

# On Participial Imperatives\*

Johan Rooryck and Gertjan Postma  
*Leiden University*

## Abstract

Apart from bare imperatives and infinitival imperatives, Dutch features a third type, the participial imperative, with a syntax quite different from the other types. First we present an inventory of the properties of the participial imperative, distinguishing the productive negative participial imperatives from a limited set of nonnegative participial imperatives. It will turn out that this last set of participial imperatives observes a number of unusual syntactic and semantic restrictions, including a definiteness restriction on their complement, temporal and locational restriction to the here and now; and incompatibility with negation. We will argue that these participial imperatives should be viewed as portmanteau morphemes, lexically clustering a set of functional elements (negation, deictic pronouns, aspectual verbs) that can be related to the restrictions mentioned. We also show that the imperative reading of these participial imperatives can be derived from scope interactions of an abstract modal AUX with overtly syntactic or covertly lexical negation.

## Keywords

Participial, imperative, negation, zero-semantics, modality.

## 1. Introduction

In Dutch, participles can be used as root sentences to a limited extent. Examples include *Wh*-sentences as in (1), and underlying passives with performative import as in (2).

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| (1) | a. Waaronom zo ver gereden?<br>why driven so far?<br>'Why would we/you drive so far?'              | b. Wat nu gedaan?<br>what now done?<br>'What shall we do now?'                        |
| (2) | a. (je wordt) bedankt!<br>you are thanked<br>'Thank you'   | b. (je wordt) gecondoleerd.<br>(you are) sympathized with<br>'My deepest sympathies.' |
|     | c. (je wordt) gefeliciteerd/gelukkiggewenst!<br>you are congratulated<br>'My/our congratulations!' |   |

In addition to these cases, there is a set of participles that may be used with imperative or exhortative force. We will call these participial imperatives. They are exemplified in (3)-(7).

- |     |                                      |  |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|
| (3) | a. Gegroet!<br>greeted<br>'Goodbye.' | b. Onder ons gezegd (en gezwegen), dat is onzin.<br>between us said and kept silent that is nonsense<br>'Between you and me, that's just rubbish.' |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|

---

\* We would like to thank Berend Hoff, Marjo van Koppen and Jeroen Van Craenenbroeck for discussion and Marcel den Dikken for extensive written suggestions and comments, and for reminding us of *Wh*-participial root constructions. Special thanks go to Ronald Landheer for useful discussion, and for pointing out the existence of other negative nominal imperatives. Our thanks also extend to the audience at the 'TIN-dag' 2001.

- (4) a. Afgelopen!  
off-walked  
'Be done with it!'
- b. Gedaan! (Southern Dutch)  
done  
'Be done with it!'
- (5) a. Opgepast!  
on-taken-care  
'Be careful!'
- b. Opgelet!  
on-looked  
'Look out!'
- c. ?Eventjes uitgekeken nu!  
for-a-moment looked-out now  
'Let's just pay attention now!'
- d. ?Eventjes acht geslagen op laaghangende takken nu!  
for a moment attention paid to low-hanging branches now  
'Please pay attention for a moment to low branches now!'
- (6) a. Ingerukt!  
in-pulled  
'Dismiss!' (military)
- b. Opgesodemieterd!  
up-sodomised  
'Sod off!'
- c. Opgerot!  
up-rotted!  
'Fuck off!'
- d. Opgekrast!  
up-scratched  
'Buzz off!'
- e. Opgehoepeld!  
up-hooped  
'Get out!'
- f. Opgedonderd!  
up-thundered  
'Get out!'
- g. Oppeduvelde!  
up-deviled  
'Go away'
- h. Opgestaan!  
up-stood  
'Get up!'
- (7) \*(Niet) getalmd/getreuzeld/getreurd nu!  
not delayed/hung-around/lamented now  
'Get on with it now!/Don't wait now!/Don't be sad now!'

This set of participial imperatives can be subdivided on the basis of their alternation with other verbal forms with imperative force. Only the forms in (5)-(7) show an alternation with bare imperatives and infinitival imperatives, as can be seen in (8)-(10), where for each verb the bare imperative alternates with the infinitival imperative and the participial imperative.

- (8)a. Pas op!/ Oppassen!/ Opgepast!  
take-care  
'Be careful!'
- b. Let op!/ Opletten!/ Opgelet!  
look on  
'Look out!'
- c. Kijk uit!/ Uitkijken!/ ? Eventjes uitgekeken nu!  
look out  
'Look out!'
- d. Sla acht/Acht slaan/ Eventjes acht geslagen op laaghangende takken nu!  
Pay/ paid attention to low-hanging branches now  
'Please pay attention to low branches now!'
- (9)a. (\*)Ruk in, jullie/ Inrukken!/ Ingerukt!  
Pull in/in-pull/in-pulled  
'Dismiss!' (military)
- b. Sodemieter op!/ Opsodemieteren!/ Opgesodemieterd!

- sodomise up/up-sodomise/ up-sodomised  
‘Sod off!’
- c. Rot op!/ Oprotten!/ Opgerot!  
rot up/up-rot/up-rotten  
‘Fuck off!’
- d. Kras op!/ Opkrassen!/ Opgekrast!  
scratch up/up-scratch/up-scratched  
‘Buzz off!’
- e. Donder op!/ Opdonderen!/ Opgedonderd!  
thunder up/up-thunder/up-thundered  
‘Get out!’
- f. Hoepel op!/ Ophoepelen!/ Opgehoepeld!  
hoop up/up-hoop/up-hooped  
‘Get out!’
- g. Duvel op!/ Opduvelen!/ Opgeduveld!  
devil up/ up-devil/updeviled  
‘Go away’
- h. Sta op!/ Opstaan!/ Opgestaan!  
stand up/up-stand  
‘Get up!’

- (10) Talm/treuzel/treur \*(niet)!/ \*(niet) talmen/treuren/treuzelen /  
delay//lament/hang-around not/ not delay/ lament/ hang-around  
\*(niet) getalmd/ getreurd/ getreuzeld!  
not delayed/ lamented/ hung-around  
‘Get on with it now!/ Don’t be sad now!/ Don’t wait now!’

The other participial imperatives do not alternate with bare imperatives or infinitival imperatives in this way, as shown in (11) and (12).

- (11) a. \*Groet/\*Groeten!  
greet  
‘Goodbye.’
- b. \*Zeg/\*Zeggen (en zwijg\*(en)), dat is onzin  
say and keep-silent, that is nonsense  
‘Between you and me, that’s just rubbish.’
- (12) a. \*Loop af!/\*Aflopen!  
walk off/off-walk  
‘Be done with it!’
- b. \*Doe!/\*Doen!<sup>1</sup> (Southern Dutch)  
do  
‘Be done with it!’

The lack of alternation with other imperative verb forms of the participial imperatives in (3) and (4) suggests that these cases are part of a different class. In fact, on closer examination, these cases are lexically frozen entirely. This is corroborated by the fact that they are limited to an extremely small set of unrelated lexical items. The cases in (13)-(14), for example, are semantically minimally different from (3)-(4), but they cannot be used as imperatives.

- (13) a. \*Begroet  
greeted
- b. \*Onder ons verteld, dat is onzin  
between us told that is nonsense
- (14) a. \*Beëindigd!  
ended
- b. \* Gestopt!  
stopped

<sup>1</sup> The infinitival form *doen* ‘do’ can be used as an imperative, but not with the meaning of (4b).

finished

stopped

By contrast, the cases in (5)-(7) are relatively productive in the sense that they form paradigms that are strongly rule bound. Even less felicitous cases such as (5c,d) are not entirely ungrammatical.

In addition, the cases in (3)-(4) can be regarded as shortened versions of longer sentences containing an imperative auxiliary or an impersonal construction. Examples (3)-(4) are interpretatively entirely equivalent to the longer (15)-(16): both (3) and (15) involve an imperative, and both (4) and (16) have exclamative force. However, the sentences in (5) do not interpretatively correspond to the longer form (17): (5) is an imperative, (17) is an exhortative. For (6), a corresponding longer form does not even exist (cf (18)), as unaccusative movement verbs can never undergo impersonal passivisation in Dutch.

- (15) a. Wees gegroet!  
 ‘Be greeted!’  
 b. Onder ons zij gezegd en gezwegen, dat is onzin  
 between us be said and kept-silent that is nonsense  
 ‘Let it be said between the two of us, that’s just rubbish’
- (16) Het moet nu maar eens even afgelopen/gedaan zijn!  
 it must now PRT once for.a.while finished/done be  
 ‘This should really be the end of it!’
- (17) Nu moet er even opgelet/opgepast/ \*(niet) getalmd/ getreuzeld worden!  
 now must there for.a.while taken.care/ not delayed/ hung around be  
 ‘Now attention should be paid!’/ ‘There should be no delaying/ waiting now!’
- (18) \*Er moet nu ingerukt/opgesodemieterd worden!  
 there must now in-pulled/up-sodomised be  
 ‘Now they should dismiss/sod off.’

In this article, we will therefore restrict our attention to the productive set of cases in (5)-(7).

Among the set of participial imperatives in (5)-(7), we have to introduce a further distinction on the basis of syntactic and semantic properties. The cases in (5)-(6) include positive participial imperatives, while (7) includes only negative participial imperatives. Interestingly, this syntactic difference corresponds to a lexical difference. Negative participial imperatives can be made with any verb, while positive participial imperatives are restricted to a semantically coherent set of verbs. As a first approximation, we can say that the verbs in (5) all involve a call to attention, and those in (6) a call to move off. Moreover, the set in (6) has aggressive connotations.

This semantic restriction holding for positive participial imperatives is rather unusual. Other tenseless verb forms, such as infinitives, do not exhibit any restriction of this type. In languages where infinitival forms can function as imperatives, a verb that can take the imperative form can just as easily occur in the infinitive with imperative force, but this is not true for the participial form, as (19) illustrates.

- |         |          |             |              |
|---------|----------|-------------|--------------|
| (19) a. | Loop!    | Lopen!      | *Gelopen!    |
|         | run-IMP  | run-INF-IMP | run-PART-IMP |
|         | ‘Run!’   | ‘Run!’      | ‘Run!’       |
| b.      | Schrijf! | Schrijven!  | *Geschreven! |

write-IMP	write-INF-IMP	write-PART-IMP
‘Write!’	‘Write!’	‘Write!’

Hoeksema (1992) was the first to observe that Dutch has three forms to express the imperative: finite, infinitive and participial. He takes the restricted occurrence of nonfinite imperatives, i.e. infinitival and participial imperatives, as an indication that this phenomenon is just a lexical, idiomatic quirk of Dutch. We think, however, that this observation is not entirely correct. The class of infinitival imperatives is syntactically unrestricted, although Hoeksema is correct in pointing out that some infinitives do not easily occur with negation ((*\*niet*) *uitkijken* ‘(don’t) look out’), while some others do not occur without negation ((*\*niet*) *aankomen* ‘(don’t) touch’). The participial class, however, is much more strongly restricted, as observed above. But in this case too, it would be premature to attribute the restriction to an idiomatic quirk of Dutch, as participial imperatives also occur in other languages. Spanish, for instance, has the equivalent of (5), French the counterpart of (4a,b), and German military terminology features an expression close to (6). Portuguese productively has the change-of-location counterparts of (6) as well.

- |                                    |                    |                         |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| (20) a. Cuidado! <sup>2</sup> (Sp) | b. Fini! (Fr.)     | c. Aufgesessen! (Germ.) |
| taken care                         | finished           | up-sat                  |
| ‘Be careful!’                      | ‘Stop!’            | ‘Mount your horses!’    |
| d. Sentado! (Port.)                | e. Deitado!(Port.) |                         |
| seated                             | laid down          |                         |
| ‘Sit down!’                        | ‘Lie down!’        |                         |

The Portuguese examples in (20d,e) have, just like the Dutch examples in (6), aggressive overtones: they are used when people talk to dogs. The fact that participial imperatives also occur in other languages is a strong indication that they do not result from some lexical idiosyncrasy. In what follows, we will present an analysis of why the set of participial imperatives is so restricted.

## 2. Negative participial imperatives

The negative participial imperatives in (7) can be compared to a productive set of nominal imperatives. These nominal imperatives share a basic structure consisting of the adnominal negator *geen* ‘no’, the iterative/ collective morpheme *ge-*, and a verbal stem.<sup>3</sup> In English, the equivalent cases involve a gerund.

- |  |
|--|
| (21) a. *(Geen) gepraat!/gepruts!/getreuzel!/getoeter!/gedans!...    |
| no talking/fidgeting/hanging around/honking/dancing                  |
| b. *(No) smoking!/trespassing!/honking!/talking in the classroom!... |

<sup>2</sup> Admittedly, the Spanish form no longer functions as a participle. Instead, it has become a noun, as is clear from its use with the imperative form of *tener* ‘take’ (*ten cuidado* ‘be careful’), and its occurrence in the complement of prepositions (*con cuidado* ‘with care’). The point in the argument in the text, however, is that *cuidado* seems to have started out diachronically as a participle, and that origin is what is of interest to us here. Importantly, the Dutch participial forms with imperative force do not function as nouns in the sense of Spanish *cuidado*.

<sup>3</sup> Thanks to Ronald Landheer for drawing our attention to the relation between these constructions and participial imperatives.

These nominal imperatives always refer to a manner of saying or acting which is experienced as troublesome or undesirable by the speaker, and which therefore must be terminated. The events of talking or honking, for example, are not intrinsically troublesome, but the context of the negative imperative makes it clear that they are interpreted as such.

It seems, however, that the curious relation between negation and an imperative reading is not exclusive to nominal imperatives. The same observation applies to impersonal passives, in which stressed negation yields an imperative reading, as in (22b):

- (22) a. Er wordt hier gedanst/geroddeld/gelezen          declarative/\*?imperative  
 there is here danced/gossiped/read  
 ‘There is dancing/gossiping/reading going on here’
- b. Er wordt hier niet//NIET gedanst/geniesd/gelezen(!) declarative//imperative  
 there is here not danced/sneezed/read  
 ‘There is no dancing/gossiping/reading going on here//  
 No dancing/gossiping/reading here!’

Such negative impersonal passives need not spell out the impersonal subject and the auxiliary. They can take the form of the bare participial imperatives observed above in (7):

- (23) a. Eventjes niet gedanst/gezeurd/gepraat nu!  
 for.a.while not danced/nagged/talked now!  
 ‘No dancing/nagging/talking right now!’
- b. Niet getalmd/getreuzeld/getreurd nu!  
 not delayed/hung around/lamented now  
 ‘Get on with it now!/Don’t wait now!/Don’t be sad now’

We assume that the relation between the negative participial imperative in (23) and its longer form in (22) is one of ellipsis. The possibility of suppressing both subject and auxiliary also occurs in other, non-imperative sentence types in Dutch.

- (24) a. (Ben je) naar de kapper geweest?  
 (are you) to the hairdresser’s been  
 ‘Did you go to the hairdresser’s?’
- b. Nee, (ik heb) de verkeerde shampoo gebruikt.  
 no (I have) the wrong shampoo used  
 ‘No, I used the wrong shampoo.’
- c. (je wordt) bedankt!  
 (you are) thanked  
 ‘Thanks’
- d. (is er) nog wat post voor mij?  
 (is there) still some mail for me  
 ‘Is there any mail for me?’

It appears that the imperative reading of participles in impersonal passives, as well as in their shortened versions as participial imperatives, is dependent on negation. This observation does not extend to standard declaratives generally: declaratives in the past or present tense do not receive an additional imperative reading by adding negation:

- (25) a. Jij komt (niet/NIET) declarative/\*?imperative  
 ‘You (do not) come’  
 b. Jij bent (niet/NIET) gekomen declarative/\*?imperative  
 ‘You have (not) come’

However, it seems that not only impersonal constructions, but passives generally, interact with negation to yield imperative readings which are unavailable in the corresponding non-negated sentences:

- (26) a. Zulke boeken worden hier gelezen declarative/\*?imperative  
 such books are here read  
 b. Zulke boeken worden hier niet/NIET gelezen(!) declarative/imperative  
 such books are here not read

We may therefore conclude that on the imperative reading of (22b) and (26b), there is an interaction between negation and passive morphology that is responsible for the emergence of imperative force. This relation between passive and negation extends to the *geen ge-V* ‘no V-ing’ cases in (21). It should be noted that deverbal nouns share with the passive participle not only the *ge*-particle but also the fact that they select an agent PP introduced by *door* ‘by’:

- (27) a. *gepraat/gepruts/getreuzel/getoeter/gedans door* dat soort mensen is  
 vervelend  
 talking/fidgeting/hanging around/honking/dancing by that kind of people  
 is annoying  
 b. *Er wordt gedanst/gepraat/geprutst/getreuzeld/getoeterd door* die mensen  
 there is danced/talked/fidgeted/hung around/honked by those people<sup>4</sup>  
 ‘Those people dance/talk/fidget/hang around/honk.’

In the remainder of this article, we will compare the negative nominal and participial imperatives in (21) and (23) with the non-negated participial imperatives in (5)-(6). The question arises as to why negative nominal and participial imperatives are highly productive, while the participial imperatives in (5)-(6) are extremely restricted in their distribution. We would like to propose that the meaning of the participial imperatives in (5)-(6) inherently contains the negation that is syntactically expressed in the verbal and nominal negative imperatives of (21) and (23). The *opgesodemieterd* ‘sod off’ class of participial imperatives (cf. (6)) can be paraphrased as ‘do *not* remain here’, while the *opgepast* ‘pay attention’ class (cf. (5)) can be assigned an interpretation ‘do not continue this way’. In other words, while the nominal and participial imperatives of (21) and (23) display overt syntactic negation, we argue that the restricted set of participial imperatives in (5)-(6) feature covert negation. We will come back to this relation between participial imperatives and negation in section 4.

### 3. Covert modality and imperative interpretation

We have suggested above that the relation between between the negative participial imperative in (23) and its longer form in (22) involves ellipsis of an auxiliary as in other sentences types in Dutch. In view of the interpretation of these negative imperatives, the

<sup>4</sup> See Postma (1996: 207) for further similarities between *ge* nominalisation and passives. Postma takes *ge*- as the nominal counterpart of passive SE in Romance.

ellipted auxiliary is most likely a modal one: the situation described by the participial must be brought about. Let us therefore take a closer look at the interpretation of this ellipted modal auxiliary and negation, as the interaction between modals and negation is not without consequences in the context of negative participial imperatives. We have to answer the question in principle why the modal auxiliary in negative participial imperatives comes out with imperative force, i.e. why it involves MUST modality, rather than CAN modality.

In order to frame the discussion properly, we first need to go into the relation between negation and modality. We will limit our model space of modality to the existential and universal quantifiers over possible worlds, i.e. CAN and MUST respectively. Importantly, these two modal quantifiers, when realized verbally, have distinct scope properties with respect to negation. For some unknown reason, verbal CAN always has narrow scope with respect to negation.

(28) John can not walk    NOT > CAN / \*CAN > NOT

Verbal MUST modality, on the other hand, has both wide and narrow scope. In Dutch and English, the two scope relations are disambiguated lexically: English *need* and Dutch *hoeven* are the narrow scope counterparts of *must* and *moeten*.

(29) a. John must not go        MUST > NOT  
       b. John need not go        NOT > MUST

It thus appears that scope of modal AUX is always disambiguated in Dutch and English syntactic structures, either by the lexicon and the mysterious scope rule in (28) or entirely by the lexicon in (29). Ambiguous structures do not exist. We formulate this more generally in (30).

(30) No-Ambiguity Principle  
       \*[...AUX<sub>MOD</sub>...] if AUX<sub>MOD</sub> is ambiguous (FI)

We will assume that (30) is a particular realization of the Principle of Full Interpretation (FI).

In the cases in (28) and (29), disambiguation is mediated by the Lexicon. Under the assumption that (30) is a general property of Dutch and English, it follows that abstract, i.e. *nonlexical* AUX<sub>MOD</sub> is not well-formed unless it is disambiguated. Consider a syntactic structure where abstract AUX<sub>MOD</sub> has scope over negation as in (31).

(31) [... AUX<sub>MOD</sub>... NOT... iff AUX<sub>MOD</sub> is not lexical

In (31), the reading of AUX is fully determined. Since CAN always has narrow scope, wide scope AUX<sub>MOD</sub> in (31) is to be interpreted as MUST. Hence, the structure in (31) is well-formed with respect to the No-Ambiguity Principle in (30) even when AUX<sub>MOD</sub> is abstract. Consider now the structure in (32).

(32) \* [... NOT ... AUX<sub>MOD</sub>... iff AUX<sub>MOD</sub> is not lexical

In this structure, AUX<sub>MOD</sub> can either be interpreted as CAN or as MUST (to be compared with (28) and (29b) respectively). Hence (32) is not a well-formed structure with respect to the No-Ambiguity Principle in (30) if AUX<sub>MOD</sub> is not lexical. Let us finally consider the structure in (33), without negation.

(33) [...AUX<sub>MOD</sub> ...

In (33), if AUX is not lexical, it can be interpreted as MUST or CAN and, hence, is not well-formed with respect to the No-Ambiguity Principle in (30). We now have a mechanism that accounts for the way in which negation interacts with empty AUX<sub>MOD</sub> to induce an imperative reading (i.e. a MUST reading). If syntax forces negation to be lower than AUX<sub>MOD</sub>, AUX<sub>MOD</sub> gets a MUST reading and the structure complies with FI. Narrow scope negation happens typically when DP-internal negation is involved, as exemplified in (34a/35a).

- (34) a. AUX [geen gepraat]  
 b. \*(AUX) niet (AUX) ook maar enig gepraat
- (35) a. AUX [no talking]  
 b. \*(AUX) not (AUX) any talking

There are three consequences. 1. Without negation, no AUX<sub>MOD</sub>-disambiguation can be established. 2. without a *noun internal* negation as in (34b/35b), no scope can be determined of AUX<sub>MOD</sub> and NOT, and hence, no reading of AUX<sub>MOD</sub> is determined. That is why non-sentential negation is a felicitous way of forcing a MUST reading. 3. Only a MUST reading can be established by an abstract AUX<sub>MOD</sub>. CAN readings are excluded because they require AUX<sub>MOD</sub> to have narrow scope with respect to negation and other lexical material, which is not possible if the expression is stored in the lexicon. Moreover, such a structure might equally be interpreted as a low scope MUST (=need). Hence, AUX<sub>MOD</sub> would be underdetermined with respect to MUST and CAN, which would violate FI. Ultimately then, we can provide a principled reason why *imperative* readings show up in elliptic structures, no *possibility* readings.

Similarly, passive formation is an appropriate way to induce a unambiguous AUX<sub>MOD</sub> reading. Since passive is a clause internal, strictly local phenomenon, no modal AUX can intervene between BE, i.e. the lexicalization of I, and the verb.

- (36) a. you must [be kissed]      [AUX BE ptc]  
 b. je moet [gekust worden]  
 c. \*you be must kiss      \*[BE AUX ptc]  
 d. \*je wordt moeten gekust

Moreover, since negation is realized in the tensed (i.e. finite/nonfinite) IP domain (Pollock 1989), and BE lexicalizes I<sup>o</sup>, negation must have narrow scope with respect to AUX in these periphrastic passives, and hence AUX is fully determined: only an imperative reading emerges.

There are other ways to disambiguate abstract AUX structures, though. One way is adding dummy temporal adverbs, like Dutch *eventjes* ‘just now’. Whereas the participial imperative is not well-formed in (37) despite the presence of negation, the structure improves considerably in the presence of the dummy *eventjes* ‘just now’.

- (37) a. \*niet gedanst  
 b. eventjes niet gedanst nu

In section 3 we will see why only the enriched structure (37b) makes the sentence well-formed with respect to FI.

In section 5 we will apply this analysis to the core participial imperative structures, such as *opgesodemieterd* and *opgepast*, which do not have (overt) negation. Not only will the analysis shed light on why imperative readings emerge, it also shows why it is only possible with a very limited class of verbs.

#### 4. The syntactic configuration of participial imperatives

It is widely assumed that *bona fide* imperatives move to C via head movement (Rivero 1989, Beukema and Coopmans 1989, Rooryck 1992, Postma and van der Wurff, this volume). The question now arises whether participial imperatives are similarly licensed by an imperative feature in the C° domain. We would like to suggest that this is indeed the case although in a slightly modified way: we suggest that participial imperatives involve movement of some participial projection to a *specifier* position in the C-domain rather than to a head in the C-domain. This yields an analysis of (5)-(6) along the lines of (38).

$$(38) \quad [_{CP} [_{PartP} \textit{opgepast/opgerot}]_i C^\circ [_{IP} t_i ]]]$$

The main reason to assume that XP-movement rather than head movement is involved comes from word order facts in participial imperatives. It appears that participial imperatives can be modified by adverbs which also occur in non-imperative (exhortative) impersonal constructions, such as *nu* ‘now’ and *even* ‘for a moment’. Interestingly, the order of these adverbs changes dramatically between the longer forms of (17), repeated here, and the participial imperative forms in (39).

(17) Nu moet er even opgelet/opgepast worden!  
 now must there for.a.while taken.care be  
 ‘Now attention should be paid!’

(39) a. Even opgepast/opgelet nu!  
 for.a.while taken.care now  
 ‘Now pay attention for a second.’  
 b. Nu \*(even) opgepast/opgelet!  
 now for.a.while taken.care

Importantly, the adverb *even* ‘for a while’ modifying the participle in (17) remains in front of the participle in (39), while the sentence initial adverb *nu* ‘now’ in (17) becomes sentence final in (39). In configurational terms, the cluster adverb + participle, which we will refer to as PartP, appears to move to a syntactic position beyond the position of *nu* ‘now’ in (39). In addition, PP complements to verbs such as *oppassen* ‘beware’ and *opletten* ‘take care’ obligatorily appear after the participle and cannot appear in front of it (*opgepast voor de hond*/\**voor de hond opgepast* ‘beware of the dog’). This suggests that the PP has scrambled out of PartP before movement of PartP to SpecCP. The basic pattern in (38) can therefore be elaborated further as in (40).

$$(40) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{a. } [_{CP} [_{PartP} \textit{even opgepast/opgelet}]_i C^\circ [_{IP} [\textit{voor de hond}] \textit{nu} [ t_i ]]] \\ \text{b. } [_{CP} [_{PartP} \textit{even opgepast/opgelet}]_i C^\circ [_{IP} \textit{nu} [\textit{voor de hond}] [ t_i ]]] \end{array}$$

The case in (39) is interesting, as *even* ‘for a while’ seems to be required to make the sentence grammatical. There is an interpretative difference between (39a) and (39b) which

can explain this: (39b) can only be interpreted as a polite imperative while (40a) is more direct. It seems that the adverb *even* ‘for a while’ licenses this ‘polite imperative’ reading, and is therefore required. Syntactically, we suggest that the imperative force of (39) is achieved by moving PartP to SpecCP at LF.

Note that non-participial imperatives cannot similarly take the adverb with them to the C-domain, as the following sentences show:<sup>5</sup>

- (41) a. Let nu even op!/Let even op nu!  
 pay.attention now for.a.while PRT/pay.attention for.a.while PRT now  
 ‘Pay attention now’  
 b. \* Even let nu op!/\*Even let op nu!  
 for.a.while pay attention now PRT/for.a.while pay.attention PRT now  
 ‘Pay attention now’

This impossibility is of course compatible with a classical analysis of imperatives in which the verb head-moves to C°, leaving behind all adverbial material on its way up.

The analysis in (38) can now be extended to (6), the *opgesodemieterd* class. These verbs can be modified by the same adverbs as the other participial imperatives, with the same word order restrictions:

- (42) a. Eventjes opgedonderd/opgekrast nu!  
 for a while up.thundered/up.scratched now  
 ‘Now buzz off for a while.’  
 b. Nu \*(eventjes) opgedonderd/opgekrast!  
 now for.a.while up.thundered/up.scratched now

In other words, the basic syntactic structure of the *opgesodemieterd* class in (6) is identical to that of the other participial imperatives. In all cases, a PartP moves to a Specifier position in the C-domain. We take the absence of a productive alternation of these constructions with an overt auxiliary, illustrated in (17)-(18), as an indication that the participial imperatives in (5)-(6) have no underlying auxiliary or deontic modal to begin with. This implies that the sentential structure between C° and Part° in (38) and (40) is truly empty.

We would like to assume that participial imperatives derive their imperative force from the C° head whose specifier PartP moves into. In this way, we can not only account for the word order of adverbs in participial imperatives, but also relate their imperative force to the imperative force of non-participial imperatives which involve head movement to C°. In other words, we claim that the imperative force of C° can be licensed in two ways: either by head movement of the verb to C° or by movement of PartP to SpecCP, as shown in (43a,b).

- (43) a. [CP \_\_\_\_\_ [C pas/rot]<sub>i</sub> [IP t<sub>i</sub> op ]]]  
 b. [CP [PartP opgepast/opgerot]<sub>i</sub> C° [IP t<sub>i</sub> ]]]

<sup>5</sup> Note that these constructions are quite different from the Dutch construction exemplified in (i) which was described by Den Dikken (1992, 1999):

- (i) Leg (niet) neer die/\*een/\*de bal!  
 put not down that/a/the ball  
 ‘(do not) put that ball down!’

These constructions are compatible with negation, and require a distal determiner on their object. See Den Dikken (1992, 1999) for analysis.

This analysis is corroborated by the syntax of infinitival imperatives. The position of adverbs in infinitival imperatives patterns with that in participial imperatives as in (40), (43b), and not with that of standard imperatives subject to head movement as in (43a):

- (44) a. Even oppassen nu!  
           for.a.while pay.attention now  
       b. Nu even oppassen!  
           now for.a.while pay.attention

This means that infinitival imperatives share the syntactic configuration of participial imperatives: in both cases, an extended projection of VP is moved to the Specifier of a C° with imperative force. This should not come as a surprise: participial and infinitival infinitives are both untensed verb forms which are compatible with imperative interpretations without being inherently imperative themselves.

The syntactic structure of participial imperatives does not give us any explanation for the strict lexical restrictions observed: only verbs of change of location and verbs of warning can function as non-negative participial imperatives. In terms of the analysis advocated here, we observe that imperative formation via head movement to C° is much more productive than via PartP movement to SpecCP. In and of themselves, the syntactic mechanisms described here do not account for the lexical limitations on the participial imperatives of (5)-(6).

Let us now return to the question why adverbs such as *eventjes* ‘just now’ and *nu* ‘now’ improve the ill-formed structure. Addition of these adverbs is necessary, despite the fact that negation is present.

- (37) a. \*niet gedanst  
       b. eventjes niet gedanst nu

As we have seen, negation may induce a modal reading, but only if a high scope position of modal AUX is guaranteed. Apparently the presence of the adverb(s) determines the high scope nature of the abstract modal AUX. How does this come about? The presence of the adverb ensures that negation is lower than the adverb, and the abstract modal AUX higher than the adverb. This order thus fixes the scope relations between negation and abstract AUX. Absent the adverb, the scope relations between negation and the modal AUX are left undetermined, and the No-Ambiguity Principle in (30) is violated.

In the presence of the adverb, then, the constituent [eventjes niet gedanst] forms a maximal projection which has undergone XP movement to specCP, but is reconstructed in situ to establish the scope relations. As C must be licensed under (abstract) V2 (which is obligatory in all sentences, questions and imperatives included), we must assume that abstract modal AUX has carried out the relevant head movement to C, i.e. AUX<sub>MOD</sub> may not have been part of the moved constituent. Since negation did move, [even niet gedanst] resides under the scope of negation.<sup>6</sup>

#### 4. Interpretive restrictions on participial imperatives

Let us now take a look at the interpretive restrictions holding of the participial imperatives in (5)-(6), as compared to their non-participial counterparts. Both *oppassen* ‘pay attention’ and

<sup>6</sup> To the extent that [even niet gedanst] moves to a lower spec position, AUX will have to move to C and the scope relations are established without reconstruction.

*opletten* ‘pay attention’ take internal arguments introduced by the prepositions *voor* ‘for’ or *met* ‘with’. Interestingly, while both participial and non-participial imperatives take definite complements, participial imperatives strongly resist indefinite DPs in their complement.<sup>7</sup>

- (45) a. Pas/let.op voor die overstekende eland!  
take.care of that crossing moose  
‘Watch out for that moose crossing the road!’  
b. Pas/let.op voor overstekende elanden!  
take.care of crossing moose  
‘Watch out for moose crossing the road!’  
c. Let.op met dat mes/messen, jongens!  
take.car with that knife/knives boys  
‘Be careful with that knife/knives, guys!’
- (46) a. Opgepast voor die overstekende eland!  
taken.care of that moose crossing the road  
b. \*Opgepast voor overstekende elanden!  
taken.care of moose crossing the road!’  
c. Opgelet met dat mes/\*met messen, jongens!  
taken.care with that knife/with knives boys  
‘Be careful with that knife/with knives, guys!’

This impossibility of using true indefinites correlates with the selection of temporal adverbs. Participial imperatives resist quantificational adverbs such as *altijd* ‘always’ or distal temporal adverbs such as *op dat moment* ‘at that time’. Unlike true imperatives, they only allow temporal adverbs such as *nu* ‘now’, as shown in (47).

- (47) a. Pas/let (nu even /altijd/op dat moment) op voor die overstekende eland!  
take.care now for.a.moment/always/at that moment PRT for that crossing moose  
‘(Now/always/then) watch out for that moose crossing the road.’  
b. Opgepast (nu/\*altijd/\*op dat moment) voor die overstekende eland!  
taken.care now/always/at that moment for that crossing moose  
‘(Now/always/then) watch out for that moose crossing the road!’  
c. Rot in zo’n geval altijd op! /Rot (nu/op dat moment) maar op!  
rot in such.a case always up/rot (now/at.that.moment) PRT up  
‘Always sod off in such a case! /Just sod off (now/then)!’  
d. Opgesodemieterd (nu/\*in zo’n geval altijd/\*op dat moment) maar!  
sodden.up (now/in such.a case always /then) just  
‘Always sod off in such a case! /Just sod off (now/then)’

Furthermore these participial imperatives are incompatible with negation:

- (48) a. (\*Niet) opgepast!      b. (\*Niet) opgesodemieterd!  
(Not) taken care              (not) sodden up  
‘Do not be careful!’          ‘Do not sodd off!’

<sup>7</sup> In those dialects that allow for participial imperatives with prepositional complements. Some speakers of the Northern standard dialect of Dutch do not accept prepositional complements with participial imperatives, while admitting them freely with non-participial imperatives.

Both the resistance to indefinite DP complements and to non-proximate temporal adverbs suggest that the participial imperative is incompatible with generic tense, or with a ‘future’ interpretation of the imperative which is invited by distal temporal adverbs such as *op dat moment* ‘at that time’. In other words, the time reference of participial imperatives is restricted to the immediate ‘here and now’. This means that the tense of participial imperatives obeys a very strict ‘present tense’ requirement. Non-participial imperatives do not exhibit this restriction and have a present tense that is compatible with generic and ‘future’ interpretations.

So far then, we have observed a number of restrictions on participial imperatives, which are lexical, morphological, and semantic in nature. Lexically, participial imperatives that alternate with other imperatives are restricted to a small set of verbs, essentially those mentioned in (5)-(6). Morphologically, they are systematically formed with particle verbs, in most if not all cases containing the particle *op*. Semantically, they are not combinable with negation. Finally, participial imperatives display a curious restriction to the immediate ‘here and now’, and they display a definiteness restriction on their complements. These restrictions need to be explained further.

## 5. The lexical decomposition of participial imperatives

### 5.1 *The functional elements inside participial imperatives*

The limited productivity of participial imperatives suggests that they might be very close to functional elements. In other words, participial imperatives could be viewed as grammaticalised items, portmanteau morphemes which spell out (a combination of) functional elements. Let us therefore explore what the basic atoms composing these participial imperatives could be.

One striking semantic property of participial imperatives is their relation with negation, as we have already observed. The participial imperatives with verbs of movement involve the wish that the addressee should leave, i.e. the wish for a situation in which the addressee is not near the speaker any more. The participial imperatives with verbs expressing a call for attention express a wish that the addressee should not involve herself in an imminent situation. It is significant that these paraphrases of the participial imperatives all involve no more than three elements (apart from the imperative force): negation, an aspectual predicate (*remain/continue*), and a proximate deictic element. We can represent these as in (49).

- (49) a. DON'T REMAIN HERE (cf. (6), the *opgesodemieterd* ‘sod off’ class)  
 b. DON'T CONTINUE THIS WAY (cf. (5), the *opgepast* ‘pay attention’ class)

Note that *remain* and *continue* are essentially equivalent, as *remain* equals *continue to be*.<sup>8</sup> The choice between *remain* and *continue* seems to be a function of the deictic element in their complement.

Let us now examine whether the semantic composition of these atoms takes place at a lexical level or at the syntactic level. If the semantic composition is lexical, we expect participial imperatives to be relatively insensitive to syntactic operations. If the semantic

<sup>8</sup> In many languages, continuative aspectual verbs are ambiguous between a stative and a dynamic reading. An example is Dutch *blijven* ‘stay’:

- (i) Jan bleef in de kamer                      (ii) Jan bleef praten  
 ‘Jan stayed in the room                      ‘Jan continued to talk’

composition is syntactic, syntactic operations will interact with the functional components of participial imperatives.

Above, we noted the curious restriction on temporal reference in participial imperatives to the immediate ‘here and now’, and also the definiteness restriction of DPs in their complement. We would like to attribute these restrictions to the proximate deictic component inside the semantic structure of participial imperatives. Proximate and distal deictic elements are inherently definite. We claim that the proximate deictic element inside the participial imperative is syntactically active, and therefore restricts temporal and deictic reference in the entire syntactic domain of participial imperatives.

Another indication of the syntactic transparency of participial imperatives comes from negation. The contrasts in (50)-(51) show that participial imperatives strongly resist syntactic negation, while non-participial imperatives do not display this restriction to the same extent.<sup>9</sup>

- (50) a. ? Pas/let nu liever even NIET op!  
pay.attention.IMP now rather one.moment not up  
‘(I’d rather you) did’t pay attention now’  
b. ? Liever even NIET/niet opletten/passen nu!  
rather one.moment not up-pay.attention.INF now  
‘(I’d rather you) did’t pay attention now’  
c. \*Liever even niet/NIET opgelet/opgepast nu!  
rather one.moment not up-paid.attention now  
‘(I’d rather you) didn’t pay attention now’
- (51) a. ? Rot nou niet meteen op, joh, doe niet zo flauw!  
rot.IMP now not immediately up man act not so lame  
‘Don’t sod off right away now, man, don’t spoil it!’  
b. ? Nou niet meteen oprotten, joh, doe niet zo flauw!  
now not immediately up-rot.INF man, act not so lame  
‘Don’t sod off right away now, man, don’t spoil it!’  
c. \*Niet meteen operot nu, joh, doe niet zo flauw!!  
not immediately up.rotted now, man, act not so lame  
‘Don’t sod off right away now, man, don’t spoil it!’

These facts lead us to conclude that the combination with negation of non-participial imperatives seems to be pragmatically unfelicitous, while the ungrammaticality of negated participial imperatives appears to be more syntactic in nature. So we are left with two interactions between negation and imperatives. In deverbal *ge*-nouns of the type in (21), negation is required. In participial imperatives, negation is excluded. We would like tie these effects to a single phenomenon.

---

<sup>9</sup> In this respect, non-participial imperatives resemble certain adjectival admonitions, as in (i).

- (i) a. Voorzichtig! \*Niet voorzichtig (Hoeksema 1992:129(18))  
‘Careful!’ ‘Not careful!’  
b. Vlug! \*Niet vlug  
‘Quick!’ ‘Not quick!’

Hoeksema (1992:129) marks the negative counterpart of (i) as ungrammatical, but observes that the examples in (ii) are fine:

- (ii) Niet al te voorzichtig nu, jongens! Niet te vlug!  
‘Not too careful now, boys!’ ‘Not too fast!’

The resistance to overt syntactic negation can be related to the presence of negation inside the semantic structure of participial imperatives. It is well known that monoclausal double negations are ungrammatical in the absence of strong contrastive stress:

- (52) a. Dat Jan niet (NIET/\*niet) leest  
 that Jan not (NOT/not) reads  
 ‘that Jan doesn’t NOT/\*not read’  
 b. Niet (NIET/\*niet) lezen nu!  
 Not (NOT/not) read now!  
 Don’t NOT/\*not read now

If we assume that the negation inside the semantic structure of participial imperatives is syntactically active, the ungrammaticality of negated participial imperatives can be attributed to the general ungrammaticality of syntactic double negations. Note that it is not uncommon for negation to be syntactically incorporated into functional elements: Latin *nolle* ‘not want’ and Old English *nabban* ‘not have’ are examples of this in the verbal domain, and in the nominal domain we can refer to Dutch *neg+ iemand* ‘someone’ -> *niemand* ‘nobody’. In the same way, negation inside participial imperatives should be viewed as syntactic negation incorporated inside a functional complex. Thus, overt syntactic negative incorporation, (or covert negative incorporation in the sense of Klima 1964) only occurs with functional elements. Importantly, it never occurs with lexical elements: alongside Dutch *niemand* ‘neg+ someone’ and Old English *nabban* ‘not have’, we don’t find Dutch *\*naap* ‘neg+ ape’, or Old English *\*neat* ‘neg + eat’.

So, we can even make this claim stronger: if a verb contains negation that is syntactically active, then this verb must be a functional element or a combination of functional elements. In other words, the syntactic transparency of the negation present in participial imperatives is an argument for their functional nature, which in turn explains their limited productivity.

Let us now turn to the question why negation and a deictic element should occur together in the syntactic decomposition of participial imperatives proposed in (49). In principle, there is no reason why participial imperatives should be restricted in this manner: why doesn’t the counterpart of (49) exist with distal deictic elements instead of proximate ones? The answer to this riddle lies in the nature of the negation ensconced in the syntactic decomposition of (49). We would like to propose that the type of negation involved is boulemaic negation, i.e. a modal type of negation meaning ‘I do not want’. Hoekstra & Jordens (1994) show that Dutch children’s grammar displays two types of negation. These include a nonmodal negation *niet* which negates a description, and a modal negation *nee* dominantly expressing boulemaic negation (cf also Postma & van der Wurff, this volume).

- (53) a. die niet goed (cf H&J 1994:130(14b))  
 that not good  
 b. nee poes hier zitten (cf H&J 1994:126)  
 No pussy here sit  
 ‘I don’t want the cat to sit here’

The meaning of this boulemaic negation of course comes very close to a negative imperative. Moreover, boulemaic negation is deictic in nature: the meaning ‘I don’t want’ is predicated of the here and now. We therefore would like to propose that the negation inside the syntactic decomposition of participial imperatives is boulemaic in nature. The boulemaic nature of negation in this context thus accounts for three properties of participial imperatives that in

principle have no intrinsic relation to each other: negation, imperative force, and the temporal restriction to the here and now. Syntactically, it could be proposed that this boulemaic negation is generated as an empty morpheme in  $C^\circ$ , and that movement of PartP to SpecCP occurs to satisfy the Neg criterion, i.e. the negation inside the participle must be checked off against the negative boulemaic feature in  $C^\circ$ .<sup>10</sup> There is a further point to make here. As H&J argue the epistemic negator *niet* is only used with verbal forms. The boulemaic negator, on the other hand, is never used with finite forms. It seems more nominal in nature. Only nominal sentences seem appropriate to carry the pure boulemaic negation. From this point of view it is not so strange that nominal constructions such as *dat gedoe* ‘that *ge*-do = that fuzz’ and the participial imperatives, which are traditionally considered nominal forms of the verb, are sensitive to boulemaic negation.

## 5.2. Participial imperatives and verb meaning

We have already observed above that there seem to be three semantic subsets of participial imperatives: the *opgesodemieterd!* ‘sod off’ class, cf. (6); the *opgepast* ‘beware’ class, cf. (5). The question arises why precisely these verbs can function as participial imperatives and not other, semantically quite close predicates. We would like to propose that a single factor underlies this restriction: the ability to lose the primary verb meaning.

For one set of participial imperatives, this property is quite obvious. The *opgesodemieterd!* ‘sod off’ class only consists of movement verbs containing an element that has lost its original lexical meaning. Following Postma (1995), we will say that these elements are in zero-semantics. A word in zero-semantics is not a word that does not mean anything. Rather, it involves a word that means something because of a specific configurational position and not because of its lexical specification.

Postma (1995) observes that (54a) involves the perception of an actual ball or dog, while (54b) has two interpretations. The first, and least interesting interpretation of (54b) is one in which the sentence simply refers to the fact that one doesn’t see an actual ball or dog (54b.i). In the second interpretation (54b.ii), the nouns *ball* and *dog* have lost their fully referential meaning to function as negative polarity items with universal meaning. In Postma’s (1995) terms, the nouns lapse into zero-semantics in the context of negation.

- (54) a. Ik zie een bal/hond      b. Niemand ziet een bal/hond  
       ‘I see a ball/a dog’        i. ‘Nobody sees a ball/dog’  
   ii. ‘Nobody sees anything/anyone’

It is important to note that lapsing into zero semantics does not mean that the lexeme has no meaning at all. Only the meaning that represents knowledge of the world disappears. formal features usually remain, e.g. the  $\pm$ animate feature of *bal/hond* is retained in its variable

<sup>10</sup> If negation inside participial imperatives is syntactically active, as is argued here, we expect it to license negative polarity items. This is not the case: compare participial imperatives (i) in this respect with overtly negative imperatives (ii):

- i. \*Ook maar voor even opgesodemieterd/afgelopen nu!  
     even for a while off-sodden/finished now  
 ii. Blijf daar niet voor ook maar een ogenblik!  
     stay there not for even only a moment  
     ‘Don’t stay there for even a single minute’

The question is why this should be so. It could be that boulemaic negation does not license negative polarity items. We will leave this point for further research.



as with *moeten* ‘must’+ infinitive in (58). Present tenses are very strange, if not ungrammatical, cf. (59).<sup>11</sup> Not surprisingly, true imperatives are well-formed, cf (60).

- (59) a. \*Jan past op voor de hond  
 Jan takes-care of for the dog  
 ‘Jan watches out for/is careful with the dog’  
 b. \*Jan let op voor de hond  
 Jan watches on for the dog  
 ‘Jan watches out for the dog’
- (60) a. Pas op voor die man  
 Beware for that man!  
 b. let op voor overstekende elanden  
 look PRT for crossing mooses  
 ‘Beware for crossing mooses’

An interesting case is (5c), repeated here:

- (5)c. ? Eventjes uitgekeken nu!  
 for a moment looked out now  
 ‘Let’s just pay attention now!’

The verb *uitkijken* ‘look out’ as well has a number of meanings, with different subcategorization structures:

- (61) a. Jan kijkt uit het raam  
 Jan looks out the window  
 ‘Jan looks out of the window’  
 b. Jan kijkt uit naar de feestdagen  
 Jan looks out to the holidays  
 ‘Jan looks forward to the holidays’  
 c. Jan kijkt uit voor subsidiegelden/\*voor honden  
 Jan looks out for the grants  
 ‘Jan is in search for grants’  
 d. Je moet uitkijken voor honden!  
 You must be aware for dogs  
 e. Kijk uit voor honden!  
 Look out for dogs

While the meanings in (61a) and to a lesser extent in (61b) are related to visual perception, the meaning of *uitkijken* in (61c) has lost its link with visual perception and only retains the psychological meaning of ‘search’. The final step is the one in (61d). It is only used in auxiliary construction with *moeten* ‘must’ and in true imperatives (61e). The complement is an undesirable object. Not accidentally, it narrows down to one of the meaning classes of the participial imperative.

Once again, then, only verbs which can lose (a part of) their original meaning can function as participial imperatives. We can safely conclude that only verbs which have

---

<sup>11</sup>The judgements are not extremely strong. Perhaps the sentences are grammatical, but cannot be felicitously used. I did not find any instance on the internet.

already lost (part of) their original meaning, and therefore have little meaning of their own, can become portmanteau morphemes for the combination of functional elements presented in (49). As in other cases of zero semantics, a formal meaning arises. To make the theory consistent, the loss of meaning must be tied to the rise of bouletic negation, DON'T as represented in (49). We can partly trace this step in the last example. The verb *uitkijken* which ranges from true 'look out' to the form that can only be used in imperatives 'beware'. The crucial transition occurs between (61c) which can be used in a completely productive way, and (61de), which do not only display a distinct meaning, but are also semantically limited to imperative contexts.

### 5.3. *The scope of negation and AUX revisited*

Let us finally turn to the question of the imperative readings of participles like *opgepast* and *opgesodemieterd*. These forms are remarkable since they are well-formed utterances by themselves without need of any additional lexical material, neither negation nor temporal adverbs, as opposed to the negative participial imperative which were argued to need an adverb in order to allow for disambiguation of the scope of AUX and negation (cf. supra section 3 *in fine*).

(62) AUX opgesodemieterd  
AUX opgelet

(37) a. \*niet gedanst  
b. eventjes niet gedanst nu

In other words, we still have to address the question why there is a contrast between (37) and (62).

Now, as we have seen, the semantics of these two forms is unusual: they both include negation in their semantic decomposition.

(63) AUX [NOT STAY deictic]

The bracketed part is spelled out by the lexeme *opgesodemieterd* or *opgepast*. In order not to lose the generalization we formulated over the imperative forms discussed in section 3, we must assume that the modal AUX is not included in this portmanteau spell-out. The fact that modal AUX is not included in the participle is also in line with the analysis of (63) as a syntactic imperative, i.e. some head must move to C to fulfil V2. As we have seen, the structure [opgesodemieterd] does not itself move to C but undergoes XP movement. Hence AUX must be able to move independently, i.e. AUX has scope over NOT. This determines a MUST reading of the abstract AUX and the structure is well-formed with respect to the No-Ambiguity Principle in (30). In section 3 above, we have explained why negation is a precondition for licensing the imperative. We now also have a clue why the structure (63) is only available to a limited class of verbs: to guarantee narrow scope negation, NOT must be incorporated in the lexeme. Since negation can only incorporate in functional heads, not in lexical heads, we have a fundamental explanation of the restriction to specific verbal classes: only verbs whose semantics can be brought in line with purely functional features via zero-semantics, allow the participial imperative.

A final word is necessary here. It is not without consequence that in these cases full V2 is the syntactic trigger that disambiguates the wide scope of AUX and, hence, the MUST reading of AUX. In a non V2 language, no high scope of AUX is guaranteed. This makes the

intriguing prediction that productive participial imperative formation is only present in full V2-languages. We will not go into the diachronic consequences for frozen forms such as *cuidado* in Spanish.

## 6. Conclusion

In this article, we have argued that Dutch has a restricted set of participial imperatives which involve a syntactic configuration of PartP to SpecCP movement. The syntactic and semantic restrictions on these participial imperatives can be related to a number of independent factors. First of all, the semantic composition of these imperatives appears to consist of a combination of functional elements: negation, an aspectual predicate (CONTINUE) and a deictic element (HERE, THIS WAY). The differences in the syntactic nature of the deictic element yield two distinct semantic classes of participial imperatives. We have argued that the semantic composition of participial imperatives is syntactically active. This suggests that the combination of functional elements that is argued for takes place in the syntactic component of the grammar. The unproductive nature of participial imperatives can be related to the fact that only verbs which have already lost part of their original meaning qualify for construal as participial imperatives. Finally, we have argued for an abstract modal AUX whose imperative MUST interpretation is solely derived through scope interaction with overtly syntactic or covertly lexical negation. It should be clear that we have only been able to descriptively scratch the surface of these intriguing constructions, and that more work is needed, especially with respect to the pervasive presence of particles, most notably *op*. These particles could be related to what Den Dikken (1999) calls ‘speaker oriented particles’. We hope to come back to these properties and correlations in later work.

## References

- Beukema, Frits & Peter Coopmans, (1989) ‘A government-binding perspective on the imperative in English’, *Journal of Linguistics* 25: 417--436.
- Den Dikken, Marcel. 1992. empty operator movement in Dutch imperatives. D. Gilbers & S. Looyenga (eds) *Language and Cognition* 2, 51-64.
- Den Dikken, Marcel. 1999. Speaker-oriented particles in Dutch imperatives. *Glott International* 4, 2, 23-24.
- Hoekstra, Teun (1992) *Aspect and Theta Theory*. In *Thematic Structure : its role in grammar*, I.M. Roca (ed.). - Berlin, Mouton.
- Hoekstra, Teun (1993) *Small Clause Theory* - *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, Special Issue on Predication ed. by De Caluwe et.al.
- Hoekstra, Teun & Peter Jordens. 1994. From adjunct to head. *Language acquisition studies in generative grammar*. ed. by Teun Hoekstra & Bonnie Schwartz, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 119-149.
- Hoeksema, Jack. 1992. Bevelende zinnen zonder polaire tegenhanger. Hans Bennis & Jan De Vries (eds.) *De binnenbouw van het Nederlands*. Dordrecht: ICG publications, 125-132.
- Postma, Gertjan (1995) *Zero-semantics. A study of the syntactic construction of quantificational meaning*. doctoral dissertation. Leiden University/HIL.
- Postma, Gertjan & Wim van der Wurff. 2000. XXX
- Rivero, Maria-Luisa. (1994) ‘The structure of IP and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans’, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.
- Rooryck, Johan (1992b) ‘Romance enclitic ordering and Universal Grammar’, *The Linguistic Review* 9: 219--250.
- Sybesma, Rint (1992) *Causatives and Accomplishments - The case of Chinese ba*. PhD Dissertation, HIL.