

## **A Minimalist Approach to the Syntactic Clause-Typing of the Imperatives in Persian**

Abbas Ali Ahangar<sup>1\*</sup>  
Hossein Moghani<sup>2</sup>

**Received: 2016/11/10**

**Accepted: 2017/10/18**

### **Extended abstract**

#### **1- Introduction**

Structures such as interrogatives, declaratives and imperatives are employed in all languages (Sadock & Zwicky, 1985). These sentences belong to a closed and restricted set, and most importantly, each of these structures is associated with its own specific force in the syntactic construction of the sentence (*ibid.*). The question that arises in this regard is how the force of each of these sentences is activated in the sentence? Along the same lines, it has been suggested that these sentences should be formally typed in different languages, that is, there needs to be a syntactic mechanism thorough which one can determine the specific type of each of these sentences or illustrate the way they are licensed. In this approach, each of the sentences has a specific element that encodes or types its special force, and this element is placed at the top of the hierarchical structure of the sentence and in particular in the Complementizer Phrase (CP) (e.g., Cheng, 1991; Rizzi, 1990, 1996; Rivero & Terzi, 1995, Han, 1998).

Accordingly, it has been assumed that the imperative constructs lack a syntactic subject, and the verb is placed in the head of ForceP in order to satisfy the clause typing or licensing requirement (Han, 1998, 1999a-b, 2000, 2001). More precisely, it has been proposed that either the verb is overtly placed in the head of ForceP, or it must move at the stage during the derivation of the sentence to the head of ForceP in order to provide the imperative reading (*ibid.*). In this approach, the head of ForceP has features that provide the required interpretation for the sentence, and this requirement implies that the verb overtly moves to this position. But in some languages, such relocation is not plausible. In the latter case, it is

---

1. Associate Professor of Linguistics, University of Sistan and Baluchestan

\*Email: [ahangar@english.usb.ac.ir](mailto:ahangar@english.usb.ac.ir)

2. Ph.D. Graduate in Linguistics from Razi University of Kermanshah

necessary that the verb is linked to this position in some other way (ibid.). Given this, this paper attempts to shed some light on how the clause typing mechanism is realized in the imperative sentences in Persian.

## **2- Theoretical framework**

The theoretical framework of this paper is the theory of feature checking within the Minimalist Program (e.g. Chomsky, 1995; 2001a-b) as well as the Split-CP Hypothesis (Rizzi, 1997). “Feature checking is actually triggered by the need to eliminate [-Interpretable] formal features from the computation” (Hornstein et al, 2005: 286), which can be accomplished either through Move-F or Agree. In Rizzi’s (1997) analysis, the CP-phase which expresses Force (declarative, interrogative, etc.) and Finiteness are divided into ForceP, Topic Phrase, Focus Phrase, and Finite Phrase (IP).

## **3- Methodology**

This research is descriptive-analytical in nature. The data were randomly collected from different contexts of the spoken form of the Standard Persian before they were scrutinized and formulated by the researchers.

## **4- Results & Discussion**

In this paper, it is first argued that of the presence of an imperative verb in the head of the ForceP or the movement of this element to such a position is impossible in imperative structures in Persian. Hence, the hypothesis that in imperative sentences in all languages the verb should be moved in the head of ForceP falls short of efficiency for Persian data, and thus it is necessary to introduce another mechanism for the syntactic typing of imperatives in Persian.

Therefore, it is suggested that since the verb in the unmarked positive and negative constructs remains in its secondary position in the head of vP and its displacement into the core of the ForceP with the aim of clause typing is impossible, an Agree mechanism can make it possible for this requirement to be satisfied from distance through checking and valuing the features.

On the other hand, in the marked positive imperative structures, the verb raises to Top<sup>o</sup> and Foc<sup>o</sup> as the final landing sites to check and value the [-Top] and [-Foc] features on the corresponding heads and provide the topic and focus interpretations, respectively. After that, due to the fact that further raising of the verb in overt syntax is blocked, it was suggested that

in the affirmative imperatives the [-IMP] feature on the Force<sup>o</sup> should be matched with the [+IMP] feature on the verb via Agree, by means of which the [-IMP] feature on the Force<sup>o</sup> is checked and valued.

In the negative imperatives, however, it was proposed that the [+IMP] feature on the verb must undergo Move-F to Force<sup>o</sup>, leaving behind the [+Neg] feature on the verb in Top<sup>o</sup> or Foc<sup>o</sup> heads. Being stranded on the verb in Top<sup>o</sup> and Foc<sup>o</sup>, the [+Neg] feature does not out-scope the [-IMP] feature on Force<sup>o</sup>, and consequently, a contradictory interpretation would not be yielded.

### 5- Conclusions & Suggestions

In this article, it was argued that in the positive unmarked imperatives, clause-typing is satisfied through establishing an Agree relation between [+IMP] on the verb and [-IMP] on Force<sup>o</sup>, and in the negative unmarked imperatives, the clause-typing requirement is accomplished via the Move-F of [+IMP] on the verb to Force<sup>o</sup>, stranding [+Neg] on the verb. In the marked imperative structures, however, first the verb is preposed, landing in the head of either TopP or FocP. Then, in the positive marked structures, [+IMP] on the verb is matched with [-IMP] on Force<sup>o</sup> through Agree, whereas in the negative marked constructions, [+IMP] on the preposed verb undergoes Move-F to Force<sup>o</sup>, stranding [+Neg] on the verb.

**Key Words:** Minimalist Program, Clause-Typing, Feature-Checking, Imperatives, Preposing.

### References

1. Ahmadi Givi, H. & Anvari, H. (1995). *Persian grammar* 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Tehran: Fatemi Publishing. [In Persian].
2. Afrashi, A. (2009). *Persian structure*, 2nd ed. Tehran: SAMT. [In Persian].
3. Arzhang, G. (1999). *A grammar of contemporary Persian*, 2nd ed. Tehran: Ghatreh Publishing. [In Persian].
4. Cheng, L. (1991). *On the typology of wh-questions*, Ph.D. Thesis. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
5. Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*, Cambridge: The MIT Press.
6. ————. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In: R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (Eds.), *Step by step: Essays on*

*Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, Cambridge/London: MIT Press. 89-155.

7. ———. (2001a). Beyond explanatory adequacy. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, 20.
8. ———. (2001b). Derivation by phase. In: M. Kenstowicz (Ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, Cambridge: MIT Press. 1-52.
9. Cinque, G. (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Darzi, A., and Anousheh, M. (2010). The movement of the main verb in Persian: A minimalist approach. *Language Research*, 2 (3): 21-55. [In Persian].
11. Farshidvard, K. (2003). *Detailed grammar of today*. Tehran: Sokhan Publications. [In Persian].
12. Frege, G. (1960). *The foundations of arithmetic: A logico-mathematical enquiry into the concept of number*, Harper/New York. Translated by Austin, J., Originally published in 1884.
13. Gholamalizadeh, K. (1995). The structure of Persian language. Tehran: Ehya-ye Ketab Publication. [In Persian].
14. Haegeman, L. (1995). *The syntax of negation*, Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
15. Hale, K., and Keyser, S. J. (1991). *On the syntax of argument structure*, Cambridge/Massachusetts: Center for Cognitive Science, MIT.
16. ———. (1993). On argument structure and the lexical expression of semantic relations. In: Hale, K. and S. J. Keyser, S. J. (Eds.), *The View from Building*, (20), Cambridge/ Massachusetts: MIT. 53–109.
17. ———. (1994). Constraints on argument structure. In: B. Lust, M. Suñer and J. Whitman (Eds.), *Heads, Projections and Learnability* vol. 1, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. 53–71.
18. Han, C.H. (1998). *The structure and interpretation of imperatives: Mood and force in universal grammar*, Ph.D. Thesis. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
19. ———. (1999a). Cross-linguistic variation in the compatibility of negation and imperatives. In: K. Shahin, S. Blake, and E.W. Kim (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 17th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Stanford: CSLI Publications. 265-279.

20. \_\_\_\_\_. (1999b). Deontic modality, lexical aspect and the semantics of imperatives. In: *Linguistics in Morning Calm 4*, Seoul: Hanshin Publications.
21. \_\_\_\_\_. (2000). *The structure and interpretation of imperatives: Mood and Force in Universal Grammar*, New York: Garland.
22. \_\_\_\_\_. (2001). Force, negation and imperatives. *The Linguistic Review*, (18): 289-325.
23. Han, C.H., and Lee, C. (2007). On negative imperatives in Korean. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 38(2): 373-95.
24. Hornstein, N., Nunes, J., and Grohmann, K.K. (2005). *Understanding minimalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
25. Iatridou, S. (2008). De modo imperative. *Lecture notes for a course on the syntax and semantics of imperatives at Ealing6, ENS, Paris*. September 16-19, 2008. Retrieved: November 10, 2016. URL: [http://lingphil.mit.edu/papers/iatridou/de\\_modulo\\_imperativo.pdf](http://lingphil.mit.edu/papers/iatridou/de_modulo_imperativo.pdf)
26. Kamp, H. (1978). Semantics versus pragmatics. In: F. Guenther and S. J. Schmidt (Eds.), *Formal Semantics and Pragmatics for Natural Languages*, Dordrecht: Reidel. 255–287.
27. Karimi, S. (2005). *A minimalist approach to scrambling: Evidence from Persian*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
28. Larson, R. (1988). On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry*, (19): 335 – 391.
29. \_\_\_\_\_. (1990). Double objects revisited: Reply to Jackendoff. *Linguistic Inquiry*, (21): 589 – 632.
30. Lasnik, H. (2002). The minimalist program in syntax. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, (6): 432-437.
31. Lazard, G. (2014). *A grammar of contemporary Persian*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Translated by: Bahreini, M. Tehran: Hermes Publishing Co. [In Persian].
32. Mahootian, S. (1997). *Persian descriptive grammars*, London/New York: Routledge.
33. Platzack, C., and Rosengren, I. (1998). On the subject of imperatives: A minimalist account of the imperative clause. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, (1): 177-224.
34. Meshkatodini, M. (2007). *Persian language syntax based on generative theory*. Mashhad: Ferdowsi University of Mashhad Publications. [In Persian].

35. Pollock, J.Y. (1989). Verb movement, universal grammar and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20(3): 365-424.
36. Radford, A. (2004). *Minimalist syntax: Exploring the structure of English*, Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
37. ———. (2009). *Analysing English sentences: A minimalist approach*, Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
38. Rivero, M.L., and Terzi, A. (1995). Imperatives, v-movement and logical mood. *Journal of Linguistics*, 31: 301-322.
39. Rizzi, L. (1990). Speculations on verb-second. In: J. Mascaró and M. Nespó (Eds.), *Grammar in Progress: GLOW Essays for Henk van Riemsdijk*, Dordrecht: Foris. 137-152.
40. ———. (1996). Residual verb second and the wh-criterion. In: A. Belletti and L. Rizzi (Eds.), *Parameters and Functional Heads: Essays in Comparative Syntax*, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
41. ———. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In: L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, Kluwer: Dordrecht. 281-337.
42. ———. (2006). On the form of chains: criterial positions and ECP effects. In: L. Cheng and N. Corver (Eds.), *Onwh-movement: Moving on*, Cambridge: MIT Press. 97-133.
43. ———. (2007). On some properties of Criterial Freezing. *CISCL Working Papers on Language and Cognition*, (1): 145-158.
44. Sadock, J.M., and Zwicky, A. M. (1985). Speech act distinctions in syntax. In: T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. I, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 155–196.
45. Schulz, K. (2003). *You may read it now or later: A case study on the paradox of free choice permission*, M.A. Thesis. Netherlands: University of Amsterdam.
46. Schwager, J.M. (2005). *Interpreting imperatives*, Ph.D. Thesis. Frankfurt: Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe Universität.
47. Schwager, J.M. (2006). Conditionalized imperatives. In: M. Gibson and J. Howell (Eds), *SALT XVI*, Ithaca/NY: Cornell University. 241-258.
48. Seuren, P.A.M. (2004). *Chomsky's minimalism*, New York: Oxford University Press.
49. Shariah, M. J. (1990). *Persian grammar*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Tehran: Asatir Publications. [In Persian].

50. Taleghani, A. (2008). *The interaction of modality, aspect and negation in Persian*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
51. Windfuhr, G., and Perry, J.R. (2009). Persian and Tajik. In: G. Windfuhr (Ed.), *The Iranian Languages*, London/New York: Routledge. 416-454.
52. Zanuttini, R. (1997). *Negation and clausal structure: A comparative study of Romance languages*, New York: Oxford University Press.