Imperatives and Negation in Romance Languages: Verbalisation, De-verbalisation and Marking

Emil Ionescu [iD]

University of Bucharest

Abstract

The topic of this paper is the expression of negative directives in several Romance languages. The majority of Romance languages do not express negative directives by adding (pre-verbal) negation to the positive imperative form, but by using a different verb form (infinitive, subjunctive or something else), to which negation is attached. The present analysis shows that (some) directive verbal forms in Romance lost some hallmarks of their verbhood. The phenomenon is taken as witnessing different stages of de-verbalisation. De-verbalisation makes directive verb forms similar to interjections. The variation documented in the Romance imperatives with respect to the compatibility/incompatibility with negation may thus seen as tendencies of different degrees of the imperatives to come closer either to the verb, or to the interjection. In the context of these tendencies, the incompatibility between negation and imperatives may be explained through the concept of marking. Put briefly, imperatives require to be marked by negation but negation is or is not able to mark them.

1   Introduction

The relationship between imperatives[1] and negation in Romance languages (and in other languages, as well) may be of compatibility or incompatibility. This means that imperatives may or may not be negated. Compatibility and incompatibility manifest in multiple forms, and involve (in a rather unpredictable way) pre- or post-verbal position of negation and the person of the imperative. Here is an (almost) complete inventory (for Romance languages):

- Pre-verbal negation is incompatible with imperatives.
  Italian[2] (also Daco-Romanian[3] and Spanish), 2nd pers. sg:

  (1)   *Non parla! 'Don`t speak!' (*parla*= true imperative)

- Pre-verbal negation is incompatible with plural imperatives but compatible with singular ones.
  The dialect from Cortina D`Ampezzo, Italy, 2nd pers. sg.:

  (2)   No laőra! 'Don`t work!' (*laőra* =true imperative)

---

[1] By `imperatives` I mean throughout this paper what is sometimes called `true imperatives` (see, for instance, Rivero and Terzi 1995), as distinct from `surrogate (or suppletive) imperatives` - for example, infinitives used with directive force.

[2] For Italian and Italian dialects, the data used here are from Zanuttini (1997).

[3] Daco-Romanian is one of the dialects of the Romanian language and the national language of the Romanian state.

Cortina D`Ampezzo, 2nd pers. pl:

(3)   *No lourà! 'Don`t work!' (*lourà*=true imperative)

- Pre-verbal negation is compatible with imperatives.
  Aromanian[4], 2nd pers. sg.:

(4)   Nu zi! 'Don`t speak!' (*zi*=true imperative)

- Post-verbal negation is compatible with imperatives.
  French (also Wallon, several dialects of Italian – Piedmontese, Valdotain, Milanese – and several varieties of Occitan – see Zanuttini 1997: 111–112), 2nd pers sg.:

(5)   Ne parle pas! 'Don`t speak!' (*parle*=true imperative)

- Post-verbal negation is incompatible with imperatives.
  Modern Central Occitan, 2nd pers. sg.:

(6)   *Canta pas! 'Don`t sing!' (*canta*=true imperative)

Despite the discouraging diversity, the above data deserve the effort to prospect the chances of a unified perspective, and the present paper attempts to do that[5]. The leading concepts in the following approach are verbalisation and de-verbalisation (as `background` concepts in the analysis) and marking (as a `foreground` concept).

2   Verbalisation and de-verbalisation in the field of the expression of directives

The aim of this part of the paper is to prove two facts: (i) that the main classes of words which express directives (that is, interjections and verb forms) share properties which makes them hybrid or impure verbs and interjections; and (ii) that in this class of hybrid words some interjection properties are instantiated by verbs whereas some verbs properties are illustrated by interjections. This increases the hybrid character of the words involved in expressing directives.

---

[4] Aromanian is a dialect of Romanian, which is still spoken in enclaves, mainly in the Balkan Peninsula.

[5] There is already a reach literature, especially of generative orientation, on this topic: Rivero and Terzi (1995), Zanuttini (1997), Tomic (1999), Han (2001), Bošković (2004), Zeijlstra (2006), Cavalcante (2011) etc.

In the light of these processes, the unavailability of some of the imperatives to negation is viewed as a form of de-verbalisation.

2.1 Expressing directives

A directive (Searle 1979) may be expressed in natural language through different forms. However, two parts of speech play a particularly important role in this respect: the interjection and the verb. Here are examples of interjections and verbs used with directive force in Spanish. Similar examples may be given not only from the area of Romance languages but also from languages of the world in general:

(7)   ¡ Anda, Juan! 'Come on John!'

(8)   ¡ Habla! 'Speak!'

Interjections and verbs are important in expressing directives but they are not limited to play this role. Apart from injunctions, interjections also serve to express emotions (*exclamative interjections* – for instance, *Wow* ! in English, which expresses admiration and/or surprise), or natural noises (*onomatopoeic interjections*). The situation of the verbs is more complex. The imperative mood or certain performatives show that verbs have dedicated forms for directives. Nevertheless, verbs may be also used to express assertions or to ask questions, which are speech acts distinct from directives.

A peculiar property of interjections and verbs deserves special attention. When they are involved in expressing directives they are no longer pure interjections or verbs. Moreover, when an interjection serves to express a directive (a *D-interjection*), it loses a feature of interjection and acquires a feature of verb. Likewise when a verb form expresses a directive (a *D-verb form*) it loses something from its verbhood and acquires a feature of interjection. So, one may say that D-interjections tend to become verbs (verbalisation), whereas D-verb forms tend to become interjections (de-verbalisation).   In the area of Romance languages these tendencies are illustrated by two properties which are shared by all D-verb forms and D-interjections. These properties are the independent occurrence and the adverbial modification. We will take a look at either of them.

2.1.1 Independent occurrence

If considered as a criterion of comparison between interjections and verb forms which do not express directives, the independent occurrence appears to be a property of the interjections. Indeed, exclamative and onomatopoeic interjections never occur in subordination (one cannot have a clause such as *I said *that wow !,* but the clause *I said: Wow !* is allowed– the same goes for every Romance language). On the other hand, verb forms not expressing

directives may (or even have to) be used in subordination. Just as in English, where one may have the same verb form *sing* used either as an independent or as a subordinate clause (*You sing* vs *I know that you sing*), one may have the same situation in all Romance languages.

This contrasts with D-verb forms and D-interjections. In their case the independent occurrence is a common property. So, no D-verb form or D-interjection is allowed to be subordinate. The following example in Romanian documents this situation (the first pair of examples contains a D-interjection while the second pair contains a D-verb form):

(9)   Hai! / I-am spus *că hai! 'Come on / I told him *that come on!'

(10)   Vino! / I-am spus *că vino! 'Come / I told him *that come!'

On may therefore conclude that the incapacity of the D-verb forms to occur in subordination is a (weak) symptom of their de-verbalisation, in the sense that due to this property D-verb forms tend to come closer to interjections.

2.1.2 Adverbial modification

Taken as another criterion of comparison between interjections and verb forms not expressing directives, adverbial modification appears to be a verb property. Adverbial modification characterizes verb forms with illocutionary forces distinct from directives. Adverbial modification, therefore, is not possible in the case of exclamative or onomatopoeic interjections. This may be seen in the following examples in Italian, where the adverb modifies a verb form with assertive force but cannot modify the exclamative interjection which expresses impatience:

(11)   Gianni è venutto subito 'John has come quickly'

(12)   Uff, subito, Gianni, subito! 'Ooh, quick, John, quick!'

The adverb *subito* in (12) cannot be understood as modifying the interjection *uff* !.

The situation changes again when one deals with D-interjections and D-verb forms. This time the adverb may be uniformly used to modify the interjection (13) or the verb form (14):

(13)   Smettila adesso! 'Stop it right now!'

(14)   Vieni subito! 'Come quickly!'

The availability of the D-interjections to adverbial modification may then be interpreted as a weak symptom of their verbalisation.

2.1.3. D-words

Since independent occurrence and adverbial modification are shared features of D-verb forms and D-interjections but are not shared properties of non-D-interjections and non-D-verb forms, it is justified to identify an intermediary category between verbs and interjections on the basis of the shared properties. I call it *D-words*. The identity of D-words with respect to `pure` interjections and verbs is represented in the table below.

	Independent occurrence	Adverbial modification
D-words (interjections or verb forms)	+	+
Non-D-interjections	+	-
Non-D-verb forms	underspecified or -	+

Table 1. Comparison between properties of verb forms, interjections and D-words.

The mixed identity of the D-words is strengthened in addition by other phenomena: properties which characterise interjections, are instantiated by verb forms, and also properties specific to verbs are illustrated by interjections. Thus, it is well known that non-D-interjections do not have arguments, nor do they host pronominal clitics. Both phenomena characterise the verb. However, in Daco-Romanian one may find a D-interjection (*Na*!, 'Take (that)') which host pronominal clitics as arguments: *Na-ți-l*! ('Take CLto you Clthat!'). Clitics may be replaced with full NP: *Na cartea*! ('Take the book!'). The same holds for the D-interjections *Iată!* and *Uite!* 'Look!'. Likewise, the D-interjection *Hai*! ('Come on!') may optionally have a subject argument *Hai și tu*! ('Come on you, too!').

As to the verbs, it is also well known that they do not have a special propensity for mono- or bi-syllabic phonetical structure. Mono- or bi-syllabic structure is a hallmark of the interjections. Nevertheless, many imperatives are either etymologically mono- or bi-syllabic, or they undergo processes of truncation (see the next paragraph)[6].

In line with these facts, in the following two paragraphs we will discuss two other relevant aspects of the hybridisation of the D-words: inflection and the unavailability to negation.

---

[6] For a systematic analysis of this aspect of the imperatives, see Floricic and Molinu (2012).

2.1.4 D-words and inflection

Inflection divides the class of D-words into two subclasses: inflected and non-inflected (= root) forms. Again, Daco-Romanian is particularly rich and instructive in this respect. The D-interjections *Hai*! (*Haide*!), 'Come on!', *Na!* 'Take it!', *Uite*!, *Iată*!, 'Look!', *Vă*! 'Go!' are uninflected forms, so they are closer to interjections, because interjections are not inflected. Nevertheless, the interjection *Haideţi*! ('Come on (pl.)') *is* inflected (-*ţi* is the 2nd pers. pl. ending for the verbs) and this means a step further in the process of the verbalisation.

In the field of the D-verb forms the majority of the lexical items in Daco-Romanian are inflected. However, a small group of old imperatives coming from Latin (*Du*! 'Bring it!', *Fă*! 'Do it!' and *Zi*! 'Speak!') are uninflected. The picture has to be completed by adding that some inflected D-verb forms have truncated counter-parts. Truncation results in morphological simplification and what is thus lost is just inflection. For example, the verbs *Păzeşte-te*! and *Fereşte-te*! 'Watch(sg.) out!' become in their truncated versions *Păzea*! and *Ferea*! with no ending. Truncated D-verb forms are amply documented in the subdialects of Daco-Romanian (Puşcariu 1959: 169–170).

From the point of view of the inflection, Italian is simpler than Daco-Romanian[7]. D-words coming from interjections are invariably uninflected, and in this respect no symptom of verbalisation may be noticed. D-verb forms, though, underwent modifications. Firstly, the verbs which turned into interjections lost inflection (*Basta*! 'Enough!', *Smetttila*! 'Stop it!'). Secondly, there are D-words that, due to their forms, indicate their verbal origin. These verb forms have no inflection, either: *Sii*! 'be.2nd sg.', *Abbi*! 'have.2nd sg.', *Vogli*! 'want.2nd sg.', *Sappi*! 'know.2nd sg.' (Romanello and Repetti 2014: 139–140). And thirdly, there are also inflected verbs with directive force, which have truncated counter-parts: *te'* (< *tieni*), *ve'* (< *vedi*), *gua'* (< *guarda*), *vete* (< *vedete*) (Hubert-Sauter1951: 65)

Finally, some relevant data also come from Spanish, where eight irregular imperatives of the 2nd pers. sg. (*haz* `do`, *ve* `go`, *di* `speak`, *pon* `open`, *sal* `go`, *se* `be`, *ten* `have`, and *ven* `come`) are uninflected and invariably mono-syllabic. Just like in Italian, Spanish D-interjections are uninflected (*anda, hale* `come on`, *basta* `enough`).

In all the cases described above, one may therefore identify clues of morphological de-verbalisation, because the lack of inflection does not characterize the verb. The tendency of these D-verb forms to come closer to interjections is clear and contrasts with the situation of the D-infinitives and D-indicatives, which preserve inflection.

---

[7] I owe details on D-interjections in Italian to Oana Sălişteanu.

2.1.5 D-words and negation in the context of the verbalisation and de-verbalisation

The relationship negation-imperatives may now be approached in the space of the D-words delimited above; at issue is the play between the complementary tendencies that manifest within this space, verbalisation of the interjections and de-verbalisation of the verb forms.

Noticing that exclamative and onomatopoeic interjections are incompatible with negation is irrelevant: one cannot imagine what the combination between negation and such interjections would amount to. Noticing instead that D-interjections cannot be negated *is* relevant, because just like imperatives, D-interjections are destined to change a state of things in the world. Under these conditions, their incompatibility with negation goes with another interjection property – the independent occurrence – and both show that the verbalisation of D-interjections is really weak. And, indeed, to the best of my knowledge no D-interjection in the Romance area could be negated; it would not be surprising to discover that this is a property of D-interjections in general.

On the other hand, negation *does* characterize the verb in general, which means that non-D-verb forms may be negated. However, in the field of the D-words some imperatives may be negated, whereas some others may not. In the context of the two tendencies, compatibility and incompatibility between negation and imperatives receive simple and obvious interpretations: compatibility means more verbhood in the nature of imperatives, whereas incompatibility means more de-verbalisation. Imperatives that are incompatible with negation therefore show an additional symptom of de-verbalisation, because they are closer to (D-)interjections than imperatives which may be negated. An important piece of evidence in favour of this view is the fact that in Romance languages in which pre-verbal negation is incompatible with imperatives, both non-inflected and truncated verb forms (if any) are invariably incompatible with negation.

3   Toward an explanation

Describing D-words as lexical items subject to verbalisation and de-verbalisation supplies a new understanding of the compatibility / incompatibility between imperatives and negation.[8] While this understanding does not represent by itself an explanation, it actually inspires one. Such an

---

[8] This understanding, however, has been anticipated in Indo-European linguistics. Stati (1965: 185) mentions that the passage from imperatives to interjections is documented in Latin, too, and that one of the types of imperative forms reconstructed in Indo-European has no ending (it is a root form). Also, in recent works in contemporary linguistics the relationship between imperatives and interjections is more carefully explored (Floricic and Molinu 2012, Swearingen 2017).

explanation is described in the next section. The analysis will be focused on languages in which the de-verbalisation of the imperatives means unavailability to negation. In addition, it also takes into account the special case of Aromanian, where the verbalisation of the imperatives (inflected or uninflected) allows them to be negated.

3.1 Imperatives as marked constructions

The explanation starts from the observation that true imperatives that are de-verbalised with respect to negation, are, in the synchrony of Romance languages, expressions of a phenomenon which occurred (and was more visible) in Vulgar Latin (VL). The phenomenon in question is the isolation of the imperatives from the rest of verbal forms, as a consequence of the fact that VL, unlike Classical Latin (CL), did not use a negative marker specific to imperatives.

In CL, imperatives and counter-factual subjunctives were negated by means of the negative marker *nē*, whereas the other verb forms were negated with the non-specific marker *non* (see Ernout and Thomas 1964, Croft 1991, van der Auwera 2010). *Nē* progressively weakened as a dedicated negator in CL. Moreover, traces of *nē* as a negative marker do not seem to be documented in VL. Under these conditions, imperatives in VL became isolated, because, unlike the rest of the verb forms (which were negated by adding the negative maker *non* to the verb), imperatives were not available to this operation.

The majority of Romance languages repeat through inheritance the situation in VL. The synchronic incompatibility between true imperative and negation may thus be seen as the manifestation of the deficiency of the VL imperatives to express negation.

On may represent this deficiency as following from a certain (implicit) requirement which in fact is not satisfied: the requirement that imperatives be marked under negation. This amounts to say that imperatives are allowed to be negated, as long as an imperative-dedicated negator exists in the language. Such a negation would then be a *directive* negation

The situation of the true imperatives which cannot be negated by means of pre-verbal negation therefore seems to be determined in Romance languages by the following factors:

(i) the existence of true imperatives (which play themselves a marking role for positive directives).
(ii) the lack of a directive negator (or of a negator which is opaque to the marking property of imperative).
(iii) the requirement that imperatives be marked in the negative polarity, too.

In this context, there remains to approach the case of Aromanian. Aromanian dispose of true imperatives (root imperatives and inflected ones). The negator *nu* indiscriminately applies to true imperatives and other verb

forms (with or without directive force). In terms of marking, this situation may be explained in three theoretically distinct ways:

- True imperatives lost marking both in positive and negative polarity. Negation freely applies to all of the verbal forms, the result being uniformly unmarked negative forms.
- True imperatives mark the directive force in positive polarity but do not require marking under negation. Again, applying negation to imperatives yields both unmarked negative (true) imperatives and unmarked negative verb forms.
- True imperatives mark directives in positive polarity and require marking under negation. Negation *nu*, which is not a directive negation, is underspecified (that is, neutral), with respect to the distinction marked / unmarked directive force, *just because it combines both with imperative and nonimperative directive forms*. This means that when negation applies to true imperatives it shares with them the directive marking carried by the imperative, whereas when negation applies to unmarked verb forms it shares with them the lack of marking.

The first hypothesis is immediately discarded. The idea that true imperatives could have lost marking in either of their polar forms is rejected by the obvious fact that true imperatives mark directives in positive polarity, due to the imperative mood as a dedicated verb form. There remains then to choose between the last two hypotheses. We will argue that the hypothesis of an underspecified negator best fits the facts.

Relevant in this respect is the comparison between pairs of polar – true and suppletive – imperatives, both types being available in Aromanian. Consider the pair of polar true imperatives *Dă!* 'Give (it)!' (sg.) / *Nu dă!* 'Don`t give (it) !' (sg.), and the pair of polar suppletive imperatives *Daţi!* `Give (it)!` (pl.) / *Nu daţi!* 'Don`t give (it)!' (pl.) In the suppletive pair *Daţi!* / *Nu daţi!*, no member is marked for the directive force, because neither the mood (the indicative) nor negation has this function. On the other hand, in the pair of true imperatives *Dă!* / *Nu dă!*, the directive in the positive polarity *Dă!* is obviously marked by the imperative mood itself.

The question now arises as to whether the prohibitive *Nu dă!* is also marked for the directive force. The present answer is yes, and is based on the syntactic relationship between negation and imperative. The relationship is complementation, the imperative being the complement of the negation[9]. To recall, negation *nu* in Aromanian is not specialised in marking the directive force. Nevertheless, it is not restricted to only select unmarked directive verb forms, either. Crosslinguistic evidence in support of its neutrality is relevant:

---

[9] The import of the fact that pre-verbal negation is the Neg^0 head in its relationship with imperatives is emphasized in Zanuttini (1997) or Zeijlstra (2006).

in Classical Latin *ne* selects imperatives (and certain subjunctives) but no other verb forms. In Daco-Romanian *nu* combines with all kinds of verb forms except imperatives. In Aromanian, though, the negator *nu* indiscriminately combines with verb forms expressing directives. The availability of the Aromanian *nu* therefore proves its underspecification with respect to the distinction marking/unmarking the directive force. Underspecification simply means that the head *nu* of a construction expressing a directive is able to host the marking properties of its verbal complement. That is, if the verbal complement carries the feature *unmarked*, negation will be able to also express this feature. And if the complement is an imperative, negation will receive from it the directive marking. Thus, in both cases, the features transmitted by the verbal complement to the negation head will also be the features of the negative construction itself. Aromanian, then, observes the requirement of marking imperative under negation without resorting to a directive negation. Due to the transparency of the negation, the marking property of the imperative also becomes a property of the whole negative clause.

3.2 Formal expression

The analysis presented above can receive a formal expression. In what follows, we will describe the main steps of this enterprise within the HPSG theory.

In HPSG, directive clauses[10] are characterized as independent phrases whose content is an *outcome* (Ginzburg and Sag 2000: 42). Independent occurrence is encoded by means of the feature I(ndependent)C(lause) which has the Boolean value +: [IC: +]. The specific message – an outcome – is encoded by means of the feature CONT(ent) which has the value *outcome*: [CONT: *outcome*]. The whole looks as follows (*dir-cl* denotes the phrasal type directive clause and the sign → is the implication sign):

C1 (*dir-cl*) $dir\text{-}cl \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD}: verb[IC: +] \\ \text{CONT}: outcome \end{bmatrix}$

This formula is a constraint on the type *dir-cl* and says that if something is a directive clause then it expresses an outcome and is an independent clause whose head is a verb. The representation on the right of the implication sign is called an *attribute-value matrix* (AVM) and denotes a feature structure (FS).

In most languages – the majority of Romance languages included – a directive clause is marked for its directive illocutionary force. Marking comes from the imperative mood as a directive-dedicated verb form. In order to capture this peculiarity, an additional specification has to be made, by means of the attribute MARKING.

---

[10] I rename Ginzburg and Sag`s *imperative clause* as *directive clause*, in order to refine the hierarchy of clauses.

In HPSG, marking is used to encode different specific features displayed by linguistic items (Pollard and Sag 1994, Tseng 2000). In the present case, MARKING may be used to express the idea that the linguistic item to which MARKING applies – the directive clause – marks the directive force. We call such a clause a marked directive clause (*marked-dir-cl*).

A marked directive clause inherits from its supertype (directive clause, *dir-cl*) the specification that its content is an outcome. In addition, it specifies that it has a MARKING attribute whose value is the directive force. This may be expressed in the following representation, where *directive* represents the value of the MARKING attribute:

C2 (*marked-dir-cl*) *marked-dir-cl* $\rightarrow \left[\text{HEAD}: imp[\text{MARKING}: directive] \right]$

There are also *unmarked directive clauses*, that is, directive clauses whose head verb forms are not characteristic to directives and do not mark them. In this case, a new subtype of directive clause is needed. It will be the type *unmarked-dir-cl*, with the following constraint:

C3 (*unmarked-dir-cl*) *unmarked-dir-cl* $\rightarrow$ $\left[\text{HEAD}: \neg imp[\text{MARKING}: unmarked] \right]$

The symbols $\neg imp$ express the fact that the verb form has to be distinct from imperative.

One therefore obtains three types of directive clauses for languages which, like Daco-Romanian, Italian or Spanish ban the combination (pre-)verbal negation-imperative. The most general type is the type *dir-cl*, with two subtypes, *marked-dir-cl*, and *unmarked-dir-cl*, which inherit the properties of their supertypes (clause and directive clause).

We need now representations for lexical items involved in the construction of different types of directive clauses. These are mainly negation and the imperative verb.

As a part of speech, negation may be considered an item akin to verbs and complementizers. For this reason, negation may be placed in the hierarchy of the lexical types as a subtype of the type *verbal* (Ginzburg and Sag 2000: 23–24).

P(*verbal*) *verbal*: *verb*, *comp*(lementizer), *neg*(ation)

This characterization needs more. We follow Kim (2000: 173) who presents reasons to assume that in Italian and Spanish negation shares with the verb it negates the same part of speech properties (which in HPSG are encoded as HEAD features). The identity of the part of speech properties between negation and verb is expressed in HPSG by means of identical tags (which are symbolized as boxed numbers or numbers in module). Identical tags are

equivalent to coindexing in other theoretical frameworks. As MARKING and its value are HEAD properties the MARKING value of the negation will be necessarily identical to the MARKING value of the verb with which negation co-occurs.[11]

The relationship between negation and its verb is complementation: the verb is the complement of the negator. Complementation is encoded by means of the feature COMP(lement)S. With these specifications, the representation of the negator in Romance languages in which negation and true imperatives are incompatible is the following:[12]

$$\text{C4 } (neg) \quad neg \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD: }|1| \\ \text{COMPS: } \langle VP[\text{HEAD: }|1|verb[\text{MARKING: } unmarked]] \rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

In words, C4 says that negation takes the part of speech properties of its complement. This means that it shares with its verbal complement the value *unmarked* for the attribute MARKING. In this way, negation selects verbs with the *unmarked* value for this attribute.

Turning now to imperative, its relevant property for the present analysis lies in the following representation:

$$\text{C5 } (imp) \quad imp \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD: } imp[\text{MARKING: } directive] \end{bmatrix}$$

C5 says that the HEAD feature MARKING of an imperative has as value the directive force. If this verb form projects its complements (if any), the result is a phrase which illustrates a marked directive clause (see C2, above).

C1–C5 suffice to account for the relationship between imperatives and negation in Romance languages such as Daco-Romanian, Italian or Spanish (but not only in them). As the complement of the negation has to be unmarked, the imperative cannot be the complement of the negation just because the imperative is marked for directives. On the other hand, as negation itself is unmarked for the illocutionary force, what it projects has to be an unmarked phrase and hence an unmarked clause. Nevertheless, the present architecture of constraints allows for both marked clauses (which are exactly the projections of the imperative verb and are constrained by C2 above) and unmarked clauses (which are the projections of the other verb forms able to be used with directive force - these verb forms have not been given here; they are

---

[11] I follow in this respect Tseng`s (2002) proposal. The proposal is distinct from the classical theory of marking in Pollard and Sag (1994).

[12] In proposing C4 I ignore the fact that the complementation of the negation in Daco-Romanian is more complicate than in standard Italian or Spanish.

constrained by C3[13]). Both results are welcome, because they cover the empirical data in languages for which these constraints are in force.

As to Aromanian, the structure of the explanation is the following. Since Aromanian also makes the distinction between true and suppletive imperatives, the clausal projections of these types of lexical items illustrate the constraints on marked and unmarked directive clauses C2-C3. Of course, C5, which characterizes true imperatives, is also in force. The only difference between Aromanian and the other Romance languages studied here lies in the representation of the negator *nu*. Unlike negation in Daco-Romanian, Spanish or standard Italian, negation in Aromanian takes as complement a verb form which is underspecified with respect to the directive marking. That is, the complement of the negation in Aromanian may be a verb with [MARKING: *directive*] or [MARKING: *unmarked*] specification. Now, since negation shares the HEAD attributes with its complement, and since MARKING is exactly a HEAD attribute, its value on the complement will be shared with the value of the MARKING attribute on negation. This is expressed in the following lexical representation:

$$\text{C6 } (neg_{\text{Arom}}) \quad neg \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD: } |1| \\ \text{COMPS: } \langle \text{VP}\left[\text{HEAD: } |1|verb[\text{MARKING: } |2|]\right]\rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

In C6, the tag $|2|$ is also the tag of the MARKING attribute of the negation (which for reasons of simplicity has not been written any more). The tag does not specify whether it means *directive* or *unmarked*, so the tag is allowed to denote any value. Consequently, if the tag means *directive*, negation projects a marked directive clause, because, due to sharing, the HEAD attribute MARKING of the negation also acquires this value from its complement. If, on the contrary, the tag means *unmarked* (illocutionary force), then, in virtue of the same device of sharing, the clause projected by negation is an unmarked directive clause.

Thus, on the present analysis, the difference between languages in which imperatives are compatible with negation and languages in which imperatives and negation are incompatible amounts (at least in the Romance field) to the distinct selectional properties of the negators, with respect to their complements.

3.3 Two further cases

The short analyses below are destinated to put to test the explanation proposed above in terms of marking.

---

[13] Such an unmarked directive clause in Italian is for instance Cantate! `sing` 2nd pl. indicative.

3.3.1 Brazilian Portuguese

Brazilian Portuguese (BP) resembles Aromanian in that, although preverbal negation (*naõ*) does not mark directives, it takes as complement the imperative. The important difference from Aromanian is that this situation is the consequence of the fact that BP does not recognise the requirement that imperative be marked under negation. The present framework is able to make this difference visible.

BP inherited from European Portuguese (EP) the imperative of 2nd pers. sg. as a form that marks the directive: BP = EP = *Canta (tu)!* (`Sing (sg)`). In EP the imperative is distinct from the corresponding indicative form: *Tu cantas* (`You (sg.) sing`) – (Cavalcante 2011: 208). It therefore counts as a true imperative. In addition, EP uses subjunctives of 2nd pers. sg. with directive force, which means that it also disposes of suppletive forms (for instance *Cantes (tu)!* `Sing (subjunct. Sg)`). Thus, in EP the imperative participates in a double opposition which gives it identity: *canta* (imp.)/*cantas* (ind.)/*cantes* (subjunct.).

In BP, though, this double opposition does not exist, because the 2nd pers. sg indicative lost its distinctive ending *-s* and became identical to the corresponding form of the imperative: *Tu canta=Canta (tu)* (`You (sg) sing`=`Sing (sg)`). The imperative thus lost its status of form specialised in expressing directives and became similar in use to the suppletive subjunctives. This situation is reflected in the present formalism as follows.

The negator *naõ* receives the representation that has been given for negators in Daco-Romanian, Italian or Spanish, that is, C4, repeated below:

$$\text{C4 (}neg\text{)} \quad neg \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD:} |1| \\ \text{COMPS:} \langle VP[\text{HEAD:} |1|verb[\text{MARKING:} \textit{unmarked}]] \rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

C4 shows that *naõ* can only negate unmarked verbal forms.
The imperative needs a distinct representation, required to express its status of non-dedicated form with respect to directives. This means that the value of the feature MARKING has to be the value *unmarked*:

$$\text{C5` (}imp_{\text{BP}}\text{)} \quad imp \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD:} imp[\text{MARKING:} \textit{unmarked}] \end{bmatrix}$$

C4–C5` are now all we need to account for the situation in BP, because representations constrained by C4–C5` project clauses validated by C3 above (which, in turn defines unmarked directive clauses). This is indeed a correct characterization of the BP imperative clauses, be they in positive or negative polarity.

On the other hand, as no projection in BP satisfies C2 (recall that C2 defines marked directive clauses), the distinction between marked and unmarked directive clauses, encoded in C2–C3, becomes in fact useless and may be

abandoned in favour of the most general constraint C1, on directive clauses themselves. The redundancy of C2 proves that the requirement of marking directives under negation does not apply in BP. This situation is in a salient contrast with Aromanian, where due to the transparency of negation (see C6), with respect to the directive marking, both C2 and C3 are relevant.

3.3.2 French

The case of French negated imperatives is interesting because it also illustrates the compatibility between negation and true imperatives. At the same time, French is representative for a whole class of Romance languages and dialects in which negation is post-verbal. Post-verbal negation, at least in Romance languages, constantly associates with compatibility with true imperatives, and we will see that the theory of marking proposed here explains this association. French has true imperatives (*Mange la soupe !* `Eat (sg) the soup`), which mark the directive force. Their representation is virtually identical to C5, used so far. A special accent has to be put on the complement list, because no specification is given regarding the marking of its members:

$$C5`` \ (imp_{\text{Fr}}) \ \ imp \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD: } imp[\text{MARKING: } directive] \\ \text{COMPS: } L(ist) \end{bmatrix}$$

C5`` characterizes French imperatives in positive polarity. The clausal projection of a positive true imperative is constrained by C2, and characterizes marked directive clauses.

Unlike negators discussed so far, the French negator (*pas*) is not considered a verbal item, but an adverb. This is the option taken by Abeillé and Godard (1997) (see also Kim 2000 and, for approaches of a different theoretical orientation, Zeijlstra 2006 or Bošković 2011). The option is justified by the identical behaviour of *pas* with other adverbs of negation. The representation of *pas* is given below; the attribute MOD encodes the fact that the adverb modifies a verb with the content denoted by the tag |1|. The content of the adverb itself is the predicate of negation which takes as argument the content|1| of the verb. The negator *pas* does not mark directives:

$$C4` \ (neg_{\text{Fr}}) \ \ neg \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD: } adv \begin{bmatrix} \text{MOD: } verb[\text{CONT: } |1|] \\ \text{MARKING: } unmarked \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{CONT: } \begin{bmatrix} \text{REL: } negation \\ \text{ARG: } |1| \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Taking the negator *pas* as an adverb has a significant impact on the projection of the imperatives in negative polarity. In principle, the combination imperative-negation may be a construction with the imperative as the head and the negator as its complement or adjunct. This means that the syntactic relationship between imperative and negator which is recognised in the case of

languages with preverbal negation is now reversed. Indeed, this time the imperative is the head and the negator is the non-head daughter. This explains the linear order imperative-negator.

In Abeillé and Godard`s account it is argued that *pas* has to be treated as a complement added to the list (possibly empty) of the complements of the positive imperative. The supplementation of the list is done through an operation called *list concatenation* (symbol,$\oplus$). The list concatenation introduces a sequential order among the members of the concatenation. One thus accounts for the fact that the negator *pas* precedes any complement in the original list of the imperative (for instance, *Mange la soupe ! / Ne mange pas la soupe !,* with *pas* preceding *la soupe*). A distinct representation is therefore needed for negated imperatives (in the representation below the presence of the clitic *ne* on the verb is omitted):

$$
\text{C7} \qquad (neg\text{-}imp_{Fr}) \qquad\qquad neg\text{-}imp \qquad\qquad \rightarrow
$$

$$
\begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD: } imp[\text{MARKING: } directive] \\ \text{COMPS: } \Big\langle \begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD: } adv \begin{bmatrix} \text{MOD: } verb[\text{CONT: } |1|] \\ \text{MARKING: } unmarked \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{CONT: } |2| \begin{bmatrix} \text{REL: } negation \\ \text{ARG: } |1| \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \Big\rangle \oplus L(ist) \\ \text{CONT: } |2| \end{bmatrix}
$$

Just like C5`` (which deals with positive imperatives), C7 also project the type of clause defined by C2. The projection is a marked directive clause, headed by imperative, with the negator *pas* as the first member in the concatenated lists of complements.

Now, the explanation of the fact that French true imperatives are compatible with a non-directive negator is already contained in the concatenated lists of complements of the negative imperative: even if it marks directives, the imperative does not constraint its complements to have the same marking value. In C7, while the head marks the directive, the negator complement *pas* is unmarked, and as already emphasized the other complements in the original list L need not be specified in this respect. This, indeed, is hardly surprising; a look at true imperatives negated by pre-verbal negators (in French or other Romance languages) shows that these imperatives have the same behaviour with respect to their complements; that is, they do not constraint their complements to share with them the same marking value for directives. The same holds if the negator is not a complement but an adjunct of the imperative. One may therefore say that if attached to the analysis of the negation proposed by Abeillé and Godard, the present analysis explains the descriptive generalization that post-verbal negation in Romance is compatible with true imperatives.

4 Conclusions

The conclusions below envisage two aspects of the present analysis: the nature of the explanation adopted in this paper and the relationship between explanation and the pair verbalisation/de-verbalisation.

4.1 The explanation

The account proposed in this paper is close to Zanuttini`s explanation for Italian. Recall that Zanuttini`s hypothesis is that negation selects the verb. In order to be the complement of the negation, the verb has to have enough morphological or functional structure. Imperatives in standard Italian do not comply with this requirement, so they are excluded as complements of the negation.

The present account also relies on complementation in the relationship between negation and imperative. Morphological peculiarities of the imperatives play a role in our explanation, too. Nevertheless, the data are differently exploited. The morphological/functional structure of the imperatives has been here considered in the perspective of its capacity of marking the directive force. It is on this empirical basis that the availability of the imperative to be the complement of the negator is evaluated.

The explanation proposed here may cover the incompatibility between pre-verbal negation and imperatives in Daco-Romanian, Italian, Spanish, Catalan and European Portuguese. It also covers the special cases of Aromanian and Brazilian Portuguese, where true imperatives are allowed to be the complements of non-directive negators. Finally, it is explained why post-verbal negation combines with true imperatives in French or the majority of Italian dialects, where negation is post-verbal. However, there are limitations, too. It is not clear what explanation could be proposed for the incompatibility between post-verbal negation *pas* and true imperatives in Modern Central Occitan, (see example (6) above, repeated here as (15a)):

(15)   a. *Canta pas! 'Don`t sing!' (*canta* = true imperative)
       b. Cantes pas! 'Don`t sing!' (*cantes* = subjunctive with directive force)

In the absence of supplementary details, it seems that ruling out (15a) and allowing (15b) presuppose the requirement that the negator of the true imperatives be a directive negator and nothing else. This would be the strictest version of the requirement that imperatives be marked under negation (which is not ignored by the present analysis). Indeed, Modern Central Occitan has true imperatives which could mark negated imperative constructions just because, as we saw in the case of French, the imperative is the head of the construction. However, it seems that this option is ignored.

336

Things are even more complicate in the case of the Italian dialect from Cortina D`Ampezzo, where the 2nd sg. imperative may be negated (16a) but the 2nd pl. one may not (16b):

(16)   a. No laőra! 'Don`t work!' (*laőra* =true imperative)
         b. *No lourà! 'Don`t work!' (*lourà*=true imperative)

Additional information is again needed. For both examples Zanuttini quotes parallel suppletive imperatives which use a form of *have* followed by the preposition *da* and the main verb in the infinitive: *No t`as da lourà*! (for 16a) and *No aé da lourà*! (for 16b). The suppletive version of (16a) seems to be in free variation with (16a), but in the case of (16b) the suppletive version is certainly meant to replace (16b). Our conjecture is that the Cortina D`Ampezzo dialect might have the same type of negator as Aromanian, that is, a negator underspecified with respect to the directive force. This would explain the combination (16a). As to the banned combination in (16b), the explanation could depend on whether infinitives in this dialect accept to be negated (because *lourà* is an infinitive used either as a positive imperative or as a main verb in suppletive imperative constructions).

4.2   Directive marking and the pair verbalisation/de-verbalisation

The relationship between explanation through directive marking and the verbalisation/de-verbalisation of the imperatives is visible in the fact that the solutions to the problem of marking can be naturally described as cases of verbalisation or de-verbalisation. The following four possible situations can be found.

(i)   There are languages in which no marked verb form or negation for directives exist. The requirement that directives be marked under negation does not exist, either, and, as a consequence, negation freely combines with all the types of verb forms expressing directives. In this case, one may say that the expression of the directive manifests a high degree of verbalisation, because the absence of the dedicated verb forms for directives means that the expression of the directives has been almost completely integrated into the system of the verb forms. This is the case of the Brazilian Portuguese.

(ii)   Some languages have marked verbal forms for directives (that is, true imperatives) but no marked negation. In these languages, positive directives are marked. Negation indiscriminately combines with expressions of the directives (true imperatives included). As shown above, we take this phenomenon as indicating a special property of negation – underspecification with respect to marking (like in Aromanian). Again, this is a symptom of verbalisation but the verbalisation in this case is less strong than in the preceding case.

(iii)   Some languages have marked forms both for verbs and negation (in the field of Romance languages, this is the case of the Classical Latin). They

observe the requirement that dedicated verb forms be marked under negation, by using marked negation in combination with imperatives. This solution also means a certain degree of verbalisation, as far as imperatives are concerned. Nevertheless, verbalisation in this case is considerably weaker, because the system of negation resorts to special items in order to integrate imperatives into the class of the verb.

(iv)   Finally, there are languages with marked verb forms for directives but no corresponding marked negation. In the Romance field, these languages represent the majority. The marking requirement under negation is observed at the cost of the banned combination between negation and imperatives. This places imperatives at the periphery of the verb system, because the ban for negation means less verbhood and brings imperatives closer to interjections.

The four situations describe a scale of the de-verbalisation/verbalisation which has in its first position the almost complete verbalisation of the imperative and in the fourth position the weakest form of verbalisation documented in Romance languages. It seems therefore that the various cases of marking or unmarking can be naturally interpreted as a form of verbalisation or de-verbalisation.

References

Abeillé, A. and D. Godard (1997), The Syntax of French Negative Adverbs, in A. Abeillé, D. Godard and Ph. Miller (eds.) *The Major Syntactic Structures of French*, ESSLLI Reader, Aix en Provence.

Bošković, Ž. (2004), On the Clitic Switch in Greek Imperatives, in O. Mišeska Tomić (ed.) *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 269–291.

Bošković, Z. (2011), When are negative imperatives banned?, *Proceedings of of SinFonIJA3*.

Cavalcante, R. (2011), Negative Imperatives in Portuguese and Other Romance Languages, in J. Herschensohn (ed.) *Romance Linguistics 2010: Selected papers from the 40th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Linguistics (LSRL), Seattle, Washington, March 2010*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 205–219.

Croft, W. (1991), The Evolution of Negation, *Journal of Linguistics* 27: 1, 1–27.

Ernout, A. and F. Thomas (1964), *Syntaxe latine*, Kliencksick, Paris.

Floricic, F. and L. Molinu (2012), Romance Monosyllabic Imperatives and Markedness, in Th. Stolz, N. Nau, C. Stroh (eds.) *Monosyllables: from phonology to typology*, Akademie Verlag, STUF, Studia Typologica, 149–172.

Ginzburg, J. and I. Sag (2000), *Interrogative Investigations*, CSLI Publications, Stanford.

Han, Ch-H. (2001), *Force, Negation and Imperatives*, The Linguistic Review, Walter De Gruyter, Berlin, 289–325.

Hubert-Sauter, M. (1951), *Zur Syntax des Imperativs im Italienischen*, Francke, Bern.

Ionescu, E. (2019), Negative imperatives in Eastern Romance languages: Latin heritage and Romance innovation*, Zeitschrift fur Romanische Philologie* 135: 3, 845–865.

Kim, J-B. (2000), *The Grammar of Negation*, CSLI Publications, Stanford.

Pollard, C. and I. Sag (1987), *Information-based Syntax and Semantics*, CSLI Publications, Stanford.

Pollard, C. and I. Sag (1994), *Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, University of Chicago Press and CSLI Publications, Chicago and Stanford.

Puşcariu, S. (1959), *Limba română. Rostirea*, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, București.

Romanello, E. and L. Repetti (2014), Imperative Characteristics in Romance Varieties Spoken, *Rivista di Linguistica* 26: 1, 135–163.

Searle, J. (1979), *Expression and Meaning*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Stati, S. (1965), Verbul, in Al. Rosetti (red. resp.), *Istoria limbii române, vol I. Limba latină*, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, București, 166–196.

Swearingen, A. (2017), Crossing the categorial divide: imperative and interjection conversions in Romance*,* in D. van Olmen and S. Heinold (eds.) *Imperatives and Directive Strategies*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 297–324.

Tseng, J. (2002), Remarks on Marking, in F. van Eynde, , L. Hellan and D. Beermann (eds.) *Proceedings of the 8th International HPSG Conference*, CSLI Publications, http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/.

van der Auwera, J. (2010), Prohibition: Constructions and Markers*,* in S. Dingfang and K. Turner (eds.) *Contrasting Meaning in Languages of the East and West*, Tübingen, Narr, 443–475.

Zanuttini, R. (1997), *Negation and Clausal Structure*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Zeijlstra, H. (2004), *Sentential Negation and Negative concord*, Ph Dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Zeijlstra, H. (2006), The Ban on True Negative Imperatives, in O. Bonami and P. Cabredo Hofherr (eds.) *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics*, 405–424, http://www. ssp. nrs.fr/eiss6.

Zhang, S. (1990), *The status of imperatives in the theory of grammar*. PhD dissertation, University of Arizona.