

# Embedded Imperatives in Slovenian

Dominik Rus  
[dr59@georgetown.edu](mailto:dr59@georgetown.edu)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Imperative clauses have received quite a lot of attention in the generative syntactic tradition (Davies 1986; Beukema & Coopmans 1989; Rivero & Terzi 1995; Potsdam 1996; Platzack & Rosengren 1997; Han 1998, etc.) though researchers disagree a great deal on the nature and the status of these. While Culicover (1976) states that "the imperative is an idiosyncratic construction in most languages", Beukema & Coopmans (1989) say that "this is an overstatement", claiming that imperatives are "fairly orthodox". Platzack and Rosengren (1997) write that the imperative clause seems to have quite a simple structure and that when looking at it more closely, we find that it has certain universal and language-specific properties "which are not immediately compatible with the descriptions assumed for finite clauses".

Numerous morphosyntactic and semantic accounts have been offered for imperative clauses, focusing mainly on their *form*, *interpretation* and *distribution*, lexical and non-lexical *subjects*, *speaker-hearer characteristics*, and the interaction with *sentential negation* and *pronominal clitic* placement. There seems to be a great deal of disagreement among linguists in terms of these properties as reflected in imperatives. However, most of these accounts seem to agree with the following four morphosyntactic characteristics of imperatives cross-linguistically:

- (i) The imperative form of the verb in imperative clauses is not always marked morphologically with a special morphological inflection. In other words, many languages do not have a separate inflectional imperative paradigm as in declaratives (and subjunctives, or other moods if recorded in a given language), but rather employ other morphosyntactic devices that give imperative meaning, such as specific particles, clitics or clitic-like affixes, verb stem alterations, or simply use infinitives or subjunctive forms with an imperative force. (Zanuttini 1997; Rivero & Terzi 1995; Platzack & Rosengren 1997; Han 1998; etc.).

- (ii) The specific properties that make a clause an imperative reside in the left periphery of the clause, i.e., in the C-domain. Hence, C<sup>0</sup> - or some other functional head in a split-CP phrase structure account - is taken to be the locus of imperative (logical) mood, interacting directly with discourse, giving the illocutionary force of ordering or command (Chomsky 1995; Rizzi 1997; Platzack & Rosengren 1997; Han 1998; Cinque 1999). In a feature-driven syntactic theory, the head hosting an imperative or imperative-related feature must be checked by the verb, triggering either overt or covert verb movement to that functional head (Chomsky 1995; Platzack & Rosengren 1997, etc.).
- (iii) An overt subject in imperatives never seems to be obligatory (Han 1998; Potsdam 1996, 1998; Platzack & Rosengren 1997, etc.).
- (iv) *There is a putatively universal restriction against embedding imperative clauses* (e.g., Palmer 2001; Platzack & Rosengren 1997; Han 1998, etc.).

The aim of this paper is to show that the statement in (iv) is *ultimately wrong* and that the prohibition of embedding *cannot be taken to be a universal property of imperatives*. Moreover, the paper addresses the mechanism behind embedded imperatives by claiming that sentential force is *not directly encoded in the syntax*, though morphological mood may be checked in functional projections above VP by the verb moving into the head positions of these projections. Furthermore, the paper shows that the phrase structure of imperatives (and imperatives in general) in Slovenian is *the same as that of finite clauses*. Consequently, the study refutes Platzack & Rosengren's hypothesis of imperatives universally lacking a T(ense) P(rojection).

The paper is organized as follows. First, we briefly review some of the most influential accounts of the syntax/semantics of imperatives in terms of the negative statement in (iv) above, showing how little attention embedded imperatives have received in the literature and how most researchers have arrived to the conclusion that imperatives cannot embed. Section 3 offers data on Slovenian imperatives in general, providing a descriptive analysis of the phenomenon and reviewing Miljovevic Sheppard & Golden's (2002) analysis of Slovenian imperative clauses. Section 4 looks at the morphosyntactic properties of Slovenian embedded imperatives in terms of the properties generally studied in relation to imperatives (e.g., subject restrictions, negation, clitic placement),

offering a possible solution to the puzzle of embedded imperatives within the minimalist syntactic framework (Chomsky 1995; 1999). Section 5 concludes the paper.

## 2. CAN IMPERATIVES EMBED?

There is a wide agreement in traditional as well as in generative linguistic literature that *imperative clauses cannot be embedded* (Sadock & Zwicky 1985; Palmer 1986, 2001; Han 1998). Palmer (2001), for example, argues that the only time imperatives can be embedded is in direct speech, as in (1) below:

- (1) She said, “do your homework!”

In her dissertation on a cross-linguistic study of imperatives, Han (1998) devotes only a short paragraph to embedded imperatives. She provides ungrammatical examples of embedded imperatives from Italian ([2]), Modern Greek ([3]), and Spanish and German, contrasting them with grammatical non-imperative examples (from Han 1998):

- (2) a. \*Ti ordino che fallo subito. [Italian]  
you order-1SGPres that do-2SGIMP-it immediately  
'I order you to do it immediately.'
- b. Ti ordino che lo faccia subito.  
you order-1SG PRES that it do-2SG SUBJ immediately  
'I order you to do it immediately.'
- (3) a. \*O Yannis se dietakse grapse. [Modern Greek]  
the Yannis you ordered-2SG Past write-2SG IMP  
'Yannis ordered you to write.'

- b. O Yannis se dietakse na grapsis.  
 the Yannis you ordered-2SG Past NA write-2SG SUBJ  
 'Yannis ordered you to write.'

Han (1998) states that it has been noted that imperatives cannot occur in embedded contexts and this is a logical consequence of a well-established assumption that *embedded clauses do not express illocutionary force*. She argues that "[i]f imperatives have an operator in  $C^0$  that encodes directive force, it follows that imperatives cannot be embedded. This fact is not conclusive evidence that imperative verbs move to  $C^0$ , but it is consistent with the claim that the locus of imperative operator that encodes directive force is in  $C^0$ " (Han 1998: 40; italics mine). I return to Han's second statement below in section 4.

Thus, for Han, embedded imperatives *do not* occur and they *should not* occur anyway. In later chapters, however, she gives evidence for imperatives in embedded contexts in Korean, but claiming that these have different properties than matrix imperatives and should not be analyzed as 'true' imperatives (see below in this section).

Platzack & Rosengren (henceforth P&R) (1997) state that "[i]mperative clauses cannot be syntactically embedded" (italics mine). The statement has a footnote saying that there have been a few exceptions mentioned in the linguistic literature, though no references are given by the authors. They claim that it has been reported that these exceptions do *not* seem to be regularly embedded imperatives but rather quotations or clauses of some other (e.g., optative) type of verbal paradigm and P&R explicitly state that they will neglect them in their discussion on imperative clauses.

Interestingly, P&R do not merely speculate that imperatives are *not* possible due to the unavailability of a force feature in embedded  $C^0$ , but rather offer an interesting account of showing *why* imperative clauses cannot be embedded. They discuss the unavailability of examples such as in (4) below (their [6]):

- (4) a. \*I ask you that sit quiet on the chair. [English]
- b. \*Ich bitte dich, sitz still auf dem Stuhl. [German]  
 I ask you sit-IMP quiet on the chair
- c. \*Jag ber dig att sitt stilla pa stolen. [Swedish]  
 I ask you that sit-IMP quiet on chair-the

According to their view, the unavailability of embedded imperatives comes from *the absence of the Agr<sub>s</sub>P projection* in the phrase structure of imperative clauses, a property that, according to P&R, also explains other characteristics of imperatives (e.g., non-obligatoriness of overt subject pronouns ([p.31 ff])). Since it is generally assumed that embedded clauses are introduced by CP and that C<sup>o</sup> c-selects Agr<sub>s</sub>P (in the minimalist paradigm of Chomsky 1991, 1993), it is the absence of Agr<sub>s</sub>P that leads to ungrammaticality, such as the sentence in (4) above. Note that under this approach, one must posit not only selectional properties of lexical heads, but also the functional ones, putting the issue aside whether we allow for empty functional heads with no visible checking properties or multiple selections with such heads. An alternative solution to the ungrammaticality in (4) that P&R offer assumes that the imperative lacks Agr<sub>s</sub>P because the addressee is spoken *to* rather than spoken *about* and is therefore not allowed to be part of the predication, or in P&R's words, "*[i]f embedding always requires a clause where the argument in Spec-VP in some way or other must be checked in Agr<sub>s</sub>P, the imperatives cannot be embedded*" (p.33; italics mine). Consider the data in (5):

- (5) a. Leave the room!
- b. He said that you **should** leave the room.
- c. He asked you **to leave** the room.

Neither with (5b) nor with (5c) do we approach the addressee the same way as we do in imperative clauses (cf. (5)a). Note that one is talking *about* ‘him’ and what ‘he’ should do. P&R go on by saying that “[i]f the imperative clause cannot be embedded, then there, of course, cannot be any CP either - that is if we define CP as the embedding projection” (P&R 1997:34; italics mine). When embedding is desirable or necessary, P&R argue that languages use “other structures”, such as subjunctive clauses or clauses containing a modal (cf. (5)b) or embedded non-finite clauses (cf. (5)c).

Portner (2003) argues that in Korean imperatives can be embedded *under verbs of ordering*. However, these imperatives *differ* from true (root) imperatives in two morphosyntactic properties, namely in the morphological form and in the restriction on the subject. Han (1998) shows that when embedded, Korean imperatives have a different morphological form. Furthermore, while Korean matrix imperatives *only* allow for 2<sup>nd</sup> person subjects, Korean embedded imperative constructions *never* allow for overt subjects, but always contain *PRO* subjects. One might conclude that such imperative clauses might be different clause types, particularly in a language like Korean showing a great variety of clause types with different morphological marking (Pak 2003). Hence, it seems that Korean imperatives do not provide much counterevidence that imperatives cannot embed.

Röngvaldsson (2003) shows that in Old Icelandic (as opposed to Modern Icelandic) imperatives do not need to move to C<sup>0</sup>, hence allowing [<sub>CP</sub> *you* *V<sub>imp</sub>* [...]]. The examples from his study are all of the following two schematas, seen in (6):

- (6) a. I order you [that you V-IMP]  
 b. Do-IMP one-of-both [that you V<sub>A-IMP</sub> or V<sub>B-IMP</sub>]

Strikingly, both these types are characterized by the fact that the context of the speech act described in (6a) or performed in (6b) in the matrix clause does not differ from the

utterance context on any of its syntactic/semantic characteristics (e.g., speaker, hearer, time, ‘possible’ world).

German is similar, though - like Modern Icelandic - it exhibits a V2 phenomenon with imperatives moving obligatorily to C<sup>0</sup>, hence blocking the occurrence of overt complementizers. However, phenomena of (at least semantically) embedded V2 clauses are attested in German (cf. Reis 1997), as seen in the example below:

- (7) Hans glaubt, es regnet  
Hans believes it rains.  
‘Hans believes that it is raining.’

In the same way, imperative contexts can embed, as seen in (8):

- (8) Ich habe dir/\*Maria doch gestern schon gesagt, geh heute hin.  
I have you/Mary part yesterday already told **go-2SGIMP** today there  
‘I told you already yesterday that you should go there today’

Analogously to the Old Icelandic example in (6) above, (8) involves (semantic) embedding, where the deictic *heute* (‘today’) refers to the utterance time as well as the time when the order should be accomplished. We see that embedding is ungrammatical when the addressee in the reported speech context is not the one of the utterance context. The only case this is possible is in direct speech.

Hence, we may conclude that universal blocking of imperative embedding is not well justified, given that at least some languages allow (within their syntactic possibilities) for embedded imperatives when reported context and utterance context overlap sufficiently.

Interestingly, Slovenian seems to be the least restrictive of all the languages that have been reported to allow for embedded imperatives. Though the Milojević Sheppard & Golden 2002 paper on Slovenian (negative) imperatives only briefly touches the issue of

embedded imperatives, it shows not only that Slovenian imperative clauses *can* be embedded, but also that embedding *need not* take place only under reporting verbs. The following section provides data and a descriptive analysis of the phenomenon of embedded imperatives in Slovenian.

### 3. IMPERATIVES IN SLOVENIAN: FORM, MEANING AND DISTRIBUTION

Slovenian is a second position (2P) ('Wackernagel') clitic language, which, according to traditional grammarians, distinguishes among three moods, namely indicative, imperative and exclamative (Toporič 2000: 657). The indicative and the imperative have distinct verbal morphology. The table in (9) below shows the imperative morphological paradigm contrasted with the present indicative paradigm, which has 9 cells (1SG, 2SG, 3SG, 1DU, 2DU, 3DU, 1PL, 2PL, 3PL). The imperative paradigm has a restriction in allowing only for 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular (2SG) and 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> persons dual and plural (1DU, 2DU, 1PL, 2PL) forms:

(9)

	<b>2SG</b>	<b>1DU</b>	<b>2DU</b>	<b>1PL</b>	<b>2PL</b>
<b>Present Indicative</b>	delaj_	delava	delata	delamo	delate
<b>Imperative</b>	delaj you-work	delajva let-us-two-work	delajta let-us-two-work	delajmo let-us-work	delajte you-work

In Slovenian, the imperative illocutionary force can be expressed in a number of ways, usually with a particle *naj* followed by a finite verb in the present ([10]a), or by conditional *be* and a past participle ([10]b), or with modals expressing a directive force ([10]c) (Toporič 2000: 658):

- (10) a. Naj dela!  
*naj* work-3SG PRES IND  
 ‘Let him work’/‘He should work’
- (10) b. Naj bi delal! /Delal bi!  
*naj* be-<sub>cond</sub> worked-SG MASC worked-SG MASC be-<sub>cond</sub>  
 ‘You/He should work’ ‘You/he should work’
- (10) c. Delati moras!  
 work-<sub>inf</sub> must-2SG  
 ‘You must work!’

All of the cases above can appear in embedded contexts:

- (11) a. Ukazal mu je, (da) naj dela!  
 ordered him is (that) *naj* work-3SG PRES IND  
 ‘He ordered him to work.’
- b. Naro\_il mu je, (da) naj bi delal.  
 ordered him is (that) *naj* be-<sub>COND</sub> worked-SG MASC  
 ‘He told him that he should work’
- c. Rekel mu je, da mora delati.  
 said him is that must-2SG PRES IND work  
 ‘He told him that he must work.’

Topori\_i\_ (2000: 657) argues that ‘true’ imperatives, i.e., imperatives with distinct imperative mood morphology on the verb are used only when we are ordering someone

to accomplish an action. This statement, we believe, is too strong since ‘true’ imperatives can have a wider interpretation, not limited to ordering only. They can also express suggestion, for example. Conversely, sentences with *naj*, conditionals and modals can also have the interpretation of ordering (cf. (11)a), and not just that of suggestion (cf. (11)b). We will focus our discussion on imperatives that show ‘true’ imperative morphology (distinct from any other finite or non-finite verb form), regardless of their speech act interpretation.

In Slovenian, such imperatives can appear in root (12 [a-c]) as well as embedded (12 [d-f]) contexts:

- (12) a. **Pojej** jabolko!  
 eat-2SG IMP apple  
 ‘Eat an apple.’
- b. **Poka\_ita,** kaj znata.  
 Show-2DU IMP what can-2DU PRES IND  
 ‘Show (us/me) what you can (do).’
- c. **Telefonirajte** mami, ko prispete v Washington.  
 phone-2PL IMP mom when arrive-2PL PRES IND in Washington  
 ‘Call mom when you get to Washington.’
- d. Rekel je, da **pojej** jabolko.  
 said is that eat-2SG IMP apple  
 ‘He said that you must/should eat an apple.’
- e. Ukazal je, da **poka\_ita,** kaj znata.  
 Ordered is that show-2DU IMP what can-2DU PRES IND  
 ‘He ordered you to show (him/us, etc.) what you can (do)’

- f. Ali je ukazal, da **telefonirajte** mami, ko prispete v Washington?  
 Q is ordered that phone-2PL IMP mom when arrive-2PLPRES IND in W  
 ‘Did he order you to call mom when you arrive in DC?’

From the examples above we see that imperatives in Slovenian can be embedded under both declarative as well as interrogative clauses.

One would naturally assume that embedded imperative clauses appear embedded *only* under (reporting) verbs, similar to Korean and Old Icelandic, as we saw above. This is not true of Slovenian, embedded imperative clauses not only appear as embedded *argument clauses* (13a-b), but also as embedded *restrictive relative clauses* (13c) and as *nominal complement clauses* (13d) (cf. Milojevic Sheppard & Golden [henceforth S&G] 2002):

- (13) a. Rekel je, da **pojdi/pojdita/pojdite** spat.  
 said is that go-2SG IMP/2DU IMP/2PL IMP sleep-INF  
 ‘He said that you must go to bed.’
- b. Peter vztraja, da **pridi/prideta/pridite** zgodaj zjutraj.  
 Peter insists that come-2SG IMP/2DU IMP/2PL IMP early morning  
 ‘Peter insists that you must come early morning.’
- c. To je avto, ki ga **prodaj/prodajta/prodajte** \_imprej.  
 this is car which it sell-2SG IMP/2DU IMP/2PL IMP as soon as you can  
 ‘This is a car which you must sell as soon as you can.’
- d. Zakaj te moje opozorilo, da **bodi** previden, tako jezi?  
 why you my warning that be-2SG IMP careful so make angry  
 ‘Why does my advice that you must be careful make you so angry?’

However, in cases with embedded argument clauses (and probably also with embedded imperatives as nominal complements) one can see that there exist, after all, a semantic restriction on the verb under which the imperative is embedded. It seems that in all these cases the semantics of the verb needs to comply to generally assumed semantics for imperatives, namely denoting the property of being the hearer and fulfilling the imperative (Portner 2003). Consider the unacceptable examples below ([14] a-b):

- (14) a. \*Obljubil je, da **pojdi/pojdita/pojdite** spat.  
 promised is that go-2SG IMP/2DU IMP/2PL IMP sleep-INF  
 ‘He promised that you (must) go to bed.’
- b. \*Peter dvomi, da **pridi/prideta/pridite** zgodaj zjutraj.  
 Peter doubts that come-2SG IMP/2DU IMP/2PL IMP early morning  
 ‘Peter doubts that you (must) come early morning.’

The most common embedding verbs seem to be *reci* (say), *vztrajati* (insist), *ukazati* (order), *svetovati* (suggest), and *opozoriti* (warn).

Trying to refute Rivero & Terzi’s (1995) hypothesis that the signaling of the so-called logical mood (which arises via the imperative mood through imperative V-feature marking) *only* arises in sentences with directive force (i.e., with imperative illocutionary force), S&G provide the following examples from Slovenian (examples in [15] in S&G 2002):

- (15) a. Potem pa \_e komu **zaupaj**.  
 then part part whom trust-2SG IMP  
 ‘And then trust anybody!’  
 [intended meaning: ‘It is impossible to trust anybody.’]

- b. **Reci** bedaku, da je pameten, pa ti bo verjel.  
 Say-2SG IMP fool that is smart part (and) you be-3SG FUT believed  
 ‘Tell a fool that he’s smart and he’ll believe you.’  
 [intended meaning: ‘If you tell a fool...’]

We agree with S&G’s (2000) intuition in pointing out that Slovenian imperatives *need not* be used only in sentences with an imperative illocutionary force, though, as we see above, the examples that S&G (2000) provide are some archaic/formulaic set phrases with imperative morphology which may not be (fully) productive in the language or could be (naturally) paraphrased as having a conditional reading. Nevertheless, from examples like the two above, S&G (2000) conclude that these data suggest that imperative verbs do not necessarily correlate with imperative illocutionary force. We leave this issue aside here for further investigation.

Furthermore, S&G (2000) crucially assume that the root C<sup>0</sup> is the natural syntactic location in the clause for the logical mood (sentential force), which we disagree with and develop our own analysis below.

The following section concentrates on embedded imperatives and their characteristics. We argue that *imperatives are tensed (finite) clauses with the same clausal representation as found in finite clauses*. The subjects of embedded imperatives show *the same (syntactic) restrictions* as the subjects of matrix imperatives (see below for these restrictions) and these seem to have the same properties as the subjects of finite clauses in Slovenian. Negation, too, functions the same way in embedded imperatives as in root imperatives and finite clauses – another piece of evidence that embedded imperatives are ‘fully-blown’ clauses (CPs). We also review clitic placement in embedded imperatives, which is *different* from the clitic placement in matrix imperatives. We argue that morphological mood (Rivero & Terzi 1995) is encoded in the syntax per se in M<sup>0</sup> (Mood/Modality; cf. also Isac & Jakab 1997), but the logical mood (illocutionary/ (sentential) force is *not* encoded in the C-domain of the clause per se, but rather arises via

syntax/semantic interface (in the spirit of Portner 2003 and Zanuttini & Portner 2002, 2003).

#### 4. THE MORPHOSYNTACTIC PROPERTIES OF EMBEDDED IMPERATIVES IN SLOVENIAN

Milojević Sheppard & Golden (S&G) (2002) argue against Platzack & Rosengren's (P&R) (1997) hypothesis about imperative clauses being tenseless clauses, where the term 'tenseless' is not to be understood merely as non-finite (in which case T<sup>0</sup> would carry a feature [-finite]), but rather as a clause completely lacking the TP projection. P&R (1997) state: "*Imperatives do not seem to be related to time (see e.g. Davies 1986 and Donhauser 1986), so we assume that there is no tense-feature in their lexical entry and hence no TP*" (italics mine). S&G's (2002) argument against P&R's tenselessness in imperative clauses doesn't come from embedding itself, of course, since non-finite clauses are commonly embedded cross-linguistically. Rather, what S&G have in mind when arguing against the lack of tense in imperatives (though this is not spelled out in the paper at all) is that the presence of an overt complementizer in C<sup>0</sup> (Slovenian *da*) indicates that there must be a complement clause to the head C, namely a TP. This, however, still doesn't present good enough evidence since complementizers cross-linguistically also introduce non-finite clauses (cf.: It was difficult [<sub>CP</sub> for John [<sub>TP</sub> to go there]]). However, in Slovenian the complementizer *da* (just like *that* in English) never c-selects a [-finite] clause:

- (16) a. Ukazal mi je, (da) naj delam.  
 ordered me is (that) *naj* work-1SG PRES IND  
 'He ordered me to work/He told me that I must work.'
- b. Ukazal mi je delati.  
 ordered me is work-INF  
 'He ordered me to work.'

- c. \*Ukazal mi je, da delati.  
 ordered me is that work-<sub>INF</sub>  
 ‘He ordered me to work.’

In the examples above, we see that the complementizer in  $C^0$  (*da*) c-selects either a [+finite] T ([16]a) or a [-finite] T ([16]b). However, it cannot be complemented by an infinitival clause with the presence of the overt *da*. Compare the examples in (16) with that in (17), where an imperative verb occurs in an embedded context:

- (17) Ukazal je, da **delaj**.  
 ordered is that work-<sub>2SG IMP</sub>  
 ‘He ordered you to work/that you just work’

From all the examples with overt complementizers above, we must conclude that an imperative *cannot* be a tenseless clause, whatever its structure may be (i.e., if it contains a TP or a fully blown CP with FinP, MoodP and TP; cf. Rizzi 1997). Hence, *we take imperatives as tensed forms, having the same structure as finite clauses (CP-TP-VP), with (optional) V<sup>0</sup>-to-T<sup>0</sup> movement (for verb movement accounts in Slovenian, see Ilc 1998, 2002; Sheppard & Ilc 2002; Rus 2003).*

In Slovenian, the syntactic subject in matrix imperatives is either the same as the addressee or quantifies over the addressee, just like in English (Han 1998). Hence, *either the hearer addressed by the speaker must be present or one or more persons the action is directed to must be present* when the utterance containing an imperative verb is uttered. *The same* restrictions apply in embedded imperatives, where there are no speaker-hearer restrictions in the matrix clause, but the imperative subject shows the same restrictions as the subject in root imperatives, i.e., it must be 2SG, 1DU/PL or 2DU/PL:

- (18) a. Peter je rekel, da **pojej/pojejva/pojejta/pojejmo/pojejte** jabolka.  
 Peter is said that eat-<sub>2SG IMP/1DU IMP/2DU IMP/1PL IMP/2PL IMP</sub> apples

‘Peter said that you/us two/you two/us three or more/you three or more must eat the apples.’

- b. Peter mi je rekel, da **pojevja/pojejta/pojejmo/pojejte** jabolka.  
Peter me is said that eat-2SG IMP/1DU IMP/2DU IMP/1PL IMP/2PL IMP apples  
‘Peter told me that ... must eat the apples.’
- c. Ali ti je Peter rekel, da **pojej/pojejva/pojejta/pojejmo/pojejte** jabolka?  
Q you is Peter said that eat-2SG IMP/1DU IMP/2DU IMP/1PL IMP/2PL IMP apples  
‘Did Peter tell you that ... must eat ..?’
- d. Peter je rekel Mariji, da **pojej/pojejva/pojejta/pojejmo/pojejte** jabolka.  
Peter is said Mary that eat-2SG IMP/1DU IMP/2DU IMP/1PL IMP/2PL IMP apples  
‘Peter told Mary that ... must eat the apples.’

Hence, the subjects of embedded imperatives seem to exhibit *the same* syntactic characteristics as the subjects of root infinitives, which exhibit *the same syntactic characteristics as the subjects of finite clauses*: they can bind an anaphor in VP ([19]a), control the PRO subject of non-finite complements ([19]b), and agree with predicatively used adjectives and past participles ([19]c):

- (19) a. Rekel je, da si **kupi** kolo.  
said is that yourself buy-2SG IMP bicycle  
‘He said that you must buy yourself a bicycle.’
- b. Rekel je, da se **navadi** PRO pospraviti svojo sobo.  
said is that refl get used-2SG IMP to clean up your own room  
‘He said that you should learn to clean up your room.’
- c. Rekel je, da **bodi** previdna!  
said is that be-2SG IMP careful-SG FEM

He said that you must be careful.’

We mentioned above that it is generally assumed that syntactic subjects in Slovenian imperatives are restricted to 2SG and 1DU/PL and 2DU/PL subjects. However, these subjects are almost always covert (*pro*). Overt subjects are, of course, possible (either full NPs or pronouns), generally denoting contrast or emphasis ([20] a-d):

- (20) a. Rekel je, da si **ti kupi** kolo, ne Marija.  
said is that yourself you buy-2SG IMP bicycle not Mary  
‘He said that you must buy yourself a bicycle, not Mary.’
- b. Rekel je, da se **vidva navadita** PRO pospraviti svojo sobo.  
said is that refl you-two get used-2DU IMP to clean up your own room  
‘He said that you two should learn to clean up your room.’
- c. Rekel je, da **vidva z Markom bodita** previdna!  
said is that you-two with Marc be-2DU IMP careful-SG FEM  
He said that you and Marc must be careful.’
- d. U\_iteljica opozarja, da **vsi otroci bodite** previdni v gozdu!  
teacher warns that all kids be-2PL IMP careful-PL MASC in wood  
‘The teacher warns that all kids must be careful in the wood.’

If the subject agreement features are assumed to be shared by small *pro*, which is a standard assumption in the generative literature, then *pro* must be *referential*. This seems to rule out P&R’s proposal on the absence of finiteness in imperative clauses. P&R explicitly claim that subject agreement (and aspect) features are *unrelated to finiteness* and that would mean that in the system we are proposing, the subject agreement features have *no* referential role. I am not sure *in what particular sense* P&R claim that the subject agreement features are non-referential. P&R’s claim seems to be counterintuitive



Though Slovenian is a language with 2P clitics (cf. [24]a), pronominal clitics can sometimes be sentence-initial (cf. [24]a vs. [24]b):

- (24) a. Daj mi mir.  
 give-2SG IMP me-CL-DAT peace  
 ‘Leave me alone’
- b. Mi lahko prinese\_ vodo?  
 me-CL-DAT can bring-2SG PRES IND water  
 ‘Can you bring me water?’

However, clitics *cannot* precede the imperative verb (*\*CL + V-IMP*) in matrix imperatives, where the only possible order is *V-IMP + CL*:

- (25) a. \*Ga poslu\_aj, \_e ho\_e\_.  
 him-CL-DAT listen-2SG IMP if want-2SG PRES IND
- b. Poslu\_aj ga, \_e ho\_e\_.  
 listen-2SG IMP him-CL-DAT if want-2SG PRES IND  
 ‘Listen to him if you want’

Interestingly, *V-IMP + CL* is ungrammatical in embedded contexts, where the reverse order (*CL + V-IMP*) is attested:

- (26) a. \*Vztrajal je, da pokli\_i ga.  
 insisted is that call-2SG IMP him-CL-ACC  
 ‘He insisted that you must call him.’
- b. Vztrajal je, da ga pokli\_i  
 insisted is that him-CL-ACC call-2SG IMP  
 ‘He insisted that you must call him.’

In interaction with clitics, negation yields the word order *Neg + V<sub>-FIN</sub> + CL*, as shown in examples in (27) below:

- (27) a. Ne pojem ga.  
 not eat-1SG PRES IND it-CL-ACC SG  
 ‘I don’t eat it.’
- b. \*Ne ga pojem.  
 not it-CL-ACC SG eat-1SG PRES IND
- c. Ne bom ga pojedel.  
 not be-1SG FUT IND it-CL-ACC SG eaten  
 ‘I won’t eat it.’
- d. \*Ne ga bom pojedel.  
 not it-CL-ACC SG be-1SG FUT IND eaten

In matrix imperatives, the word order is exactly the same, *Neg + V<sub>-IMP</sub> + CL*, as seen below:

- (28) a. Ne pojej ga!  
 not eat-2SG IMP it-CL-ACC SG  
 ‘Don’t eat it.’
- b. \*Ne ga pojej!  
 not it-CL-ACC SG eat-2SG IMP
- c. Ne poslušaj jih.  
 not listen-2SG IMP them-CL-ACC PL  
 ‘Don’t listen to them.’

- d. \*Ne jih poslusaj  
 not them-CL-ACC PL listen-2SG IMP  
 ‘Don’t listen to them.’

Hence, as regard to clitic placement, Slovenian matrix imperatives show *the same* word order as clitic placement in finite indicative clauses (*Neg + V<sub>FIN/IMP</sub> + CL*). Interestingly, the embedded imperatives *do not* show the same word order as regard to clitic placement as matrix non-imperative clauses, yielding ...*that CL + Neg + V<sub>IMP</sub>*:

- (29) a. Rekel je, da ga ne poslusaj.  
 said is that it-CL-ACC SG not give-2SG IMP  
 ‘He said that you must not listen to him.’
- b. \*Rekel je, da ne poslusaj ga  
 said is that not give-2SG IMP it-CL-ACC
- c. Vztrajal je, da mu ga ne poka\_i.  
 insisted is that him-CL-DAT it-CL-ACC SG not show-2SG IMP  
 ‘He insisted that you must not show it to him.’
- d. \*Vztrajal je, da ne poka\_i mu ga.  
 insisted is that not show-2SG IMP him-CL-DAT it-CL-ACC SG

From all the data above, we can now account for the following research questions:

- (a) *Can imperatives embed? How? (= What’s the mechanism behind this?)*  
 (b) *Are imperative clauses really tenseless, having the least structure of all clauses (à la Platzack & Rosengren 1997)?*  
 (c) *Do embedded imperatives in Slovenian have different characteristics than matrix imperatives? If so, which and why?*

The question in (a) has been partially answered: *YES*, imperatives *can* and *do* embed and there is nothing like a universal prohibition against embedding them. Explaining why this is so is another task, though. P&R's is the only existing study that offers an account on why imperatives cannot embed, yet even that one doesn't seem to offer a satisfactory answer, as we saw.

As noted above, most generative linguists have claimed that the root  $C^0$  is the locus of the logical mood. In other words,  $C^0$  is the logical candidate for the locus for the imperative feature or the imperative operator that licenses (binds, checks off) the imperative V-feature, yielding the illocutionary force of the sentence. This analysis is on a par with the general assumption that in interrogative *wh*-questions the *wh*-element moves to [Spec, CP] in order to check its interrogative feature, residing in  $C^0$  under Spec-head relation (Rizzi 1991, 1997). Han (1998) observes that in such a feature-checking theory, it follows *without stipulation* that a sentence *cannot be of two types* (e.g., an imperative and an interrogative), simplifying the theory with the same semantic type associating with the same syntactic category.

However, this assumption *cannot* be straightforwardly extended to Slovenian imperatives, as we saw above. Two logical hypotheses open here. First, either *both* matrix and embedded  $C^0$ 's must be the loci of an imperative operator (or an imperative feature) and LF is 'blind' to interpreting the embedded context operators; or second,  $C^0$  is *not* the locus of any clause-type features or operator, but the clause type – rather than being marked in syntax per se – arises compositionally from other semantic features (Portner 2003; Zanuttini & Portner 2000, 2002, 2003). The unavailability of LF interpreting a clause type (and consequently sentential force, as it is usually assumed) in embedded contexts follows from nowhere and is thus a pure assumption, though most mainstream generativists have accepted this hypothesis (Rivero & Terzi 1995; Platzack & Rosengren 1997; Rizzi 1997; Han 1998).

S&G (2000) avoid the discussion in question by saying that “[s]ince Slovene imperatives can be embedded, whatever the established mechanism, if *stipulating* selectional



- b. [CP knjige<sub>k</sub> jim<sub>j</sub> berite<sub>i</sub> [MP NP<sub>k</sub> V<sub>i</sub> CL<sub>j</sub> [TP ... ] VP ...]]

Such an approach to the phrase structure in Slovenian can capture all attested word orders as regards to imperatives in both matrix and embedded contexts:

- (32) a. [CP [MP poje<sub>j</sub> [TP V<sub>i</sub> ] [VP V<sub>i</sub> jabolka]]]  
 [CP [MP eat<sub>i-IMP</sub> [TP V<sub>i</sub> ] [VP V<sub>i</sub> apples]]]
- b. [CP rekel je] [CP da] [MP poje<sub>j</sub> [TP V<sub>i</sub> ]][VP V<sub>i</sub> jabolka]]]  
 [CP said is] [CP that] [MP eat<sub>i-IMP</sub> [TP V<sub>i</sub> ]][VP V<sub>i</sub> jabolka]]]
- c. [CP poje<sub>j</sub> [MP V<sub>i</sub> [TP V<sub>i</sub> jih<sub>j</sub>] [VP V<sub>i</sub> CL<sub>j</sub>]]]  
 [CP eat<sub>i-IMP</sub> [MP V<sub>i</sub> [TP V<sub>i</sub> them<sub>j-CL</sub>] [VP V<sub>i</sub> CL<sub>j</sub>]]]
- d. [CP rekel je] [CP da jih<sub>j</sub> ] [MP poje<sub>j</sub> [TP V<sub>i</sub> CL<sub>j</sub>][VP V<sub>i</sub> CL<sub>j</sub>]]]  
 [CP said is] [CP that them<sub>j-CL</sub>] [MP eat<sub>i-IMP</sub> [TP V<sub>i</sub> CL<sub>j</sub>][VP V<sub>i</sub> CL<sub>j</sub>]]]

By positing the structure in (30) and (32) above, the research question in (b) above has been answered already: NO, imperative clauses are *not* universally tenseless. We have argued that the phrase structure for imperatives does not differ from that of finite clauses in not having a CP and TP layers (or CP/MoodP/TP projections in a split-CP system of Rizzi 1997).

We label the highest projection with CP, though it may be some other functional projection (generally, FP) in a split-CP system. Nevertheless, we *do not* posit that this highest projection is a force (or a force-type) projection, yielding *sentential force* (as assumed by Rizzi 1997, for example). We believe that the force of imperatives is *not* directly represented in the syntax. In other words, there is no special morpheme or element that directly encodes force in our view. However, in our view, the syntax of imperatives as clause types *is* marked morphosyntactically via mood morphology. Cross-linguistically, there are other morphosyntactic elements that create the meaning

components needed for a specific clause type, for example specific particles or different properties of negative markers (see Isac & Jakab [I&J] 1997 for the latter).

As we saw above, we posit an M projection heading the MP. M hosts an imperative verb in Slovenian imperative clauses (and verbs of other moods for that matter), but can host a mood particle, mood operator or mood feature, or some modal-like operator, depending on the language. MP is lower than Rizzi's (1997) Force and higher than NegP. In our system, variation across languages with respect to infinitives would not be a consequence of differences in the syntax of imperatives, but would follow from different properties of clitics and negative markers in various languages. Whereas we posit that logical mood (yielding 'clause type') is checked by one of the three ways discussed by I&J (by merging a Mood particle in the head of the MP; by moving the  $V_{-IMP}$  to  $M^0$ ; by moving  $Neg^0$  to  $M^0$ ), we *do not* posit that imperatives check *an imperative force feature* located in  $M^0$ , as I&J do.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The aim of this paper was to show that imperative clauses *can* embed with the presence of overt complementizers and that a general prohibition against embedding imperatives cannot be taken to be a universal property of languages. In Slovenian, imperative clauses are not restricted to be embedded argument clauses (only) under reporting verbs, but can function as embedded restrictive relative clauses or adnominal complement clauses. A careful analysis of the morphosyntactic properties of Slovenian embedded imperatives in terms of the properties generally studied in relation to such clauses (e.g., subject restrictions, negation, clitic placement, and the interaction between negation and pronominal clitic placement), showed that in general, embedded imperatives not only function similarly to the way matrix imperatives do, but also share several properties with (other) finite (i.e., non-imperative) clauses. The only property that distinguishes embedded imperatives from matrix ones is the clitic placement, which - in embedded contexts - is  $CL+V_{-IMP}$ , rather than  $V_{-IMP}+CL$ .

Though most generative linguists have claimed that the root  $C^0$  is the locus of the logical mood (i.e., sentence force) with the imperative feature or the imperative operator licensing (binding, checking off) the imperative V-feature, we saw that such an assumption cannot accommodate sentences where a matrix clause has a different mood interpretation than the embedded clause. To accommodate Slovenian matrix and embedded imperatives, we posited an approach assuming that morphological mood is checked in a Mood head ( $M^0$ ), triggering the *clause type*, but that there is *no force* encoded in the syntax per se. Verb movement under this approach is an operation of  $V^0$  moving to  $M^0$  for purely morphological reasons. Movement of the verb from  $M^0$  to  $C^0$  (presumably for semantic or even discourse reasons) is independent of the previous movement and is the consequence of Slovenian being a P2 clitic language.

We also showed that the subjects of embedded imperatives have the same syntactic properties and restrictions as the subjects of matrix imperatives. What is more, the subjects of embedded imperatives show the same syntactic properties as the subjects of finite indicative clauses; they can bind an anaphor in VP, control the PRO subject of non-finite complements, and agree with predicatively used adjectives and past participles.

We proposed that Slovenian embedded imperatives have the same structure as matrix imperatives, which in turn have the same clausal representation as finite (indicative) clauses. Hence, imperatives *cannot* be taken to be universally tenseless, as suggested in recent syntactic literature.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Beukema, F. & Coopmans, P.** 1989. A government-binding perspective on the imperative in English. *Journal of Linguistics* 25: 417-436.
- Bo\_kovi\_, \_.** 2000. Second Position Cliticization: Syntax and/or Phonology?, In Beukema, F. & den Dikken, M. eds. *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 71-120.
- Chomsky, N.** 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N.** 1999. *Derivation by phase*. Ms. MIT.
- Cinque, G.** 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, E.** 1986. *The English Imperative*. London: Croom Helm.
- Han, C. H.** 1998. *The structure and interpretation of imperatives: mood and force in Universal Grammar*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Henry, A.** 1995. *Belfast English and Standard English: Dialect Variation and Parameter Setting*. Oxford: OUP.
- Huntley, M.** 1984. The Semantics of English Imperatives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 7, 103-133.
- Ilc, G.** 2002. *Verb movement and functional categories*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Ljubljana.
- Ilc, G. & Milojevi\_Sheppard, M.** 2002. Verb movement and Interrogatives. To appear in *Linguistica XLII*, Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- Ilc, G. & Milojevi\_Sheppard, M.** 2003. *Verb movement in Slovenian: A Comparative Perspective*. Ms. University of Ljubljana.
- Isac, D. & Jakab, E.** 1997. *Mood and force features in the languages of the Balkans*. Unpublished paper retrieved online.
- Kayne, R.** 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph Vol. 25. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Milojevi\_Sheppard, M. & Golden, M.** 2000. Imperatives, Negation and Clitics in Slovene. In *Razprave 17/II razreda SAZU* Ljubljana.
- Milojevi\_Sheppard, M. & Golden, M.** 2002. (Negative) Imperatives in Slovene. In Barbiers, S, Beukema, F & van der Wurff, W. eds. *Modality and its Interaction with the Verbal System*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Pak, M.** 2003. *Sentence Types in Korean*. Ms., Georgetown University.
- Platzack, C. & Rosengren, I.** 1998. On the subject of imperatives: A minimalist account of the imperative clause. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1, 177-224.
- Palmer, F. R.** 1986. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics, Cambridge: CUP
- Palmer, F. R.** 2001. *Mood and Modality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP
- Portner, P.** 2003. Clause Types and the Semantics of Imperatives. Ms. Georgetown University [also presented at ESSLI 2003 in Vienna].
- Potsdam, E.** 1998. *Syntactic issues in the English imperative*. New York: Garland.
- Reis, M.** 1997. Zum syntaktischen Status unselbständiger Verb-Zweit Sätze. In: Dürscheid. ed. *Sprache im Fokus*. Tübingen, 121-144.
- Rivero, M.-L., & Terzi, A.** 1995. Imperatives, V-movement and logical mood. *Journal of Linguistics* 31, 301-332.
- Rizzi, L.** 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, L.** 1997. On the fine structure of the left-periphery. In Haegeman L. ed. *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Röngvaldsson, E.** 2003. *The Syntax of the Imperative in Old Scandinavian*. Ms. Univ. of Iceland.
- Rus, D.** 2003. *Quirky Verb Movement in Slovenian*. Ms. Georgetown University.

- Tomic, O. M.** 1996. The Balkan Slavic clausal clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14, 811-872.
- Toporič, J.** 2000. *Slovenska slovnica* [Slovenian Grammar]. Maribor: Založba Obzorja.
- Zanuttini, R. & Portner, P.** 2000. The Characterization of Exclamative Clauses in Paduan. *Language* 76.1, 123-32.
- Zanuttini, R. & Portner, P.** 2003. Exclamative Clauses: At the Syntax-Semantics Interface. *Language* 79.1, 39-81.
- Zanuttini, R.** 1997. Negation and verb movement. In Haegeman, L. ed. *The New Comparative Syntax*. Oxford UK/Cambridge USA: Blackwell Publishers, 214-245.
- Zwicky, A.** 1988. On the subject of bare imperatives in English. In C. Duncan-Rose & Vennemann, T. eds. *On Language: Rhetorica, Phonologica, Syntactica: A Festschrift for Robert Stockwell from his Friends and Colleagues*. London: Croom Helm, 437-50.