Imperatives Under and Over Conjunction

Ezra Keshet (U of Michigan) & David Medeiros (CSU, Northridge)

Imperative-and-Declarative conjunctions (**IaDs**, Schwager/Kaufmann 2006, 2012) are coordinations with morphologically imperative first clauses (see Jespersen 1924). They feature conditional meanings, as shown in (1), examples from von Fintel & Iatridou (2009, 2015):

(1) a. Study hard and you'll pass the class. (= if you study hard, you'll pass)
b. Ignore your homework and you'll fail the class. (= if you ignore it, you'll fail)

Most researchers since Clark (1993) have distinguished IaDs that describe situations **desirable** for the speaker and/or hearer like (1a) from IaDs describing **undesirable** situations like (1b). Others (Han 2000, von Fintel & Iatridou) have proposed one unified category for all IaDs. Neither camp maintains the full force of the imperative speech act in all IaDs, especially in undesirable ones.

In this paper, we present evidence that all IaDs indeed contain full imperative speech acts, which we represent via an operator **IMP** in C (cf. Han, Kaufmann, i.a.). We propose a split in IaDs, but one quite different from previous accounts. In our first category, **Na**rrow-scope **IaDs** (**NaIaDs**), IMP scopes low, creating a fully imperative first clause that conjoins at the CP level with a declarative. Any conditional meaning in NaIaDs arises from modal subordination (Han, Roberts 1989). Our second category, **Tr**ans-clausal **IaDs** (**TrIaDs**), patterns with so-called conditional conjunctions (Culicover & Jackendoff 1997, Russell 2007, Keshet 2012): IMP scopes above a coordination of TPs, agreeing morphologically (only) with the first clause. To the extent that we correctly explain IaDs, our proposal is evidence that an element like IMP appears in the syntax of all imperatives (pace Porter 2007, Zanuttini et al. 2013). Consider the following tests for our two categories:

(2) **NaIaDs** Syntax: [$_{CP}$ IMP TP] and [$_{CP}$ …]
(a) CAN ALWAYS be paraphrased as two sentences without 'and':
Study hard! You'll (easily) pass the class.
(b) CANNOT therefore include (unlicensed) NPIs in their first clauses:
Do somebody/#anybody please confess, and we can all go home.
(c) CAN be of the form 'do (negation) subject VP':
Don't everybody talk at once, and maybe I'll be able to understand you.
(d) CAN be concessive / be conjoined with 'but':
Fine! Come closer, but I am going to shoot you.

(3) TrIaDs Syntax: [$_{CP}$ IMP [$_{TP}$ …] and [$_{TP}$ …]]
(a) CAN include imperatives that sound odd unconjoined (Han 2000):
Doubt that you'll succeed and you won't. vs. *#Doubt that you'll succeed! You won't.*
(b) CAN include (apparently) unlicensed NPIs (Bolinger 1967, Davies 1986, Han 2000):
Come any closer and I'll shoot. vs. *#Come any closer!*
(c) CANNOT be of the form 'do (negation) subject VP':
#Do anybody take even one more step, and I'll shoot.
(d) CANNOT be concessive / be conjoined with 'but':
Fine! #Come any closer, but I am going to shoot you.

We propose that the scope of IMP explains these differences. NaIaDs must include imperatives that can stand alone since their first conjunct is a complete imperative, as marked by the low-scoping IMP

operator. The first clause of a TrIaD is more flexible since, as we will see below, the imperative meaning arises from the entire conjunction, not just the first clause. Second, the ability of a TrIaD to contain an NPI follows from it being a conditional conjunction (as argued by von Fintel & Iatridou 2015), which also allow such NPIs: *You come any closer, and I'll shoot*. CP conjunctions like NaIaDs cannot be conditional conjunctions (see Culicover & Jackendoff 1997) and therefore do not allow NPIs. Third, following Potsdam (2007), we take the form 'do (negation) subject VP' to involve T-to-C movement of *do*. Such movement, we claim, is not allowed from within the TP conjunction of a TrIaD, due to the coordinate structure constraint (Ross 1967). Finally, we assume that concessives require conjunction at the CP level and leave the explanation for this to future work.

[As an aside, neutral IaDs (neither desirable nor undesirable) like Clark's *Open the Guardian, and you'll find three misprints on every page*, pattern with non-conditionals: *Do everyone open the Guardian (next time you see one), and (I guarantee) you'll find three misprints on every page*.]

Semantically, we propose IMP is a modal that imposes certain pragmatic constraints on its TP complement, thus generating an imperative speech act (Kaufmann 2012). As a modal, IMP can induce a conditional meaning, e.g. in the second clause of a NaIaD, via modal subordination. For instance, compare (4a) to an explicit modal conjunction like (4b) (pace von Fintel & Iatridou, whose counterexamples to modal subordination are most easily understood as TrIaDs rather than NaIaDs):

(4) a. Do everybody come over to my place, and we'll have a great time.
    b. ≈ Everybody should come over to my place, and we'll have a great time.

As for TrIaDs, we believe we are the first to propose that all IaDs (even undesirable ones) involve true imperative speech acts. We make this claim based on new empirical data: IaDs that don't even indirectly imply a possible course of action are ruled out. For instance, the acceptability differences in (5a) and (5b) hinge on the fact that while it is impossible to control whether you are on a security tape recorded earlier or whether you are (currently) old enough to drink, you can control whether you show up on a future security tape or whether you wait until you are old enough to drink:

(5) a. Be on (✓tonight's / #last night's) security tape, and they'll arrest you.
    b. Be old enough to drink (#tonight / ✓when you come back), and you can try the wine.

To explain the semantics of TrIaDs, we adopt Keshet's (2012) proposal that first conjuncts in conditional conjunctions act like conditional antecedents by joining the restriction of a higher modal (here, IMP). We next propose extending imperative speech acts to include **indirect imperatives**, parallel to indirect answers to questions (Groenendijk & Stokhof 1984). For instance, *Be late and you're fired*, along with the contextual knowledge that the listener wants their job, implies that the listener should arrive on time. In simple imperatives, only priority modals (deontic, bouletic, etc) are available flavors for the modal IMP; since a priority modal can always be construed as a direct imperative, this blocks the less salient indirect imperative reading. Independently, though, we know that conditionals (including conditional conjunctions) license different modal flavors from simple declaratives and imperatives, such as the **future** modal as in (6b). The IMP in TrIaDs are thus freed from necessarily using a priority modal, and therefore may indirectly indicate a course of action.

(6) a. You are grounded. ≠ You will be grounded.
    b. If you're late, you are grounded. = If you're late, you will be grounded.