modality	34
5.1 Theory internal motivation for postulating ModP	34
5.1.1 Distribution of subjunctive particles	34
5.1.2 Distribution of true imperative verbs	35
5.1.3 Relative position of Topic and Focus constituents	36
5.2 Justification for ModP springing from output conditions	36
5.2.1 Modality	37
5.2.2 Imperatives and Modality	39

5.3 Imperatives are modal	42
5.3.1 The two problematic properties	42
5.3.2 More on the denotation of Type 1 Modality carriers	45
5.3.3 Summary on the modality of imperatives	47
5.4 Two more differences	47
5.4.1 Actuality entailments	48
5.4.2 Temporal orientation	50
5.5 Syntactic location of the Modality feature	53
5.5.1 Two positions for modality carriers	53
5.5.2 Previous literature	63
6 The speaker	64
6.1 The speaker as part of the meaning of imperatives	64
6.2 Morphosyntactic correlates of the speaker?	66
6.2.1 The speaker represented in the syntax	68
6.2.2 Against representing the speaker in the syntax	71
6.3 To summarize	74
7 The addressee	75
7.1 Making the case	75
7.1.1 Null subjects of imperatives	75
7.1.2 Overt subjects of imperatives	77
7.1.3 Overt subjects of imperatives are genuine subjects	81
7.2 Where is the addressee encoded?	82
7.3 Where in the syntax?	86
7.3.1 A distinct syntactic position for the Addressee	86
7.3.2 A 2nd person feature on a functional head	91
7.3.3 My proposal	97
8 True imperatives	101
8.1 An Affix Hopping analysis	103
8.1.1 Class I true imperatives	103
8.1.2 Class II true imperatives	103
8.1.3 Challenges	105
8.2 A verb movement analysis	109
8.2.1 True imperatives Class I	110
8.2.2 True imperatives Class II	116
8.2.3 Conclusions on true imperatives	146
8.2.4 Position of pronominal clitics: Class I vs. Class II	149
9 Surrogate imperatives: subjunctives	153
9.1 Modality in subjunctive imperatives	153
9.2 Orientation toward the speaker	155

9.3	Orientation toward the addressee	156
9.4	Syntactic analysis: high vs. low modality	157
9.4.1	Subjunctives instantiate the high Mod head	157
9.4.2	Features of the Se head in subjunctive imperatives	160
9.4.3	Features of the high Mod head in subjunctive imperatives	161
9.4.4	More on the EPP feature of Mod	161
9.5	The subject of subjunctive imperatives	171
9.5.1	Subjects with valued person features	171
9.5.2	Subjects with unvalued person features	174
9.5.3	Null pronouns as subjects	183
9.5.4	Subjects of subjunctive imperatives vs. subjects of true imperatives: politeness effects	185
9.6	Negation	187
9.6.1	Compatibility with negation	188
9.6.2	The interpretation of the subject of negative subjunctive imperatives	202
9.7	To conclude	215
10	Surrogate imperatives: infinitives	218
10.1	Modality	218
10.2	Orientation toward the speaker	220
10.3	Orientation toward the addressee	221
10.4	Analysis	222
10.4.1	The high Mod head	222
10.4.2	Morpho-phonological realization of the Mod head in infinitive imperatives	224
10.5	Negation	227
10.6	The subject of infinitive imperatives	227
10.6.1	Generic subjects	227
10.6.2	2nd person subjects	230
10.7	Conclusions	234
11	Embeddedness	236
11.1	Properties shared by all embedded imperatives	237
11.2	Embedded true imperatives	238
11.2.1	True imperatives embedded under a matrix (true) imperative	239
11.2.2	True imperatives embedded under directive verbs	239
11.3	Embedded surrogate imperatives	243
11.3.1	The data	244
11.3.2	The analysis	248
11.3.3	Truncated subjunctives/infinitives	249
11.4	Conclusions	252

12	Conclusions	254
12.1	Features	254
12.2	Types of imperatives	255
12.2.1	Modality across types of imperatives	256
12.2.2	Subjects across types of imperatives	256
12.2.3	Grammatical vs. non-grammatical properties	258
12.3	Negation	259
12.3.1	Ban on negative true imperatives	259
12.3.2	Surrogate imperatives that must be negated	260
12.3.3	Restrictions on the subject in negative imperatives	260
12.4	Embedded imperatives	261
	<i>References</i>	263
	<i>Index</i>	277

General preface

The theoretical focus of this series is on the interfaces between subcomponents of the human grammatical system and the closely related area of the interfaces between the different subdisciplines of linguistics. The notion of ‘interface’ has become central in grammatical theory (for instance, in Chomsky’s Minimalist Program) and in linguistic practice: work on the interfaces between syntax and semantics, syntax and morphology, phonology and phonetics, etc. has led to a deeper understanding of particular linguistic phenomena and of the architecture of the linguistic component of the mind/brain.

The series covers interfaces between core components of grammar, including syntax/morphology, syntax/semantics, syntax/phonology, syntax/pragmatics, morphology/phonology, phonology/phonetics, phonetics/speech processing, semantics/pragmatics, and intonation/discourse structure, as well as issues in the way that the systems of grammar involving these interface areas are acquired and deployed in use (including language acquisition, language dysfunction, and language processing). It demonstrates, we hope, that proper understandings of particular linguistic phenomena, languages, language groups, or inter-language variations all require reference to interfaces.

The series is open to work by linguists of all theoretical persuasions and schools of thought. A main requirement is that authors should write so as to be understood by colleagues in related subfields of linguistics and by scholars in cognate disciplines.

Many recent investigations into imperatives have focused on the interaction between their syntax and their semantics to explain certain striking phenomena, such as the odd behavior of negated imperatives across languages. In this book, Dana Isac takes a different tack, and focuses on the morphosyntax of imperatives, arguing that the imperative property should be deconstructed into a number of features, including modality, causality, and (second) person. She develops a theory of the interaction of these features that can be used to capture a wide range of cross-linguistic morphosyntactic variation in how this kind of speech act is expressed, but at the same time provides insight into where, and why, uniformities emerge. The general thrust of the book is to argue that certain kinds of pragmatic force can be constructed by languages out of atomic units of grammar that are independently motivated.

David Adger
Hagit Borer

Acknowledgments

This book is the result of many years of study, during which the original project underwent significant changes both in its architecture and in its intended content. All changes for the best, I believe. I am indebted to many people, who one way or another have contributed to the final shape of this book. I do not want them to feel like they need to share the responsibility for the mistakes and omissions that this book undoubtedly contains, but I am happy to share the ownership of anything that might be considered of value in here.

My warmest thanks go to Charles Reiss who listened (sometimes even patiently) to many of the half-articulated thoughts that would inhabit me at various moments during the making of this book, and who would most of the times trash them. The result of these conversations were always beneficial: either they led me to reluctantly admit he was right, and to discard the respective analysis, or else they led me to sharpen my arguments. Either way, the outcome was a clearer and more articulated argumentation. I am also deeply indebted to my colleagues at Concordia University, and to my colleagues at the University of Bucharest, especially to Alexandra Cornilescu, a constant source of inspiration and of bafflement at how sharp some people can be, and to Larisa Avram, who always reminds me of the importance of keeping my feet on the ground when launching hypotheses that contained too many *ifs* and *thens* to be realistically acquirable by a language learner.

I have also benefited from discussions and direct or indirect support from many other people: Gabriela Alboiu, Conor Cook, Virginia Hill, Ana Maria Di Sciallo, Maria Luisa Rivero, Stanca Somesfalean, and Raffaella Zanuttini. Thank you!

I would also like to thank two anonymous reviewers whose comments greatly improved the quality of the manuscript. Their effort, time, and pertinence of comments are greatly appreciated.

Finally, I want to thank my family—Ami, Z, and Charles, for putting up with me (during the time when I was writing this book and not only) and for making my life fun.

List of abbreviations

1st	first person
2nd	second person
3rd	third person
ACC	accusative
aff	affirmative
APPOS	appositive
AUX	auxiliary
BN	Bare Noun
CL	clitic
CP	Complementizer Phrase
DAT	dative
DECL	declarative
DEF	definite
DET	determiner
DP	Determiner Phrase
EPP	Extended Projection Principle
EvalP	Evaluation Phrase
EvidP	Evidential Phrase
EXCL	exclamatory
EXH	exhortative
FP	functional phrase
FUT	future
Gen	generic
GEN	genitive
IF	illocutionary force
IMP	imperative
IMPERF	imperfect
INDEF	indefinite
INDIC	indicative
INF	infinitive

INFL	verbal inflection
INT	interrogative
INTJ	interjection
IP	Inflection Phrase
LPH	“Light” Performative Hypothesis
Mod	Modality
ModP	Modality Phrase
MP	Mood Phrase
NEG	negative
NEUT	neuter
NOM	nominative
NON-PERF	non-perfective
NP	Noun Phrase
OBJ	object
PART	participle
PAST	past
PERF	perfective
PF	phonological form
PL	plural
PN	Proper Name
POL	polarity
PREF	prefix
PRES	present
PRM	promissive
PRT	particle
QP	Quantifier Phrase
QU	question
REFL	reflexive
SBJ	subject
SC	Serbo-Croatian
SeP	Speech Event Phrase
SG	singular
SPEC	Specifier
SUBJ	subjunctive
SUFF	suffix

TP	Tense Phrase
UG	Universal Grammar
uMod	uninterpretable [Mod] feature
uNeg	uninterpretable [Neg] feature
VP	Verb Phrase

Introduction and aims

This book is about the syntax of imperative clauses. Unlike most of the existing literature on clause types (declaratives, interrogatives, exclamatives, and imperatives), which focuses on the specific properties that make each type distinct, my starting point will be the observation that despite their differences, various clause types seem to actually share a number of properties. To illustrate, consider the following Quebec French example, which contains the morpheme *tu*.

- (1) Il fait **-tu** assez beau? (interrogative)
 It does -TU enough nice
 'Is the weather nice?' (Morin, 2006)

Tu in (1) is distinct from the 2nd person pronoun *tu*, as shown by the fact that *tu* in (1) co-occurs with a 3rd person subject *il* in an impersonal construction. Some existing analyses propose that *tu* is an interrogative marker cliticized onto the tensed verb (Noonan, 1992; Vinet, 2000, among others). However, the following example shows that *tu* is grammatical not only in interrogative clauses, but in exclamatives, as well.

- (2) Il fait **-tu** assez beau! (exclamative)
 It does -TU enough nice
 'Isn't the weather nice!' (Morin, 2006)

This suggests that *tu* cannot simply be taken to encode interrogative force, and that this morpheme must be the overt realization of some finer grained feature(s), that both interrogatives and exclamatives share. Moreover, *tu* cannot be used in other clause types, such as *declaratives* or *imperatives*, so whatever feature *tu* realizes, it is a feature that brings together interrogatives and exclamatives, to the exclusion of the other types of clauses.

- (3) Il fait (***-tu**) assez beau (declarative)
 It does (-TU) enough nice
 'The weather is nice enough'
- (4) Fais (***-tu**) tes devoirs! (imperative)
 Do.2.SG -TU your homework
 'Do your homework!' (Morin, 2006)

This observation has consequences on the way in which clause typing is formalized: the specificity of each clause type cannot be the result of a unique *Force* feature that can be valued as a declarative, interrogative, exclamative, or imperative, as argued by many authors (Baker, 1970; May, 1985; Rizzi, 1990, 1997, 2001; Cheng, 1991; Rivero and Terzi, 1995; Platzack and Rosengren, 1998; Han, Chung-Hye, 2000; Han, Na-Rae, 2000), but rather, the ‘type’ of a clause should be traced back to a plurality of finer grained features, some of which might cut across several clause types.

This view opens up the possibility of unifying apparently disparate phenomena, such as clause typing, focalization, and topicalization, by potentially revealing primitive features that various clauses share with *Topic* and *Focus*, that have been shown to be ‘composite’ in a similar way (Choi, 1996; Lambrecht, 1996; Birner and Ward, 1998; Cormack and Smith, 2000; Ward and Birner, 2003). Thus, this line of research could lead to an understanding of some puzzling properties of a language like Gascon, for example. Gascon clauses are typed by independent clause type particles both in matrix and embedded contexts, but in embedded contexts these particles show a distributional restriction—they must co-occur with a Topic, as shown in (6).

- (5) a. Maria **que** parla gascon
 Maria Decl.PRT speaks Gascon
 ‘Maria speaks Gascon’ (Morin, 2006)
- b. E parla gascon Maria?
 INT.PRT speaks Gascon Maria
 ‘Does Maria speak Gascon?’
- c. **Be** m’ agrada la toa pelha!
 EXCL.PRT me pleases the your dress
 ‘How I like your dress!’¹
- (6) a. Que ’m demandi se lo gat e drom.
 DECL.PRT me ask if the cat INT.PRT sleeps
 ‘I wonder if the cat is sleeping’ (Morin, 2006)
- b. *Que ’m demandi se e drom lo gat
 DECL.PRT me ask if INT.PRT sleeps the cat
 ‘I wonder if the cat is sleeping’

Under the assumption that *Force* can be broken down into several morphosyntactic features, some of which may be shared by other functional categories in the CP layer, such as the Topic, this dependency of all clause types in Gascon on the presence of the Topic is more likely to receive an explanation.

¹ There is no particle for imperatives. Imperatives display verb raising to a relatively high position.

The main goal of this book is to validate the hypothesis that *Force* is decomposable into more primitive features by applying it to imperative clauses.

Correlations between the type of a particular clause and a variety of functional elements have been noted before in the literature (Manzini and Savoia, 1999; Poletto and Zanuttini, 2003; Zanuttini and Portner, 2003; Portner, 2004; Truckenbrodt, 2006; Zanuttini, 2008; Zanuttini et al., 2012). Some of these authors focus on the *semantics/pragmatics* of imperatives. Portner (2004), for example, identifies two *semantic components* for imperatives, and argues that the force of an imperative can be derived *pragmatically*. Other authors (Zanuttini and Portner, 2003) go a step further in the direction of relating these semantic components to morphosyntactic aspects of imperatives. The direction in these studies is from semantics to syntax: first a semantic analysis is offered which identifies the semantic components of imperatives and then a number of morphosyntactic elements are proposed to match those primitive components of the imperative semantics.

Unlike these works, I will not have anything to say about the semantic decomposition of imperatives or about how semantic components can be put together by means of an interpretation function. Instead, this book is concerned with the *syntax* of imperatives and with identifying relevant *morphosyntactic* features of imperative clauses. The evidence I consider when positing these features/projections is morphosyntactic in nature (expressable in terms of Agree and feature checking). However, given that I will end up proposing new features/projections that are relevant for the syntax of imperatives, I will also include a discussion about the semantics of these features. The semantic considerations included in this book are simply meant to justify the postulation of functional features/categories and are not intended as a semantic analysis of imperatives clauses. I follow Chomsky (1995b) in assuming that postulation of a functional feature/category has to be justified either by ‘output conditions (phonetic and semantic interpretation) or by theory internal arguments’.

This work is not alone in being concerned exclusively with the syntax of imperatives. Other authors, Dikken (1992); Poletto and Zanuttini (2003); Zanuttini (2008); Zanuttini et al. (2012), also posit the existence of a number of functional projections which can be found in imperatives but not in other clause types. We share with these works the assumption that *Force* as such is not formally represented in the syntax. However, we differ in several respects. First, the literature quoted above draws on evidence that comes from individual languages/dialects—Poletto and Zanuttini (2003) discuss Badiotto, a dialect spoken in north-eastern Italy, Zanuttini and Portner (2003) focus on Standard Italian and Badiotto, Dikken (1992) discusses Dutch, Zanuttini (2008) mainly discusses English, Zanuttini et al. (2012) focus mainly on Korean.

This book presents new evidence from a much wider range of languages (several Romance languages, several Germanic languages, a number of Slavic languages like Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian, Macedonian, and other languages like Albanian, Greek, Labrador Inuktitut, and Utkuhiksali Inuktitut). Second, most of the above

quoted literature focuses on individual features that are relevant in the grammar of imperatives—Poletto and Zanuttini (2003) and Dikken (1992) argue for the existence of a Modality Phrase (ModP) in imperatives, Zanuttini (2008) and Zanuttini et al. (2012) propose a JussiveP that hosts a 2nd person feature, Jensen (2003) proposes a 2nd person feature in the T head of imperatives, etc. The one exception is Zanuttini and Portner (2003), who identify more than one such functional projections that are at work in the syntax of imperatives—ModP (posited on the basis of evidence from Standard Italian) and Point-of-ViewP (posited on the basis of Badiotto). Just like Zanuttini and Portner (2003), this book will present evidence that there are several functional projections that are relevant in the grammar of imperatives (although the projections I propose are different from Zanuttini and Portner, 2003). Unlike Zanuttini and Portner (2003), however, who do not show how the Point-of-ViewP they propose on the basis of Badiotto is relevant for Standard Italian (the other language they consider), the analysis proposed in this book points out in an explicit way how the proposed projections/features interact in the syntax of imperatives in all languages under consideration. Last but not least, the present analysis uses the same proposed features in order to account for some long-standing puzzles in the syntax of imperatives:

- the restrictions affecting negative imperatives (in particular why true negative imperatives are banned in some languages, but not in others);
- the similarities and differences between true and surrogate imperatives, and between different types of surrogate imperatives;
- the interpretation of the subject in true vs. surrogate imperatives, as well as in various types of surrogate imperatives;
- the differences in embeddability across different languages and various types of imperatives.

The ultimate goal is to shape a *complete and coherent picture* of the syntax of imperatives, which will eventually be helpful in distinguishing between features that are active across several clause types and features that are distinctive for each clause type.

Descriptive properties of imperatives

Imperatives differ from other types of clauses primarily in point of meaning. My working definition will be the one proposed by Kaufmann (2011): imperatives are clauses prototypically used for *orders*.

(7) Close the door!

It is well known however, that imperatives may be used as a variety of speech acts, not only as orders. In the examples below, adapted from Kaufmann (2011: 12, ex (13)), imperatives are used as a warning, request, advice, or curse.

- (8) a. Stay away from me! (warning)
b. Have fun at the party!
c. Close the door, please! (request)
d. Take the A train if you want to go to Harlem! (advice)
e. Go to hell! (curse)

Following Kaufmann (2011), I will assume that the variation in (8) can be explained by the fact that an imperative (in fact any clause type) may interact with certain lexical properties of the lexical items involved, or with contextual properties in order to render a particular speech act type more plausible in the respective context. Example (9), for instance, is odd as a command because *be blond* is an individual level predicate over which the addressee does not normally have control. If the context, however, provides information that the speaker is on his/her way to a blind date, for example, this restriction can be overridden and (9) could be interpreted as a command.

(9) Be blond! (Kaufman, 2011: ex 5)

Similarly, declaratives are typically used for assertions, but depending on the context, they can also be used for other speech acts such as promises (10b), threats (10c), warnings (10d), orders (10e).

- (10) a. I am cold. (assertion)
b. I'll be there on time. (promise)
c. I'll pay you back for this. (threat)

- d. I'm getting fed up with this. (warning)
- e. I am cold. (order to close the window)

Conversely, not only imperatives can be used for giving orders or commands. For example, if my roommate came in and left the door open, and I utter the declarative (11) while pointing at the door, my intention is most likely to get my roommate to close the door. Hence I am using (11) as a command.

(11) The door is open.

On the other hand, if (11) is uttered in a different context—say I just left the house and I meet my roommate in the street going toward the house and say I have the only key to the apartment—then my intention when uttering (11) is plausibly different, namely to simply inform my roommate that the door is open. Generalizing, any utterance is prototypically associated with a particular speech act type but, in given contexts, additional acts could be performed.

My use of the term 'imperative' will thus cover clauses prototypically used for giving orders/commands and not clauses, such as (11), whose interpretation as orders depends exclusively on the intention of the speaker (and therefore on the context). Moreover, I will restrict the discussion to clauses that are unambiguously interpreted as commands *when taken out of context* and I will thus leave aside the question of how exactly various other speech acts can be obtained when uttering an imperative (as in (8)). In doing so, I want to focus on those imperatives that show a strong link between form and meaning. The question I will ask is what are the morphosyntactic correlates of clauses that are unambiguously interpreted as orders in the absence of any interference from the context.

2.1 True vs. surrogate imperatives

From the point of view of their morphosyntax, imperatives can be divided into two classes: *true* and *surrogate* or *suppletive* imperatives (Zanuttini, 1991, 1994, 1997; Joseph et al., 1987; Rivero, 1994; Rivero and Terzi, 1995).

2.1.1 Morphological differences

Morphologically, in *true* imperatives, the verb is drawn from a distinct verbal paradigm, which is used exclusively for giving orders, while in *surrogate* imperatives, the verb is taken from a morphological paradigm which can express an order or command, but not necessarily so, for example the subjunctive or the infinitive.

- (12) True imperatives
- a. Inchiide ușa! (Romanian)
Close.IMP.2SG door.the
'Close the door!'

- b. Pijene! (Greek)
Go.IMP.2SG
'Go!'
- c. Fige! (Cypriot Greek)
leave.IMP.2SG
'Leave!' (Rivero and Terzi, 1995: ex 46)
- d. Citajte! (Serbo-Croatian)
read.IMP.2PL
'Read!'
- e. Ceti! (Bulgarian)
read.IMP.2SG
'Read!' (Rivero, 1994)
- (13) Surrogate imperatives
- a. Să închizi ușa! (Romanian)
SBJ.PRT close.SUBJ.2SG door.the
'Close the door!'
- b. Na pas! (Greek)
SBJ.PRT go.SUBJ.2SG
'Go!'
- c. Da cetes! (Bulgarian)
SBJ.PRT read.INDIC.2SG
'You should read!' (Scatton, 1984)

2.1.2 Relative position with respect to clitics

Syntactically, true and surrogate imperatives are assumed to have distinct structural properties. First, true imperatives undergo raising to a high functional head, which typically precedes the position of clitics (as shown in (14a)), while surrogate ones adopt the structural properties of their source morphological paradigms (Rivero, 1994; Rivero and Terzi, 1995). In particular, subjunctive or infinitive verbs follow clitics.

- (14) True imperatives
- a. Diavase to! (Greek)
Read.IMP.2SG CL.3SG
'Read it!'
- b. *To diavase!
CL.3SG read.IMP.2SG
'Read it!'

(15) Surrogate imperatives

a. Na tu to stilis! (Greek)

SBJ.PRT CL.3SG CL.3SG send.SUBJ.2SG

'You should send it to him!'

b. *Na stilis tu to! (Greek)

SBJ.PRT send.SUBJ.2SG CL.3SG CL.3SG

'You should send it to him!'

This distinction can be observed clearly only in languages in which clitics have a fixed host, typically assumed to be an IP projection (Kayne, 1994). In other languages, clitics are not placed in a fixed position and their surface position is instead determined by independent requirements. In Serbo-Croatian, Slovenian, Czech, and Slovak, for example, clitics are subject to second position requirements—they require the syntactic or phonological support of a first constituent. Thus, the Serbo-Croatian true imperatives in example (16) can either precede or follow the clitic, depending on whether the second position requirement for the clitic is fulfilled by the verb or by an independent constituent, respectively.

(16) a. Citajte im! (Serbo-Croatian)

read.IMP.2PL CL.3PL.DAT

'Read to them!'

b. Knjige im citajte!

Books CL.3PL.DAT read.IMP.2PL

'Read the books to them!'

On the other hand, Bulgarian clitics show Tobler–Mussafia effects (Tobler 1875; Mussafia 1886), which means that they are subject to a syntactic constraint against first position, without restrictions on second or later positions. Bulgarian clitics are thus different from Serbo-Croatian ones, which show Wackernagel (second position) effects. The examples in (17) show that a true imperative can either precede or follow the clitics in Bulgarian, depending on whether this independent requirement on clitics is met. The surface position of verbs with respect to clitics cannot therefore be taken as symptomatic for the distinction between true and surrogate imperatives.

(17) a. Donesi mi go! (Bulgarian)

Bring.IMP CL.1SG.DAT CL.3SG.ACC

'Bring it to me!'

b. Ja mi go donesi!

hey me.CL.DAT it.CL.ACC bring.IMP

'Hey, bring me it!'

- c. KONJAKA mi donesi!
 cognac.DEF CL.1SG.DAT bring.IMP
 'Bring me the COGNAC!'
- e. Na IVAN go davaj!
 to Ivan CL.3SG.ACC give.IMP
 'Give it to IVAN!'

2.1.3 Negation

A third difference between true and surrogate imperatives, apart from morphology and the relative position with respect to clitics, is that true imperatives are incompatible with the negative marker (as shown by the ungrammaticality of (18)), while surrogate ones can be negated (Rivero, 1994; Rivero and Terzi, 1995). The position of the negative marker with respect to the verb depends on the specific structural properties of the respective surrogate form. In particular, the verb inflected for subjunctive in (19) follows both pronominal clitics and the negative marker, as shown in (19a) and (19b), respectively.

(18) True imperatives

*Den/mi diavase!
 NEG read.IMP.2SG
 'Don't read!'

(19) Surrogate imperatives

- a. Na tu to stilis! (Greek)
 SBJ.PRT CL.3SG CL.3SG send.SUBJ.2SG
 'You should send it to him!'
- b. Na min tu to stilis!
 SBJ.PRT NEG CL.3SG CL.3SG send.SUBJ.2SG
 'You should not send it to him!'

2.2 Two classes of true imperatives

Rivero and Terzi (1995) and Postma and Van der Wurff (2007) and among others, notice that not all true imperatives are incompatible with the negative marker and thus propose that a further distinction should be made within the class of true imperatives between Class I imperatives, which cannot be negated, and Class II imperatives, which can. Among languages that have true imperatives but disallow negative imperatives are Greek, Romanian, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Catalan, Sardinian, Hungarian, Latin, and Hebrew. Class II languages include Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian, Macedonian,

Russian, Polish, Czech, Albanian, Slovenian, Berber, Basque, Yiddish, Norwegian, Swedish, and German.

(20) Class 1 True imperatives

- a. *Den/mi diavase! (Greek)

NEG read.IMP.2SG

'Don't read!'

- b. *En/mi fige! (Cypriot Greek)

not leave.IMP.2SG

'Don't leave!' (Rivero and Terzi, 1995: ex 46b)

(21) Class 2 True imperatives

- Ne ceti! (Serbo-Croatian)

NEG read.IMP.2SG

'Don't read!'

Moreover, this distinction is matched by a difference regarding the relative position of the imperative verb with respect to clitics: Class I true imperatives always precede clitics, as illustrated in (22)–(25), whereas Class II true imperatives may either precede or follow clitics, as illustrated in (26).

(22) a. Citește-le! (Romanian)

Read.IMP.2SG-them.CL

'Read them!'

- b. *Le citește!

Them.CL read.IMP.2SG

'Read them!'

(23) a. Telefona le (Italian)

call.IMP.2SG her

'Call her!'

- b. *Le telefona!

her call.IMP.2SG

'Call her!'

(24) a. Lee lo! (Spanish)

Read.IMP.2SG it.CL

'Read it!'

- b. *Lo lee!

it.CL read.IMP.2SG

'Read it!'

(25) a. Faites le! (French)

Do.IMP.2PL it.CL

'Do it!'

- b. *Le faites!
 it.CL do.IMP.2PL
 'Do it!'
- (26) a. Čitajte je! (Serbo-Croatian)
 read.IMP.2PL it.CL
 'Read it!' (Rivero and Terzi, 1995: ex 12)
- b. Knjige im citajte! (Serbo-Croatian)
 Books to.them.CL read.IMP.2PL
 'Read books to them!'

These two contrasts—between true and surrogate imperatives and between the two classes of true imperatives—have received a lot of attention in the literature. Most of the proposed analyses are based on the assumption that imperative clauses contain an imperative Force feature which is checked by the verb. In the following chapter I will review these proposals—first the accounts of the true/surrogate contrast, and then the accounts of the distinction between Class I and Class II true imperatives.

Previous analyses

3.1 The ‘true’ vs. ‘surrogate’ contrast

Existing analyses of the contrast between true and surrogate imperatives fall into two classes.

One type of analyses proposes *different syntactic locations for the imperative features*: with true imperatives it is C that hosts imperative features and thus the verb needs to raise to C, whereas with surrogate forms the imperative features are located in a lower position, say FP. Such a view can be found in Rivero (1994); Zanuttini (1994, 1997); Rivero and Terzi (1995); Han, Chung-Hye (2000).

Another type of analysis attempts to *unify true imperatives and surrogate ones* (Miyoshi, 2002; Bošković, 2004; Isac and Jakab, 2004; Postma and Van der Wurff, 2007; Bošković, 2012) and proposes that all imperatives, be they true or surrogate, check an imperative feature in a head which is higher than the Infl head and than negation.¹ The differences between true and surrogate imperatives, as well as cross-linguistic variation follow in this view from the particular properties that clitics and negative markers have across languages, as well as from the particular mechanism by which the imperative Force feature is checked (by merging a free morpheme in the head of the projection hosting imperative features; by moving the imperative verb to this head; or by moving the Negative marker to the same head). In what follows, I will briefly describe how these two types of analyses can account for the contrasting properties discussed above: position of the verb relative to pronominal clitics, and compatibility with negation.

3.1.1 Position with respect to clitics

As described in Chapter 2, true imperatives differ from surrogate ones with respect to their relative position to clitics. In particular, true imperatives precede clitics while in surrogate imperatives the verb follows clitics. It is easy to see how an analysis that assumes different locations of the imperative Force feature for true vs. surrogate

¹ Miyoshi (2002), Bošković (2004, 2012) simply mention a unified analysis as a possibility, along with the alternative of assuming that surrogate imperatives do not have an imperative feature at all.

imperatives can account for the different locations of these forms with respect to clitics. Given that in this view true imperatives must raise to a higher position than surrogate ones, and given that this higher position (but not the lower one) precedes the host of clitics, true imperatives will precede clitics whereas surrogate ones will not.

(27) [_{CP} C^o [_{TP} CLITIC T^o [_{FP} F^o [_{VP} V^o]]]]

Under the second type of account, the one in which all imperatives, be they true or surrogate, check an imperative force feature in a position higher than the clitics, it is less obvious how the differences between true and surrogate imperatives with respect to clitics can be derived. The key observation is that the imperative force feature is checked in different ways in true vs. surrogate forms: with true imperatives, it is the verb itself that raises to the relevant head to check the imperative force feature, whereas with surrogate imperatives a particle which is independent morpho-phonologically from the verb, but still part of the verbal complex, is merged in this high position (C in (27)).

Thus, in fact both true and surrogate imperatives have at least one segment higher than the clitics, and the difference is that this segment could be either the verb itself, as in the case of true imperatives, or an invariant particle, as in the case of subjunctives and infinitives. The differences lie in the relative position of the verbal stem with respect to the clitics.²

3.1.2 *The ban on negative imperatives*

The incompatibility between negation and true imperatives (Class I) has received several types of explanations. Since the ban on negative imperatives extends only to (a subclass) of true imperatives, and never to surrogate ones, the proposed explanations have to do with the specific properties of true imperative verbs and with how the latter interact with the properties of negation.

3.1.2.1 *Explanations based on locality constraints* One type of accounts relates the ban on negative imperatives to a violation of locality restrictions. In Rivero's (1994) and Rivero and Terzi's (1995) view, negation blocks verb raising to C by virtue of being placed in an intermediary position, in between V and C, as illustrated in (28a). The same type of account is also proposed in Isac and Jakab (2004).

² The analysis of subjunctive and infinitive particles in Greek and Romanian is not uncontroversial. Some linguists analyze these particles as complementizers (cf. Dobrovie-Sorin, 1994 for Romanian, and Agouraki, 1991 for Greek, for example). Other researchers, such as Rivero (1994), take subjunctive and infinitive particles to occupy the head of a Mood projection, which is lower than CP but higher than TP. Still others assume that the subjunctive particles are merged in MP and raise to C in the absence of a lexical complementizer (cf. Roussou (1994) for Greek; Motapanyane (1994) for Romanian, for example). What is important is that the relevant position—be it M or C, is higher than TP, the host for clitics. These surrogate forms will thus contain two segments: one particle preceding the TP (and thus the clitics) and the verbal stem lower than the clitics.

- (28) (a) [_{CP} C° [_{NegP} Neg° [_{IP} I° [_{VP} V°]]]]
 (b) [_{CP} C° [_{NegP} Neg° [_{IP} I° [_{FP} F° [_{VP} V°]]]]]

Surrogate imperative verbs are not blocked by negation, since the NegP is higher than the head of FP which is assumed to host the imperative Force feature in surrogate imperatives, as illustrated in (28b). Given that surrogate imperatives are assumed to remain in a position FP which is lower than the IP, and given that clitics are assumed to be generated in a fixed, IP related position, such an analysis can also easily account for the fact that surrogate imperatives follow, whereas true imperatives precede, clitics.

Laka (1990) and Zanuttini (1994) have a slightly different take on locality and propose that the head which attracts true imperative verbs—the Sigma head in Laka’s view and the Polarity (Pol) head in Zanuttini’s view—hosts not only imperative force features, but also negative features. This turns the negative marker and the imperative verb into potential competitors for raising to the Sigma/Pol head. However, since the negative head is placed in between the verb and the Sigma/Pol head, it is closer to the Sigma/Pol head, and thus ends up always winning when both negation and a true imperative verb are present in the derivation. The derivation crashes when a true imperative is present, since the imperative features on the verb remain unchecked.

3.1.2.2 Explanations based on morphosyntactic defectiveness Alternatively, the incompatibility between true imperatives (Class I) and negation has been accounted for not by locality effects, but by the features of the heads involved in the derivation of a negative imperative, more specifically, the selectional properties of the negative head, and the morphosyntactic (defective) features of true imperatives (Zanuttini, 1991; Postma and Van der Wurff, 2007). Zanuttini (1991), for example, proposes that true imperatives (Class I) are incompatible with negation because languages that have Class I true imperatives use a preverbal negative marker which subcategorizes for a TP, while true imperatives are morphosyntactically defective or reduced, and lack a TP by assumption. A clash thus results between the selectional restrictions of the negative head and the morphosyntactic “make-up” of Class I true imperatives. Similarly, Zanuttini (1994) explains the incompatibility between Class I true imperatives and negation by proposing that negation selects a Mood Phrase. The Mood feature hosted by the Mood head can be checked by an infinitive verb, for example, but not by a true imperative verb, given that the latter are defective and do not have Mood features. The ungrammaticality of a negated Class I true imperative is thus the result of the Mood feature remaining unchecked. Affirmative true imperatives (Class I) are not affected by Mood, because MoodP is licensed by the Neg head, and there is no Neg head in Affirmative true imperatives.³

³ For a similar account, but based on a finiteness feature, see Platzack and Rosengren (1998).

3.1.2.3 *Semantic explanations: Han, Chung-Hye (2000)* Under a third type of account, negated true imperatives (Class I) are ruled out for interpretational rather than morphosyntactic reasons. The crucial observation is that semantically, orders or commands cannot be negated, and thus that negation cannot have scope over the Imperative operator. True imperatives (Class I) cannot be negated because the syntax derives a structure in which negation would take scope over the imperative operator feature in C, a structure that would map into an incoherent interpretation. More specifically, in Han's view, the negative marker in languages that have Class I true imperatives is a clitic and as such it moves together with the verb when the latter raises to C to check the directive feature.⁴

In contrast to true imperatives, suppletive imperatives do not raise to C in Han's account, but to a lower position. Even though negation has scope over the verb in suppletive imperatives, it crucially does not have scope over the imperative operator, which is placed in C, because the verb never moves to C.

3.1.2.4 *PF explanations: Miyoshi (2002); Bošković (2004); Bošković (2012)* A fourth type of accounts for the incompatibility between Class I true imperatives and negation has to do with the status of the imperative feature as a PF affix. Imperative affixes are treated in a parallel fashion to Tense affixes in this proposal and true imperatives are spelled out with imperative morphology as a result of Affix Hopping (in the spirit of Bobaljik, 1994, 1995). More specifically, in Bobaljik's view, Tense is a functional head which is a PF affix, that is it needs support from an adjacent verb. If negation is absent, the adjacency condition between the verb and the imperative affix is met, and Affix Hopping can apply. When negation is present, it counts as intervening PF material between the affixal imperative feature and the verb, and thus the adjacency condition is violated. The result is ungrammatical.

- (29) a. *John T_{aff} not left.
 b. John did not leave.
 c. *Imp_{aff} nu pleca! (Romanian)
 IMP_{aff} NEG leave.IMP.2SG
 'Don't leave!'
 d. Să nu pleci! (Romanian)
 SBJ.PRT NEG leave.SUBJ.2SG
 'Don't leave!'

In (29a), the stranded Tense affix cannot get support from the verb, because negation is intervening and thus the Tense affix and the verb are not adjacent. *DO* support saves

⁴ Han proposes that the imperative operator, which is hosted in C, contains several features: a directive force feature and a modality feature, the imperative operator ends up in the scope of negation—a syntactic representation that cannot be interpreted semantically.