

UQAM/ Concordia University

The contrast between true imperatives (with unambiguous imperative morphology) and suppletive ones (subjunctive, indicative, or infinitive forms used with an imperative force) has received a lot of attention in the literature (Rivero 1994, 1995, Laka 1990, Zanuttini 1991): in languages with preverbal negative markers, true imperatives cannot be negated, whereas suppletive ones can be.

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------------------|----|------------------------|
| (1) | a. | telefona! (Italian) | b. | non parlare! (Italian) |
| | | call.IMP.2.S! | | neg speak-INF.! |
| | | *non telefona! | | don't speak! |
| | | don't call! | | |

This paper focuses on a puzzling further contrast within the class of surrogate imperatives which has gone unnoticed in the literature: some suppletive forms can acquire imperative force only under negation, whereas others can be used with imperative force both in the affirmative and in the negative.

- (2)a. *călca pe iarbă! (Romanian) b. *parlare! (Italian) c. *grafis! (Greek)
 step.INF on the grass speak.INF. write.IND.2.sg.
nu călca pe iarbă! **non** parlare! **mi(n)** grafis!
 neg step.INF. on grass neg speak.INF neg write.IND.2.sg.
 'Don't step on the grass!' 'Don't talk!' 'Don't write!'
- (3)a. **să** vii! (Romanian) b. **na** tu to stilis (Greek)
 SA(SUBJ.prt)come (subj.2.S) NA(SUBJ.prt) him it send-2S
 'Come!' 'You should send it to him!'
- să** nu vii! **na** min tu to stilis
 SA(SUBJ.prt)not come (subj.2.S) NA(SUBJ.prt) Neg. him it send-2S
 'Don't come!' 'You should not send it to him!'

Our proposal is that the negative markers in (2) have a similar syntax to the subjunctive particles in (3): the negative markers in (2) check a logical mood feature hosted by a functional projection which is higher than IP and which can also host subjunctive and infinitive particles. We take this projection to be the MP proposed by Rivero 1994, for independent reasons. Our analysis involves three steps:

- (i) Based on distributional similarities illustrated in (4) and (5), we propose that all imperatives (be they true or surrogate) have the same syntax; they all involve checking a (logical) Mood feature which is hosted by a functional head (henceforth M) that is higher than the Infl projection which hosts the clitics.

- (4) Du -te! (Romanian) (5) Stile tu to! (Greek)
go.IMP.2.S -CL.2S Send.IMP.2.S. CL.2S. CL.3S.
Să te duci! Na tu to stilis!
SĂ (SUBJ.prt) CL.2S. go .SUBJ.2.S NA(SUBJ.prt) CL.2S. CL.3S. send.2S
'Go!' 'Send it to him!'

The differences regarding negation illustrated in (1) stem from the different ways in which this logical mood feature is checked: true imperatives are morphologically synthetic forms, and check the logical mood feature by raising to M, whereas suppletive forms are morphologically analytical in the sense that there is a division of labor between the verb and an independent particle: the verb raises to an Infl head which is lower than M, and an independent particle is merged in M. The presence of negation in true imperatives blocks verb movement to M and this explains the incompatibility between true imperatives and negation illustrated in (1a). In contrast, Merging an independent particle in M is not blocked by negation, and therefore subjunctives and infinitives used with imperative force can be negated.

- (ii) The contrast between surrogate imperatives that must be negated and the ones that need not be negated (as illustrated in (2), (3)) seems to be similar to the contrast between true imperatives and surrogate ones (illustrated in (1)), in that it involves a more general contrast between morphologically synthetic forms and morphologically analytical ones. However, short infinitives or indicatives do not raise as high as imperatives, as shown by the fact that they are preceded by clitics, whereas true imperatives are followed by clitics. The fact remains, though, that the surrogate imperatives in (2) are morphologically synthetic, and that there is no division of labor between the V and an independent particle with respect to the checking of features. The fact that short infinitives and indicatives can be used with imperative force only when a neg. marker is present suggests that the neg. marker itself takes over the function performed by the independent particles in 'analytical' forms such as (3). Under negation, the verb targets a head which is lower than M, but the negative marker 'completes' the feature matrix of the verbal complex in that it contributes not only a neg feature, but also checks the logical mood feature.

- (6) [MP [NegP [IP

- (7) A le citi cu atentie! (Romanian)
 A (INF.prt) them.CLread.INF. with attention
 'Read them carefully!'
 Nu le citi!
 neg them.CL read.INF
 'Don't read them!'

(iii) We bring further evidence from Greek, Cypriot, Bulgarian, Albanian and Macedonian, that the same division of labor that is operative in (3a,b) also takes place in (2): the V raises to an Infl head which is lower than M, and the negative marker raises to M to check the logical mood feature:

A. When Greek indicatives are used as veridical, they are negated with *den*, but when used with imperative force, i.e. as non-veridical, the neg marker must be different, i.e. *min*. Since the form of the (indicative) V is the same when the interpretation is veridical or non-veridical, it must be that the veridical vs non-veridical distinction is carried by the neg. marker. Under our analysis, the neg marker raises to M in order to check the imperative force feature, and this explains why *den*, which does not have 'logical' mood features, results in ungrammaticality.

- (8)a. den grafis b. mi(n) grafis! (Greek)
 neg write.IND.2.sg. neg write.IND.2.sg.
 'you are not writing'. 'don't write!'

B. In Bulgarian, Macedonian and Cypriot Greek, true imperatives can be negated. This is also marginally possible in Romanian. What is interesting is that although the clitic normally follows the imperative (Bulgarian and Cypriot are Tobler Mussafia languages, while for Macedonian this order applies only for nonfinite verbs), the clitic precedes the verb when negation is present. Similarly, in Romanian, negative imperatives are acceptable only if the clitic precedes the verb, although normally in true imperatives clitics follow the verb.

- (9) ceti- ja! (Bulgarian) (11) Du- te! (Romanian)
 read.IMP- it .CL Go.IMP.2.sg.- you.relf.CL
 ne ja ceti! *Te du!
 neg it (CL) read.IMP relf.CL go.IMP.2.sg.
 (10) ...i klanjajki se na nego,...(Bg) *Nu du- te!
 and owing refl.CL to him neg go.IMP.2.sg.- you.relf.CL
 ne vizdajki ja,... Nu te du!
 neg seeing her.CL neg relf.CL go.IMP.2.sg

C. In Albanian, the negative marker, *mos*, which is used with subjunctives, can be placed on either side of the subjunctive marker *të*, but only in root subjunctives, which are actually subjunctives used with imperative force. This suggests that the logical mood feature can be checked either by the subjunctive particle or by the negative marker.

Conclusions and consequences: (i) We show that negation can take over the role of checking the imperative force features in suppletive forms. Similar suggestions have been made by Zanuttini 1997 (who merely mentions the availability of this option in some contexts, without discussing any restrictions) and Kayne 2000 (who focuses on Italian infinitives). Unlike these authors, we relate this possibility to the morphological form and to the features of the verb, and we are thus able to predict the set of contexts where this option is obligatory. (ii) Our analysis provides independent evidence that negation in imperatives has a meaning which is different from that of negation in non-imperatives. In many languages this difference is reflected in the use of different negators in negative imperatives vs negative non-imperatives. This result converges with conclusions reached by Postma and van der Wurff 2001, who distinguish between modal and non modal negation.

Selected References:

- Franks, S. and T.H. King. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. OUP.
 Kayne, R. 2000. 'Italian negative imperatives and clitic climbing'. in *Parameters and Universals*, OUP.
 Laka, I. 1990. *Negation in syntax: on the nature of functional categories and projections*, PhD thesis, MIT.
 Rivero, M.L. and A. Terzi. 1995. 'Imperatives, V-movement and Logical Mood'. *J. of Linguistics* 31: 310-332.
 Rivero, M.L. 1994. 'Clause Structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans'. *NLLT* 12: 63-120.
 Zanuttini, R. 1994. 'Speculations on negative Imperatives'. in *Rivista di Linguistica* 6.1, 67-89.
 Postma, G. and Wim van der Wurff. 2001. 'How to say *No* and *Don't*: Negative Imperatives in Romance and Germanic'. Ms. University of Leiden.