

This paper discusses why verbs with a distinctive imperative morphology can be negated in Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian, but not in Spanish. The proposal is that the contrast is due to the different function the C(omplementizer)-position of root clauses plays in these languages. In languages like Spanish, C is an indicator of Illocutionary force, and holds the Imperative feature that the verb with imperative morphology must reach. That is, the Spanish imperative verb must necessarily head-move to C. The negation prevents V from reaching this position, so imperative sentences cannot be negated. In languages like Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian, a root C performs a different function. It is a formal licenser of clitics and does not hold the Imperative feature, which is in I(inflection). Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian Imperatives are licensed in I like other verbs, enjoy the same flexible syntax as those verbs, and are not affected by the presence of negation. Thus, imperative sentences can be negated.

As to clitic pronoun position, Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian contrast with each other. Serbo-Croatian is a Wackernagel language, and Bulgarian is a Tobler-Mussafia language. It is proposed that this difference derives from parametric variation in the function of C as a formal licenser of clitics in these two languages.*

1. Introduction.

In some languages, verbs with a distinctive or 'true' Imperative morphology cannot be negated, as illustrated by the Castilian Spanish (Sp) contrast in (1a) vs (1b):

- | | | |
|--------|------------------|----|
| (1) a. | lee! | Sp |
| | read+IMP+2Sg | |
| | 'you (Sg) read!' | |
| b. | *no lee! | |

* Research for this paper was supported by SSHRCC Grant 410-91-0178 and the Eurotyp Project of the ESF. This version has benefited from discussion with R. Zanuttini and A. Terzi and her work on Albanian Imperatives (1993), and from written comments by L. Haegeman and an anonymous reviewer. Usual disclaimers apply. Unless indicated, B examples are from E. Savov, and SC examples are from D. Kudra, and I thank them.

In these languages, negative commands are expressed with non-Imperative or 'surrogate' morphology, as with the Subjunctive in (2a), or the Infinitive in (2b):

- (2) a. no leas!
 Neg read+PRES/SUBJ+2Sg
 'do not read!'
 b. no leer!
 Neg read+INF
 'do not read!'

In other languages, however, 'true' Imperatives appear in affirmative and negative clauses. For instance, Bulgarian (B) and Serbo-Croatian (SC) show distinctive Imperative forms for the second person, just like Sp, and these can be negated, as in (3b) and (4b):¹

- (3) a. četi!
 read+IMP+2Sg
 'you (Sg) read!'
 b. ne četi!
 Neg read+IMP+2Sg
 'do not read!'
- (4) a. čitaj!
 read+IMP+2Sg!
 'you (Sg) read!'
 b. ne čitaj!
 Neg read+IMP+2Sg!
 'do not read!'

B and SC resemble Sp in that they can express imperatives through non-specialized or 'surrogate' forms. Thus, 'true' negative Imperatives

¹ 2P forms for *read* in 'true' Imperatives vs. Presents are:

Language	Imperative				Present			
	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl
C. Sp.	lee	leed	lees	lees	leas	leas	leas	leas
B.	četi	četete	četes	četete	----	----	----	----
SC	čitaj	čitajte	čitas	čitajte	čitajte	čitajte	----	----

Certain varieties of Sp do not display the above morphology. In some, 2Sg exists but 2Pl is absent. In Argentina and Chile, distinctions are preserved under a different familiar morphology, labelled *vos*. B and SC use identical Present forms in Indicative and Subjunctive environments. B has the same form for 2Pl Imperatives and Presents with the stem class that includes *read* (Scatton 1984: sect. 4.5213), but with other stems the distinction parallels SC: for instance, the Imperative for *play* is *igraaj/igrajite*, and the Present *igraaj/igrajite*. SC has 1Pl Imperatives: *čitajm* 'Let us read' contrast with *čitamo* 'We are reading'. This is not the case in B or Sp.

are possible when other means to express commands exist. For instance, a B surrogate imperative is the *da*-clause with present V equivalent to a Sp Subjunctive, as in *Da četes!* 'da' read+PRES+2Sg 'You (Sg) should read!' (Scatton 1984:338-9).

In some languages 'true' Imperatives are absent. French lacks Imperative morphology, and uses 'surrogate' forms. Spelling aside, the Vs in *Chante / chantez!* 'Sing!', *Tu chantes / Vous chantez* 'You are singing', and corresponding negative sentences are all identical.

This paper deals with the contrast in (1) vs. (3-4), arguing that the main distinction between B and SC vs. Sp is the different function of C in root clauses. In Slavic, the root C has the function of licensing PF-properties of clitics, and does not indicate Illocutionary Force. By contrast, in Sp C in Imperatives indicates Force.

There are three recent accounts of the ungrammaticality of negative 'true' Imperatives, as in (1b). Rivero (1988:sect. 4) derives the affirmative nature of Imperatives in Modern Greek, Rumanian, and Sp from a combination of two factors open to parametric variation: (i) the just mentioned function of C, and (ii) the structural properties of Neg. The proposal is that in these languages the Imperative V must raise to C to activate Force. In affirmative clauses this movement is unproblematic, but in negative clauses Neg is an intervening head between V and C, and constitutes a barrier that blocks the required movement and makes negative Imperatives deviant. Under this view, C in the root clause is an Imperative Force indicator, or [+IF], but this characteristic shows variation. I argue that in B and SC, C is not a Force indicator, or [-IF], and the Imperative feature is in I. Secondly, Neg in Sp does not allow Incorporation, or is [-INC]: V cannot move to Neg to void barrierhood, and the Neg+V complex cannot subsequently move to C. I argue that B is like Sp in this respect, but this does not affect its Imperatives. B allows negated Imperatives because C does not hold the Imperative feature, and V need not cross Neg to reach it.

By contrast, the SC Neg incorporates V, so it is [+INC]. In this language, the Imperative V need not reach the [-IF] C, so negated Imperatives offer a double situation. When PF-properties independent of Force require an item to fill C, V raises there once it incorporates to Neg. In other circumstances, the Imperative V is not in C, which is also licit.

Summarizing, the three languages are parallel in having Imperative morphology that is distinctive - or, using Chomsky's terms (1992), 'strong' - but they differ in the location of the (abstract) Imperative feature, which resides in either I or C. Imperative morphology is 'strong' in these languages, and must be checked by PF, as opposed to LF. This is successfully accomplished when V raises in the syntax to the position the feature occupies, but it fails if V cannot reach that position. If Vs are inflected in the lexicon, abstract Imperative Force and strong Imperative morphology must be paired up in the syntax. In the language that

combines Imperative Force in C and a blocking Neg, a contradictory situation arises for negative Imperatives, since V must but cannot move to C. However, with other combinations negative Imperatives are possible, as summarized in (5):

(5)	Language	'Strong' Morph.	C	Neg	Neg Imperatives
	Spanish	YES	+IF	-INC	NO
	Bulgarian	YES	-IF	-INC	YES
	Serbo-Croatian	YES	-IF	+INC	YES

In another approach (Zanuttini 1990, 1991), the absence of Tense is the crucial factor for the deviance of (1b). Zanuttini distinguishes between two types of Neg in Romance. The kind making (1b) ungrammatical heads a maximal projection with the phrase headed by Tense as complement: [NegP Neg° [TP To]]. Imperatives lack Tense, so cannot be negated. The second kind of Neg does not take TP as complement, so is insensitive to Tense, and appears below TP in the basic phrase-marker: [TP To [Neg ...]]. This type can negate Imperatives, as in Piedmontese *Parla nen!* talk+IMP+2Sg not 'Don't talk!'. If Zanuttini's proposal is restricted to Romance, it is accidental that Modern Greek and Sp true Imperatives show identical properties. However, it cannot be a general property of the sentential Neg of the Sp-type to take TP as complement. This is because in B, SC, Modern Greek, and Sp, Neg is of the same structural type, with the properties of the kind considered incompatible with Imperatives, but in the first two languages Neg can attach to Imperatives, as in (3b) and (4b), while in the last two it cannot, as in (1b). The hypothesis that Neg is similar in relevant respects follows from proposals by Laka (1990), and Bosque (1992) for Sp, and Rivero (1988, 1991) for Modern Greek, B, and SC. These authors argue that (a) Neg heads its own maximal projection, and (b) occupies a basic position that c-commands the Agr/T complex. In Sp, Neg takes IP as complement: NegP [no [IP lees]] 'You are not reading'. The same holds for B sequences like *Ne cêtes* 'You are not reading' or their Modern Greek counterparts. Sequences like *B Ne šte cêtes* Neg will read+PRES+2Sg 'You will not read', or their Modern Greek counterpart, have Neg before the invariant modal and the inflected V and show that Neg takes a Modal Phrase as complement, followed by IP: [NegP ne [MP šte [IP cêtes]]]. According to Rivero (1988), clausal structure is the same in B and Modern Greek, but it can be seen that the two languages contrast as to negated Imperatives.² As to Tense in Imperatives, no morphological or semantic reasons suggest that

2. Slovak (Rivero 1991) and Breton (Borley, Rivero & Stephens 1992) have a Neg that does not take TP as complement, and 'true' negated Imperatives. These languages are compatible with my general approach, but are not discussed here.

B and SC differ from Greek and Sp in this respect. As stated, my idea is that the difference relates to C and not to T.

In a third approach (Laka 1990:246ff), Sp lacks negative Imperatives because Imperative V and Neg are in the same position, or in complementary distribution. This position is the head of ΣP for Negation or Affirmation: [CP C° [$\Sigma P \Sigma^\circ$ IP]]. Basque Imperatives and Neg are not in the same position, so this language negates Imperatives, as in *Ez ezazu hori jan!* Neg Aux that eat 'Do not eat that!'. In my account (1b) is deviant due to the properties of C, which must hold the Imperative V and is higher than ΣP .

As stated, the distinction between B / SC and Sp / Greek is the different function a root C plays. In Slavic, a root C is a *Morphological Licensor* in the sense of Chomsky (1992). In languages like Sp, a root C is a *Force Indicator*. The Slavic languages show so-called 'Wackemagel' effects, or second position restrictions for clitics. I will argue that these restrictions are not identical, but are connected with the need to fill a root C to license these items. In other words, an overriding function of the root C in the 'Wackemagel' language is to establish the syntactic configuration to license functional categories such as D. This makes C not be a marker of Illocutionary Force, because if C had a fixed value in this respect, conflicts could arise for its PF-licensing function. More specifically, in questions, statements, or commands, B and SC rules raising Vs to C apply in an identical manner irrespective of Illocutionary Force, which is indicated in ways that need not impinge on verb position. Another way to express the same idea is that if a root C had the abstract Imperative feature, then there could be a conflict when a V with a different morphology than the Imperative one raises to C to perform the PF-function of licensing clitics. Or, in simple terms, B and SC word order does not distinguish Imperatives from Statements, but the shape of the V does. This is possible because the Imperative feature is in I, V raises out of the VP to check it, and matches up Force and 'strong' morphology at that point. The subsequent movement from I to C is triggered by PF-requirements that are independent of the V-feature(s) already checked in I, so can apply to Vs with various morphologies with no conflict.

Then, not only Imperatives, and finite non-imperatives may raise to C, but also non-finite Vs in the so-called Long Head Movement process: [CP [C° Čel.] [IP [I° šum] [VP t_i knigata]]] 'I have read the book'. For Rivero (1993b), LHM shows that the root C is not the locus of the finite (non-imperative) feature, in contrast with V2 languages, and this supports the proposals of this paper from still another perspective.

Modern Greek and Sp are like B and SC in having 'strong' Imperative morphology but unlike them as to second position effects for clitics, and offer a different situation. Their root C is not a Morphological Licensor for the PF-properties of clitics, but a Force Indicator the raised V activates. This is because the Imperative feature is

not in I but in C, and V must check it by PF. In this paper, I show how this aspect accounts for the characteristic syntax of sentences containing 'true' Imperatives in Sp.

To summarize, B / SC and Sp differ empirically as to negated 'true' Imperatives, and the contrast is general and not specific. These languages share Imperatives with parallel semantics and 'strong' morphology, and a similar negation, but differ as to the function of C. In 'Wackemagel' languages, a root C is activated to license clitics, V-to-C rules apply for reasons independent of Force, the Imperative feature is not in C but in I, and Vs check it by raising there by PF. As a result, Imperatives appear in C to license clitics like other Vs, or they can be in I like other Vs, when clitics are licensed by means other than a V in C. By contrast, the C of a non-Wackemagel language like Sp holds the Imperative feature and is activated for Force. As a result, the Imperative that cannot be in C will be unlicensed and deviant, as when Neg is present in (1b).

The paper is organized as follows. Sect. 2 deals with Sp, a sample language with 'true' Imperatives in C as Force Indicator, or [+IF]. Sect. 3 considers B and SC with a double aim. Firstly, it shows how 'true' Imperatives need not be in the C that is [-IF] and a Morphological Licensor, the core distinction in (5). Secondly, it shows that C need not fulfill this morphological function identically in [-IF] languages, so there is parametric variation in this area. Second position effects labelled 'Wackemagel' above are not identical, and I derive this difference from parametric variation in the function of C in [-IF] languages. More precisely, B clitics show Tobler-Mussafia (TM) effects (Tobler 1875, Mussafia 1886), while SC clitic pronouns show Wackemagel (W) effects (Wackemagel 1892). These traditional distinctions have often been conflated, and are not usually applied to Slavic. Here I argue that they are applicable to Slavic in ways that suggest that they should not be totally unified. Intuitively, TM is a syntactic prohibition against first position, without restrictions on second or later positions, which is the situation in B. As the less frequent case in Slavic, TM has attracted little attention. By contrast, W is the obligatory requirement on second position, which entails prohibitions not only on first, but third or later positions. As the more frequent case, W has attracted an almost exclusive attention, since it is found not only in SC, but Czech, Slovenian, and Slovak, which will not be discussed. I account for this difference by positing two local PF-licensing requirements for clitics in the general case. These conditions are reminiscent of the split ECP (Jaeggli 1982 and later work), closely resemble conditions for little *pro* (Rizzi 1986), and require of the clitic to be both morphologically licensed, and identified. In my account, what unifies TM and W-languages and separates them from languages such as Sp which lack 'second' position effects is that the licensor and the identifier are different items. In addition, what separates the W from the TM-language is that in W, C

must be the morphological licensor, so clitics appear in strict second position. By contrast, in the TM-language, not only C but other heads can be morphological licensors. The difference between SC and B in (5) derives from this variation in the primacy of the [-IF] C as licensor: in SC but not B V incorporates to Neg. This is because in SC as W-language clitics must be formally licensed by C but identified by V, so the tension between the two local requirements is solved by Neg and V forming a complex head. In B, the clitics are identified by V and can be formally licensed by heads other than C, so V-incorporation to Neg is unnecessary, and in fact impossible.

2. C as Force Indicator: the Castilian Spanish case.

2.1. True vs. surrogate Imperatives.

In Rivero (1988), now in revised form in NLLT, I derived from a unique factor the three properties in (6) for what I then labeled 'true' Modern Greek and Rumanian Imperatives: the requirement that V raise to C (den Besten 1977):

- (6) a. True imperative sentences are root constructions.
- b. In true imperative sentences clitics must follow V.
- c. True imperative sentences cannot be negated.

There I mentioned Sp in passing, but in updating my proposal, I now concentrate on Sp, and add Sp 'surrogate' imperatives - a term borrowed from Joseph & Philippaki-Warbuton (1987) - to my earlier discussion of Modern Greek and Rumanian 'surrogate' imperatives. Consider the 'true' Imperative in (7):

- (7) dad- me el libro.
give+IMP+2PI- me the book
'give me the book!'

'True' Imperatives are ungrammatical if embedded under Vs of command, as in (8a). They cannot follow clitics, as in (8b), and cannot be negated, as in (8c). Example (8d) is deviant due to the combined effect of negation and clitic:

- (8) a. *pido [que dad- me el libro]
I+ask [that give+IMP+2PI- me the book]
- b. *me dad
me give+IMP+2PI
the book
- c. *no dad- me el libro
Neg give+IMP+2PI me the book
- d. *no me dad el libro
Neg me give+IMP+2PI the book

By contrast, these conditions do not apply when Vs have non-Imperative morphology. Sp surrogate imperatives can share the regular syntax of the V that gives them shape. Consider Subjunctives. As illustrated by (9a), a Subjunctive used as 'surrogate' imperative can be embedded. It follows clitics, as in (9b), and can be negated, as in (9c). As stated, in my account the true Imperative V obligatorily raises to C, while in surrogate imperatives in the Subjunctive, V remains in I:

- (9) a. ordeno [que me deis el libro]
I+order [that me give+Pres/Subj+2Pl] the book
I order you to give me the book
b. *deis- me el libro
give+Pres/Subj+2Pl- me the book
c. no me deis el libro
Neg me give+Pres/Subj+2Pl the book
'don't give me the book'

Now consider Infinitives, labeled popular when used as surrogate imperatives. Like other Infinitives, they precede clitics, (10a-c), can be negated, (10b), and can be embedded, (10d). These properties follow under Kayne's proposal (1991a) for Infinitives+Cl sequences in Romance: the infinitive V adjoins to I':^{3,4}

- (10) a. dar- le el libro!
give+INF- him the book
'give him the book!'
b. no dar- le el libro!
Neg give+INF-him the book
'don't give him the book!'
c. *no le dar el libro!
mando no darle el libro
I order that the book not be given to him'

³ Other forms used as imperatives are the present and future indicatives:

- (i) a. Te duermes/dormirás
Yourself sleep+{PRES/FUT}+2Sg ahora mismo!
'You (will) go to sleep right now!
b. No te duermes/dormirás hasta las siete!
Neg yourself sleep+{PRES/FUT}+2Sg until the seven!
'You (do/will) not go to sleep until seven!'

⁴ For another analysis see (ii) in fn. 7. Adjunction of X⁰ to Y' is not structure-preserving but compatible with restrictions on head movement (Kayne 1991a:650), and ensures the necessary adjacency between V and Cl.

2.2. True Imperatives as root constructions.

The proposal that the imperative V must surface in C accounts for the root nature of true Imperatives in (7) in ways that are familiar from discussions of V2. Namely, C is a viable landing site for V in root clauses, but such is not the case for the C of embedded clauses, so true Imperatives are root constructions.⁵ By contrast, surrogate imperatives do not move to C and can be embedded, as in (9a) and (10d). In addition, this proposal accounts for root emphatic imperative sentences with the complementizer *que*.

These constructions must be in the Subjunctive, as in (11a), and cannot show true Imperative morphology, as in (11b). This is because true Imperatives can only be licensed in C in Sp, and in (11b) that position is occupied by *que*. By contrast, if Imperatives were in Σ in the Σ P projection that is below CP (Laka 1990), the ungrammaticality of (11b) would be unexpected: *[CP que [Σ P escribid]]:

- (11) a. que escribáis!
that write+PRES+SUBJ+2Pl
'you just write!'
b. *que escribid!

The *que* of (11a) is in C because this item co-occurs with the emphatic marker *si que* 'yes that' that attaches to finite Vs, as in (12) and *Promettieron que si que escribiríais* 'They promised that you would, of course, write':

- (12) que sí que escribáis!
that yes that write+PRES+SUBJ+2Pl
'of course, you just write!'

This proposal also accounts for why Ps can occur with Infinitives as root surrogate imperatives, as in (13), but are excluded with true Imperatives, as in (14): if these Ps are in C, they should be incompatible with the true Imperative and unproblematic with Infinitives, which by assumption are not in C.

- (13) a. a escribir!
P write+INF
'come on, write!'

⁵ In Ancient Greek 'true' Imperatives appear embedded, but I do not know under which Vs. 'True' imperatives in Sp cannot be embedded, and this does not look like the restriction of V2-phenomena to main clauses in Dutch, as opposed to German. L. Haegeman suggests reference to a C which is not dominated by another maximal projection, which would correctly reflect the contrast of Sp 'true' Imperatives and P+ Infinitives as imperatives, which can be embedded under a restricted class of Vs. However, this same requirement may be too strong for 'true' imperatives in UG, given Ancient Greek.

- b. sin empujar!
without push+INF
'do not push!'
- (14) a. *a escribid!
b. *sin empujad!

The P in (13) is in C because this construction can be embedded under Vs with a recursive CP as complement, such as *decir* 'tell' in (15), but not under Vs that disallow CP-recursion such as *pedir* 'demand' in (16):

- (15) a. digo que a escribir
I+say that P write+INF
'I say to write'
- b. digo [CP₁ [C₀ que] [CP₂ [C₀ a] [IP escribir]]]
c. digo que sin empujar
I+say that without push+INF
'I say not to push'
- (16) a. ?*pido que a escribir
I+ask that P write + INF
b. *pido que sin empujar
I+ask that without push+INF

2.3. True Imperatives and clitics.

The fact that true Imperatives precede clitics, as in (7), follows if V raises to C alone. For Imperatives, Rooryck (1992) proposes that the characteristics of the morphology are such that, if the clitic moved with V to C, it would be unable to antecedent-govern its trace (and see Haverkort 1993: 2.2 for a slightly different alternative).⁶ Since clitics are adjoined to I or one of its projections, V comes to precede them once it moves to C in true Imperatives.

Observe that this account offers an advantage to that proposed by Laka (1990), who does not mention clitics. If the Imperative V headed the Σ P projection, the clitic position would be unexpected. This is

⁶ Mechanisms for V to head-move past clitics depend on the specific analysis of clitics, and apply elsewhere than Imperatives, as Slavic suggests. Some possibilities are as follows. Firstly, if clitics are X⁰s, intervene in the raising path, and differ from V for Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1989), long head movement of V across the projection holding the clitic could be licit. Likewise, the clitic could cross the projection holding V, as is perhaps the case in SC later. Secondly, if clitics are XPs as 'topicalized' or scrambled adjuncts, as in Old Sp (Rivero 1986), then V may bypass them, and they may bypass V with no special provisos. Thirdly, if clitics are in the Spec of some functional projection, as I suggested for Balkan languages Rivero (1988) - i.e. scrambled to an L-related position in current terms -, then V can also cross them. It seems unlikely that V+Cl orders involve Excorporation of V. This is because in Slavic at least, Cl+V sequences are just one of the possible word orders, often lacking Incorporation properties.

because in the Σ P analysis, sentences like (17a) have the negative phrase in Spec- Σ P, and the clitic before the V in Σ^0 , as in (17b):

- (17) a. a ningún sitio te enviaré yo
to no place you will+send I
'I will not send you anywhere'
- b. [Σ P A ningún sitio [Σ^0 te enviaré] [IP yo [I₀ t_i] ...]]

The word-order of (17) is impossible with true Imperatives. Rather, it must be V+Cl, as in *envía-lo* 'send-it' in *A ese sitio envíalo tú!* 'You send it to that place!'. This difference casts doubts on the idea that true Imperatives occupy the same position as V in (17). The assumption that *A ningún sitio* is in Spec-NegP and not Spec-CP is based on factors such as embeddability under 'non-bridge' verbs, as in *Prometo que a ningún sitio te enviaré yo* 'I promise that I will not send you anywhere'. Consider now clitics in surrogate imperatives. First, Subjunctive Vs remain in I, so follow the clitics adjoined to Iⁿ, as in the emphatic imperatives with *que* in (18) :

- (18) a. que lo escribáis!
that it write+Pres/Pres/Obj+2Pl
'you just write it!'
- b. *que escribáis-lo!
c. que sí que lo escribáis!
'of course, you just write it!'

Infinitives are not in C, and if they adjoin to I', as Kayne proposes, then in surrogate constructions they should precede clitics and follow P in C, as in (19):

- (19) a. a escribir- lo!
P write+INF-it
'come on, write it!'
- b. *a lo escribir!
c. digo que a escribirlo
'I say to write it'

2.4. True Imperatives and negation.

As to the incompatibility of negation and true Imperatives, recall that Sp Neg heads its own maximal projection and takes IP, representing the Agr/T complex, as complement, as in (20) (Laka 1990, Bosque 1992 for Sp, Ouhalla 1990, Zanuttini 1990, 1991):

Sp *no* is unlike *ne* in French *ne ... pas* (Pollock 1989). It differs in basic position; it is not discontinuous, and it is not a clitic. B and SC *ne* are like Sp *no* in this respect. The assumed difference accounts for the well-formed Sp. *No y no!* and SC *Ne i nel!*, in contrast with French **Ne et ne!* vs. *Non et non!* 'No and no!'. (20) accounts for the form of answers such as *Mejor que no* Lit. 'better that not 'Better not' to questions like *¿Quieres que cante?* 'Do you want me to sing?': IP appears empty but the upper structure is filled, which has no counterpart in French. There are other substantial differences I will not go into.

If clausal structure is as in (20), the Imperative V can reach I, but not C for two reasons. First, Neg intervenes between I and C and V cannot skip it, because this would violate the ECP. Second, V does not incorporate to Neg, which the answer *Mejor que no* suggests.⁷ If Neg allowed Incorporation, then Neg and V could form a complex head and move as X⁰ to C, which would be unproblematic for the purposes of the ECP. By contrast, I will argue in the next section that Neg incorporates V in SC. Under this approach, true Imperatives cannot be negated because *no* in **No leed* 'Do not read!' indicates that V is not in C, so it cannot be licensed.

⁷ If Neg disallows Incorporation in general, not just in Imperatives, the Aux-to-Comp construction (Rizzi 1982:83ff) should have Aux in a position lower than C, since it can be negated, as shown in (i):

(i) No habiendo Juan protestado, terminaron la discusión.
'John not having complained, they ended the discussion.'

An additional reason for a lower-than-C position for this Aux concerns clitics, which follow it in this construction: Aux+Cl+NP+V. For Kayne clitics are in I⁰, so he suggests (1991a: 657, n. 27) that the nominative NP in (i) is not in standard subject position (Spec-IP), but lower in the clause. Then the Aux assigning nominative to this NP need not be in C. In view of (ii), Sauer (1992) argues that finite Vs do not raise to C in Spanish questions but are in I, and considers Neg a blocking head:

(ii) A quién ya casi no le escribes tú cartas?
'To whom already almost Neg him write you letters
'To whom don't you write letters hardly anymore?'

Rumanian Gerunds show V+Cl order and can be negated, so Rivero (1988) proposes that their V raises to M, as opposed to C in Imperatives and Long Head Movement. In the Balkans, M is below Neg and above IP, the locus of clitics, as in (iii):

(iii) [Cp C [NegP Neg [Ivp Cl [Ivp V]]]

Kayne (1991a) obtains strict adjacency between V and Cl in V+Cl orders from adjunction of V to X', with clitic in X' (n. 13, n. 27), but if V moves to M as in (iii), adjacency is not automatically ensured. However, a general characteristic of functional categories of the I-system is to allow Specifiers (and Adjuncts) only at the top-most level, so this could ensure the adjacency of M and Cl in (iii). The same could also ensure adjacency between V and Cl in Spanish Imperatives, if C forms an extended projection: with V in this construction, given that it encodes the feature of the imperative mood. In Slavic, adjacency between V in C and the clitic lower in the clause may follow from the last recourse nature of rules moving V to C and Economy, including Imperatives.

For Italian Infinitival imperatives with Neg+Cl+V order, Kayne (1991b) proposes that the clitic climbs to an abstract M licensed by Neg. This order is also found in Old Sp Infinitives and Gerunds, which allow preverbal nominative subjects, as in (iv):

(iv) Tengo que me erraron, yo non gelo mereciendo. Zifar 411
'I+have that me hurt, I not from+them+it deserving
'I consider that they hurt me, and I did not deserve it'

This proposal also accounts for the fact that with preposed negative phrases, only surrogate forms are grammatical, as in (21a), not true Imperatives, as in (21b):

- (21) a. a ningún sitio vayáis vosotros sin abrigo!
to no place go+PRES/SUBJ+2Pl you without coat!
'don't you go anywhere without a coat!'
b. *a ningún sitio id vosotros sin abrigo!
to no place go+IMP+2Pl you without coat

The Subjunctive in (21a) is not in C, and follows the negative phrase in the Spec of NegP, so the sentence is grammatical. A *ningún sitio* is not in Spec-CP since this sentence can be embedded under a non-bridge V, as in *Os mando que a ningún sitio vayáis vosotros sin abrigo* 'I order that you not go anywhere without a coat'. The true Imperative in (21b) is ungrammatical because V cannot bypass NegP and reach C, since Neg is phonologically empty, but has features.

Root emphatic imperatives with *que* in C must also show Subjunctive forms, as in (22). In addition to the effect of NegP, these sentences have a filled C, so 'true' Imperatives are illicit here:

- (22) a. que no lo escribáis!
that not it write+PRES/SUBJ+2Pl
'you just don't write it!'
b. que a ningún sitio vayáis sin abrigo!
that to no place go+PRES/SUBJ+2Pl without coat!

If Infinitives with an imperative function adjoin to I' like other Infinitives, it should be possible to negate them even if their C contains a P, which is correct, as in (23):

- (23) a. no escribir -lo!
Neg write+INF-it
'do not write it!'
b. a no escribirlo!
c. digo que a no escribirlo
'I say not to write it'

2.5. Surrogate Subjunctives and C.

In Castilian Sp, Imperative morphology is reserved for second persons in familiar form: for *dar* 'give', *da* is singular and *dad* is plural. Polite second persons and the first person in the plural appear in the Subjunctive: *de* is 2Sg, *den* is 2Pl, and *demos* is 1Pl. Interestingly, these last forms participate in the syntax characteristic of familiar true Imperatives and in the one reserved for familiar surrogate imperatives. I

suggest that this situation is significant for the idea that the Sp C is an indicator of Imperative Force, as follows. When polite second persons in the singular and plural and the first person plural are embedded, they behave like ordinary Subjunctives, can be negated and must follow clitics, as in (24):

- (24) ordeno que ustedes no me den el libro
 I+order that you Neg me give+PRES/SUBJ+2PI the book
 'I order that you do not give me the book'

However, (25a-b) show that if used as surrogate root affirmative imperatives, they must precede clitics in the same context the true second plural Imperative does, as in (7) *Dadme el libro!* 'You (pl) give me the book'. Furthermore, (25c) shows that this order cannot be negated, which makes them contrast with surrogate Infinitives (*No darme el libro!*, *A no darme el libro!*):

- (25) a. den- me el libro!
 give+PRES/SUBJ+2PI-me the book!
 'you (pl.) give me the book!'
 b. *me den el libro!
 c. *no den-me el libro!

Finally, in contexts where true Imperatives are excluded, the previous forms must adopt the syntax of familiar surrogate imperatives such as the 2PI Subjunctive *deis* that is in complementary distribution with *dad*, as in *Que me deis el libro!* 'Just give me the book!' *No me deis el libro!* 'Don't give me the book!' and *Nunca me deis el libro!* 'Never give me the book!'. This alternative use of the surrogate Subjunctive contrasts with (25a), as illustrated in (26):

- (26) a. que me den el libro!
 'just give me the book!'
 b. que si que me den el libro!
 'of course, just give me the book!'
 c. no me den el libro!
 'don't give me the book!'
 d. nunca me den el libro!
 'never give me the book!'

V-position in (24) vs. (25) does not affect my earlier conclusion that the true Imperative must be in C, but provides additional support for the idea that the root C is the Imperative Force indicator. The contrast in (24-26) vs. (25) suggests that when true Imperative morphology is absent, and does not alternate with Subjunctive morphology, Subjunctives must raise to C whenever possible. However, when

V-raising to C violates constraints these Subjunctives remain in a lower position in the clause, in contrast with true Imperatives, which cannot. Thus, the surrogate imperative of (25a) must raise to C, since there are no structural factors blocking the procedure: it is like a 'true' imperative in its syntax but 'surrogate' in its morphology. By contrast, in (26a-b) C is filled by *que* and the surrogate V cannot raise there, so it remains in I. In the same vein, since Neg in (26c-d) stands in the raising path, if V moved to C it would violate the ECP, so it remains in I, and both its syntax and morphology are 'surrogate'. The explanation for this situation must await future research, but it appears that the combination of (subject) Agreement (Person and Number) and Mood with 'operator' properties (Subjunctive) successfully checks the abstract Imperative feature in C, when 'true' Imperative morphology is unavailable. Infinitives as surrogate imperatives lack Agreement and display the behavior of other Infinitives, as we just saw. Indicators are not 'operator'-like and when used as surrogate imperatives offer no syntactic peculiarities (see fn. 3).

To summarize, the hypothesis that true Imperatives surface in C accounts for their syntactic contrast with surrogate imperatives, including negation. In addition, surrogate imperatives with Agr/Mood and no true Imperative counterparts raise to C if possible, but if this violates principles of grammar they remain in I, so they exhibit a doubly faceted syntax. V-movement in Sp Imperatives is triggered by the root C as *Force Indicator*.

3. C as morphological licenser: the Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian cases.

B and SC differ from Castilian Sp as to negative true Imperatives. In view of the descriptions in Scatton (1984) and Browne (1992), these two languages have a strong Imperative morphology similar to Sp, and closely resemble Modern Greek in their preference for imperfective aspect in Imperatives.⁸ In B and SC Neg is of the same type as in Sp. In my view, the contrast between Sp vs. B and SC derives from the hypothesis that root Cs in the last two languages are morphological licensers, and the imperative feature is in I.

⁸ A Sp perfective Imperative is shown in (a-b):
 (i) a. habedlo leído antes!
 have+IMP+2PL-it read before!
 'you should have read it before!'
 b. *no habedlo leído antes!

It cannot be negated, like the Modern Greek Imperative reflecting aspect inflectionally. Thus, it is not that Slavic Imperatives can be negated because of aspect. A. Terzi mentions that Classical Greek Imperatives can be negated, and this is also the case in Latin. Such old Imperatives are labelled present or future, but the distinction is aspectual, not temporal. Latin future Imperatives are used for generic orders, suggesting that they are imperfective. Classical Greek and Latin are among the languages originally discussed by Wackemagel for second position effects, so their C is not likely to be a Force Indicator.

B and SC are alike in not associating a root C with features for Illocutionary Force because they use this position to license functional categories such as clitics. The two languages assign a common function to their root C, but they nevertheless differ as to the specific way they implement it. The main difference is that the SC C is the sole morphological licenser of clitics, but such is not the case in B. We shall see that this difference, which has consequences for negative sentences, gives a Wackemagel flavor to SC, and characteristics to B that as Romance linguist I label 'Tobler-Mussafia'. The section is organized as follows. I begin with B, continue with SC, and conclude with a discussion of the contrasts between the two languages, which derive from the different implementations of the function of C as licenser.

3.1. Bulgarian.

Consider the well-known variations in the statements in (27-28). If the finite V opens the clause, the clitic follows it, but if Neg opens the clause, the clitic precedes V:

- (27) a. četes ja
read+PRES+2Sg it
'you are reading it'
b. *ja četes
- (28) a. ne ja četes
Neg it read+PRES+2Sg
'you are not reading it'
b. *ne četes ja

True Imperatives show a similar contrast, as in (29). If the Imperative opens the clause the clitic follows, but if Neg does the clitic precedes:

- (29) a. četi ja!
read+IMP+2Sg it!
'you read it!'
b. ne ja četi!
'don't read it!'

Yes-no questions with the interrogative particle *-li* are parallel again, as in (30):

- (30) a. četes li ja?
read+PRES+2Sg Q it?
'are you reading it?'
b. Ne ja li četes?
'aren't you reading it?'

The traditional idea for the above phenomena is that clitics cannot be first and need an initial element for support. Here, I adopt the treatment developed for Slavic auxiliaries in Rivero (1993b) extended to pronouns in ways that resemble earlier proposals by Uriagereka (1988). Adopting an idea originating in Postal (1966), I consider B clitics functional categories of the D type. Furthermore, I assume that they (left) adjoin to Iⁿ, so they are similar to modern Romance clitics in Kayne's (1991a) account. In addition, B clitics must be morphologically licensed by appearing in the internal domain or minimal complement domain of another head, in the sense of Chomsky (1992). Under my system, root clauses with inflected verbs, fall into four main types. First, sentences with strictly initial clitics such as (27b) are ungrammatical because the clitic is adjoined to Iⁿ, as is always the case in this language, V is in I, and IP is ungrammatical so does not constitute an internal domain: *[IP CL [I^o V]]]. Second, negative patterns such as (28a), (29b), and (30b) are grammatical, because NegP takes IP as complement. Then IP is the internal domain of Neg and appears in a configuration that satisfies the morphological licensing requirements of the clitic in Iⁿ, as in (31). In such negative patterns, the licensing head for the clitic is Neg that is in situ, and V raises to I and no further, and follows the clitic:

- (31) [NegP Neg^o [IP CL [I^o V_i] [VP t_i]]]

Third, in patterns with a modal X_{max} between CP and IP (Rivero 1988:2, 1991), the modal head will be the licenser of the clitic in IP. This is clearly shown by the emphatic interrogative in (32), as cited in Scatton (1984:375). In this case, *šte* heads M^o and morphologically licenses the clitic because M^o has IP as its internal domain, while the inflected V has raised to I and follows the clitic:⁹

- (32) a. koj li šte im pomogne?
who Q will them help+PRES+3Sg
'who will help them?'
b. [CP Koj [C' [C_o I_i] [MP [M' [M^o šte] [IP im [I_o pomogne_i] [VP t_i]]]]]]]

Fourth, affirmative V+CL patterns such as (27a), (28a), and (30a) indicate that V has raised out of IP to C, as in (33). Through this movement, V becomes the morphological licenser of the clitic, since IP is now the internal domain of C, in a configuration that satisfies the requirements of the clitic in IP:

- (33) [CP [C' [C_o V_i] [IP CL [I_o t_i] [VP t_i]]]]]

⁹ The question complementizer *-li* has different licensing conditions: *-li* is licensed in a checking domain in the sense of Chomsky (1992), not in the internal domain for clitic pronouns. In (30b), V cannot raise to *-li* in C because of Neg, so *-li* lowers to the checking domain of V in I to be licensed (Rivero 1993a)

Finally, in non-root contexts, the clitic precedes and is strictly adjacent to the finite V, and its morphological licenser is the head taking IP as complement: Neg^o, M^o, or C^o. In (34), for example, modal *šće* is the licenser of the clitic while the complementizer *će* is not. This is because *im* is in the internal domain of M *šće* but not of C *će*. This order supports that B clitics are always within IP in root and non-root clauses alike:

- (34) a. znam *će šće im pomogne*
 I+know that will them help+PRES+3Sg
 'I know that he will help them'
 b. znam [CP [C^o *će*] [MP [M^o *šće*] [IP im [I^o pomogne]] [VP t_j]]]

The comparison of (32b-34b) and (33) demonstrates two B characteristics absent in SC, which becomes relevant in the next sections. First, (32-34) show that B clitics need not be second in the clause, even though they cannot be first (see Halpern 1992 on this point too). Second, B clitics are strictly adjacent to the finite V, whether V follows, as in (32-34), or precedes, as in (33) (Hauge 1976:5, Ewen 1979:16). In this sense, B has the same flavor as the medieval Romance languages studied by Tobler (1875) and Mussafia (1886), while we shall see that SC does not.

Having outlined how clitics are licensed with finite verbs and Imperatives, let us return to the function of the root C. My proposal relies in an essential way on a robust but simple factor: the identical position of V in statements, commands and questions. If the initial V comes to occupy the head of the highest functional projection of the root sentence in the affirmative patterns in (33), then it is clear that it moves there to satisfy morphological requirements of the functional category D, and disregards the Force of the clause, as I suggested in the introduction. For instance, the Force of the question in (30a) resides in *-li* and not in the position of V. This is why (27a) is a statement and (30a) is not, even though V raises to C in both instances. Also, this is why *Da-li ja četes?* *Da-Q it read+PRES+2Sg* 'Are you reading it?' is still a question but differs in syntax from its counterpart in (30a), because *da* prevents V from raising to C (Rivero 1993a). Turning to negative sentences from this perspective, we see again that the statement, the command, and the question in (28-30) are parallel. In these three cases, the B V remains in I because in the presence of *ne* verbs do not, in fact cannot, raise to C. Additional motivation comes from 'long head movement' constructions like *Čel šum knigata read have+PRES+1Sg book+the 'I have read the book'*. These are always affirmative because the V *čel* 'read' raises to C to license *šum* 'I have', and cannot cross Neg (Rivero 1988:3, 1991).

The B negated true Imperative in (29b) is not in C, [NegP Neg [IP Cl [I^oV] ...]], which is unproblematic in contrast with the Sp true

Imperatives of the previous section. The affirmative Imperative V is not in C when another item such as a conjunction serves as morphological licenser for the clitic, and V remains in I, as in the second conjunct in (35) with CL+V order. This is also unproblematic:

- (35) Ela i mi kaži!
 come+IMP+2Sg and me tell+IMP+2Sg
 'come and tell me!' (Hauge 1976:5)

Hauge states when giving this example that "modern B has no special rule for imperative verb forms". In my account, this is because C is not the Force indicator and need not attract V to license/check its Imperative feature. Rather, Imperatives are licensed in I, the position where Imperative Force and Imperative morphology match. To summarize, the B root C can be used as a morphological licenser for clitics, as when verbs move to that position irrespective of the Force of the clause, so Imperatives lack a distinctive syntax. This is because in this language Vs raise to I to license imperativity, but clitics in IP must meet the PF-requirement of being morphologically licensed in an internal domain. In the absence of a Neg, or a modal item as elements that have IP as internal domain, V moves to C to perform this function. In section 3.3, I will come back to this condition, and the contrast with SC.

3.2. Serbo-Croatian.

As the paradigms in (36) through (39) show, in SC the order of V and clitic can be identical in affirmative / negative statements, commands, and questions:

- (36) a. čitate je
 read+PRES+2Pl it
 'you are reading it'
 b. *je čitate
 (37) a. ne čitate je
 Neg read+PRES+2Pl it
 'you are not reading it'
 b. *ne je čitate
 (38) a. čitajte je!
 Read+IMP+2Pl it!
 'read it!'
 b. ne čitajte je!
 Neg read+IMP+2Pl it!
 'do not read it!'

- (39) a. čitate li je ?
 read+PRES+2PI Q it ?
 'are you reading it?'
 b. ne čitate li je ?
 Neg read+PRES+2PI Q it ?
 'aren't you reading it?'

Thus, Imperatives have a distinctive morphology, but no distinctive V position, just like in B. In the affirmative (36a), (38a), and (39a), V raises to C to establish the internal domain where clitics can be licensed in PF, and it does so irrespective of Illocutionary Force, again like in B. Thus, there is no reason to think that the SC root C is a Force indicator, which is the main point of this paper.

Negative patterns offer a more complex situation, but the conclusion is the same. It is well-known that in B negative sentences, V must always follow the clitics, as in (28a-30a), so Neg+CL+V order is the only grammatical option. It is also well-known that the same word order is ungrammatical in SC. In this language, the clitics either follow Neg and V, as in (37a), (38b) and (39b), or they precede Neg and V, as in (40). All of these are ungrammatical options in B:

- (40) a. lica im ne razaznaje
 faces to+them neg distinguish+PRES+3Sg
 'he does not distinguish their faces' (Radanović Kočić 1988:107)
 b. knjige im ne čitajte!
 books to+them neg read+IMP+2PI
 'do not read them books!'

Intuitively, the SC situation is due to two different factors, which I relate to the function of C in the next section. First, clitics appear in strict second position in the clause (Browne 1974, Radanović Kočić 1988, Halpern 1992), which gives SC the Wackernagel flavor absent in B.¹⁰ To this effect consider the root construction in (41). Clitic *nam* stands away from V, between subject and preverbal object, which is impossible in B:

- (41) Olga nam nesto dovikuje
 Olga us something tell+PRES+3Sg
 'Olga is telling us something'
 (Radanović Kočić 1988:105)

¹⁰ SC has partial counterparts in medieval Romance languages not studied by Tobler and Mussafia, like Old Portuguese (Meyer-Lübke 1897) and Old Sp (Rivero 1986, 1992). Such Romance languages never display W phenomena as the only option, in contrast with SC. Rather, they are mixed, with TM effects like B and W effects like SC as grammatical options, when the two can be distinguished: i.e. TM: [CP XP YP CL V] vs. W: [CP XP CL YP V]. V + CL order is always found, as in B and SC, but cannot be used to differentiate the two types.

Second, Neg and V count as one unit in SC, so they both precede the clitic, as in (37a), which would be ungrammatical in B.

In embedded clauses the contrast is very clear. The SC clitics must follow and be strictly adjacent to the complementizer, so they must precede V just like in B, but need not be adjacent to it, unlike B (34). As a result, when (41) is embedded, the Wackernagel order of (42) is obtained. This is impossible in B:

- (42) Ivan kaže, da nam Olga nesto dovikuje
 Ivan say+PRES+3Sg that us Olga something tell+PRES+3Sg
 'Ivan says that Olga is telling us something'

Therefore, both languages are alike in disallowing clitics in first position, but B lacks requirements on second position, or is a TM-language, while SC imposes second position restrictions, or is a W-language.

Having described how SC clitics pattern, I turn to their analysis. As to the strict second position aspect, I adopt the idea of Halpern (1992:3.5) that the SC clitics stand in a functional projection he labels CleftP, which is the complement of CP.¹¹ Neg c-commands IP in SC (Rivero 1991), so clausal structure is as sketched in (43):

- (43) [CP C [CleftP CL [NegP Neg⁰ [IP I⁰ [VP V⁰]]]]

For Halpern, the clitic is adjoined to CleftP. I leave this aside, but it suggests interesting parallels with B clitics, which I have assumed are adjoined to Iⁿ.

My idea that clitics must be morphologically licensed in an internal domain is applicable both to B and to SC. In this respect W and TM-languages need not differ. However, in SC the licensing head will always be C and this contrasts with B, a difference that is discussed in the next section. As shown in (44a-c), the sentences in (40-41) have the initial NPs in the Spec-of-CP, and the clitics in the CleftP that is the internal domain of C, which is the formal configuration that licenses the clitics:

- (44) a. [CP lica [C' [C₀∅] [CleftP im [NegP ne [IP razaznaje]]]]]
 b. [CP knjige [C' [C₀∅] [CleftP im [NegP ne [IP čitajte]]]]]
 c. [CP Olga [C' [C₀∅] [CleftP nam [IP nesto dovikuje]]]
 d. [CP [C' [C₀ da] [CleftP nam [IP Olga nesto dovikuje]]]]]

¹¹ CleftP most closely resembles the IP of Uriagereka (1988, 1992), the WP of Rouvret (1992) for European Portuguese, and the AgrP1 of Cardinaletti & Roberts (1991) for medieval Romance and Germanic.

These works also concern second position clitics, but differ from my approach in that they do not draw the formal distinction between W and TM situations I suggest. My proposal also differs from Cavar & Wilders (1992), who right-adjoin the clitic to C and have V in C.

As to the characteristics of 'true' Imperatives, notice that the Imperative V in (44b) is not in C. This is unproblematic under the assumption that in Serbo-Coatian imperativity is licensed in I and not in C, just like in B.

Under the above perspective, the negative sentences in (35a), (36b), and (37c) must have Neg and V as a unit in C in order to license the clitic in CleftP. This brings us to the issue of why Neg and V count as one item in SC. I have previously proposed (Rivero 1991) that in this language V incorporates to Neg in the sense of Baker (1988), so the two form a complex head, and I will provide a reason why this must be so in the next section. Now we can give the analysis of (35a) (36b), and (37c). If the clitic is in CleftP and Neg and V blend, then V moves to I, the resulting complex moves to Neg, and the total moves to C as illustrated in (45):

(45) [CP [C₀ ne+V_i] [CleftP je_i [NegP t_i [IP t_i [VP t_i]]]]]

From this I conclude that C is not a Force indicator since Vs with very different morphologies raise there, but a morphological licensor of clitics, the crucial point. Furthermore, SC Imperatives can but need not be in C, just like other verbs, because the Imperative feature resides in I rather than C.

3.3. The function of C in Tobler-Mussafia and Wackernagel effects.

In the previous sections I have argued that C in B and SC is a morphological licensor in that it defines an internal domain for clitics. As a result, word order in commands is the same as in statements and questions, which is not the case in Sp. However, B and SC differ in two respects. First SC clitics are independent from I while B clitics depend on I. Second, SC clitics may follow Neg and V, while B clitics must precede V if there is a Neg. I propose that these differences derive from the ways the function C plays in licensing clitics is implemented, and I will sketch my argument for why this is so before I conclude.

I propose that in the general case clitics must meet two licensing requirements, which are reminiscent of the split ECP (Jaeggli 1982 and later work) but more closely resemble the conditions for little *pro* proposed by Rizzi (1986): the formal condition in (46a), and the identification condition in (46b). I also adopt the idea that licensing is local Chomsky (1992):

(46) *Licensing principles for clitic pronouns:*

- a. A clitic must be formally licensed by H⁰ = a head.
- b. A clitic must have its features identified by H⁰ = a head.

Let us see how Sp, B, and SC differ in relation to (46). Firstly, in languages like Sp that lack second position restrictions for clitics, I propose that the two principles in (46) are satisfied via the *same* H⁰, i.e. the inflected V which moves to I. Since H⁰ in (46a) and (46b) receives the same value in this type of language, in cases like *Lo leyó 'He read it'*, the clitic is in the checking domain of the head V in I, in the sense of Chomsky (1992), and this local relation satisfies both the formal requirement in (46a) and the identification requirement in (46b).

By contrast, languages like B and SC that have second position restrictions differ from Sp in that the two requirements in (46) are satisfied via *different* heads, and not necessarily in a checking domain. The formal licensor or the H⁰ in (46a) is the head that defines the projection containing the clitic as its internal domain, i.e. what I have been calling the morphological licensor in the above discussion. The identifier or the H⁰ in (46b) must always be the inflected V, or the head in I, since this item is the bearer of the appropriate features. Thus the H⁰ in (46a) and the one in (46b) receive different values, and this crucial difference with languages of the (modern) Sp type entails different formal relations for licensing purposes.

But, how do B and SC differ from each other? The distinction derives from principle (46a), and the value assigned to H⁰ in this condition. Principle (46b) is always invariant.

Languages like B representing the TM-type impose no conditions on the formal or morphological licensor, other than that it be the superordinate c-commanding head, but this follows from locality without stipulation. In other words, in this language clitics are in IP and the licensor for the clitic is whichever head takes IP as internal domain: M if present, Neg if M is absent, and C if M and Neg are absent. If all these heads are present, the clitic appears in other than second position in the clause, as discussed in 3.1. Given clausal structure in B, M is the formal licensor when C and Neg are present too: [CP C [NegP Neg [MP M [IP Cl [I]]]]. In other words, the value of H⁰ in (46a) is not fixed in this type of language, and must simply be whichever head takes IP as complement. As to (46b), V in I has the clitic in its checking domain in the sense of Chomsky (1992), and must serve as identifier because it carries the appropriate features. Then, no tensions arise when complying with the two requirements in (46) through local relations with two different heads: the formal licensor is the H which has the clitic in its internal domain, and the identifier is the H which has the clitic in its checking domain. The two conditions are satisfied locally, as required, and the language has no strict second position flavor, although many patterns have clitics in second position.

By contrast, languages of the W-type assign a fixed value not only to the identifier of (46b), but also to the formal licensor of (46a), and in this way differ from the TM type. The discussion in 3.2 illustrated that the morphological or formal licensor must always be C in SC, regardless

of specific content. That is, the clitic must appear in the internal domain of C in order to be formally licensed in PF. The relation between formal licenser and clitic is more rigid in SC than B, and this gives a strictly second position tone to all patterns with clitics. The identifier in (46b) must necessarily be the inflected V in I, and I have assumed that the clitic is in CleftP in order to be formally licensed. Thus, a tension may arise when meeting the two separate requirements in (46). This is because the clitic must establish local relations with both formal licenser and identifier. In affirmative patterns, this poses no particular problems, as in (44b-c) repeated below:

- (44) c. [CP Olga [C' [Co \emptyset] [CleftP nam [IP nesto [I₀dovikuje]]]]]
 d. [CP [C' [Co da] [CleftP nam [IP Olga nesto [I₀dovikuje]]]]]

Such patterns are unproblematic because the clitic bears local relations both with its formal licenser C and its identifier V in I. This is because within this analysis the clitic is in the *internal* domain of C, and has V as the head of its *internal* domain IP. This formal situation is local but different from the one between V and clitic in B, which is a checking domain relation instead. In addition, if *Olga* and *nesto* are adjuncts of IP, these two phrases fail to disturb the locality relation between the head *nam* and the V-head in I. In adopting Chomsky's definitions (1992), I assume that licensing may involve not only his notion of checking domain, but his notion of internal domain, as discussed in more detail in Rivero (1993b).

Under the outlined approach, there is no problem in (44c-d), as stated, but conflict arises in the negative patterns of type (44a-b) repeated below, because clitics will not be in a local relation with the inflected V as identifier, if the structure is as shown:

- (44) a. [CP Lica [C' [Co \emptyset] [CleftP im [NegP ne [IP [I₀ razaznaje]]]]]]]
 b. [CP Knjige [C' [Co \emptyset] [CleftP im [NegP ne [IP [I₀ čitajte]]]]]]]

Since Neg intervenes between clitic and V in I, the clitic will not have V as the head of its internal domain. This internal domain is headed by *ne*, which carries no features to identify the clitic. However, if V incorporates to Neg, locality is established: V, which carries the appropriate features to be the identifier, is now part of the complex head of the internal domain of the clitic. I have previously argued that V incorporates to Neg in SC on empirical grounds, and the theoretical reason behind this incorporation is the assumed locality of licensing relations in UG, which in SC apply both in checking and internal domains. Summarizing, the proposal that in (46a) H^o necessarily equals C in SC (as suggested in Rivero 1993: note 3) forces V and Neg to form a complex head in this language, as opposed to B. Therefore, the contrasts in clitic position between the two languages ultimately reduces

to the core aspect that distinguishes them from Sp, that is, the morphological function of C.

Summary.

The main empirical issue discussed in this paper is why Imperatives can be negated in B and SC, but not in Sp. The proposal is that the contrast is due to the different nature of the C of root clauses. In languages like Sp, C is a Force indicator, and holds the Imperative feature that the verb with distinctive imperative morphology must inflexibly reach. The negation prevents V from reaching this position. In languages like B and SC, C is a formal licenser of clitics and does not hold the Imperative feature, which is in I. As a result, once Imperatives are licensed in I like other verbs, they enjoy the same flexible syntax as those verbs, and fail to be affected by negation in the damaging way that prevents Sp Imperatives from being negated.

Subdifferences behind the Wackernagel phenomena of SC and the Tobler-Mussafia effects of B derive from the function of C as morphological or formal licenser of clitics, which distinguishes both languages from Sp.

Address of the Author:

Maria-Luisa Rivero
 Department of Linguistics
 78 Laurier East
 University of Ottawa, Ottawa
 K1N 6N5, Ontario
 Canada

References

- Baker, M. C. (1988), *Incorporation*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.
 den Besten, H. (1977), "On the interaction of Root transformations and Lexical Deletive rules", in W. Abraham, ed., *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins: 47-131.
 Borsley, R. D., M.-L. Rivero & J. Stephens (1992), "Long Head Movement in Breton", ms., University of Wales, University of Ottawa, and South Glamorgan Institute. Paper presented at the Contrastive Celtic Syntax Conference, Bangor, Wales.

- Mussafia, A. (1886), "Una particolarità sintattica della lingua italiana dei primi secoli", *Miscellanea di filologia e linguistica in memoria di N. Caix et U.A. Canello*, Florence, Le Monnier:255-261.
- Ouhalla, J. (1990), "Sentential Negation, Relativized Minimality and the Aspectual Status of Auxiliaries", *The Linguistic Review* 7:183-231.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (1989), "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP", *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:365-424.
- Postal, P. (1966), "On so-called 'Pronouns' in English", in Francis P. Dineen, ed., *Report of the 17th Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*, Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.
- Radanović Kočić, V. (1988), *The grammar of Serbo-Croatian clitics: a synchronic and diachronic perspective*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana.
- Rivero, M.-L. (1986), "Parameters in the typology of clitics in Romance and Old Spanish", *Language* 62:774-807.
- Rivero, M.-L. (1988), "The Structure of IP and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans", ms., University of Ottawa. Revised version in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2:63-120, 1994.
- Rivero, M.-L. (1991), "Long Head Movement and negation: Serbo-Croatian vs. Slovak and Czech", *The Linguistic Review* 8:319-351.
- Rivero, M.-L. (1992), "Clitic and NP Climbing in Old Spanish", in H. Campos & F. Martínez Gil, eds., *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*, Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press:241-282.
- Rivero, M.-L. (1993a), "Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian Yes-No Questions, V-raising to -li vs. Li-Hopping", *Linguistic Inquiry* 24.3:567-575.
- Rivero, M.-L. (1993b), "Finiteness and Second Position in Long Head Movement Languages: Breton and Slavic", ms., University of Ottawa.
- Rizzi, L. (1982), *Issues in Italian Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Rizzi, L. (1986), "Null objects in Italian and the theory of pro", *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:501-557.
- Rizzi, L. (1989), *Relativized Minimality*, Cambridge, Mass, MIT Press.
- Rooryck, J. (1992), "Romance enclitic ordering and Universal Grammar", *The Linguist Review* 9:219-250.
- Rouveret, A. (1992), "Clitics, morphological checking and the Wackernagel position in European Portuguese", Paper read at the Eurotyp Plenary Meeting, September 1992, San Sebastian, Spain.
- Scatton, E. A. (1984), *A Reference Grammar of Modern Bulgarian*, Columbus, Ohio, Slavica Publishers.
- Suñer, M. (1992), "V-movement and the licensing of argumental wh-phrases in Spanish", forthcoming in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.

- Bosque, I. (1992), "La negación y el principio de las categorías vacías", forthcoming in V. Demonte, ed., *Estudios de gramática española*. Special issue of the *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, XLI, 2 (1993).
- Browne, W. (1974), "On the problem of enclitic placement in Serbo-Croatian", in R.D. Brecht & C.V. Chvany, eds., *Slavic transformational syntax*, Ann Arbor:36-52.
- Browne, W. (1992), "Serbo-Croat", forthcoming in B. Comrie & G. Corbett, eds., *The Slavonic Languages*, London, Longmans.
- Cardinaletti, A. & I. Roberts. (1991), "Clause Structure and X-Second", to appear in W. Chao & G. Horrocks, eds., *Levels of Representation*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- čávar D. & C. Wilder. (1992), "Long Head Movement? Verb Movement and cliticization in Croatian", *Arbeitspapier Nr. 7*. Institut für Deutsche Sprache und Literatur II, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main.
- Chomsky, N. (1992), "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory", *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 1, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Halpern, A. L. (1992), *Topics in the placement and morphology of clitics*, Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Stanford University.
- Haverkort, M. (1993), *Clitics and Parametrization. Case Studies in the Interaction of Head Movement Phenomena*, Eurotyp Working Paper VIII, 2. European Science Foundation, Strasbourg.
- Hauge, K. R. (1976), *The word order of predicate clitics in Bulgarian*, Meddeleiser 10, Slavic-Baltic Institute, University of Oslo, Oslo.
- Ewen, R. C., (1979), *A grammar of Bulgarian clitics*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Jaeggli, O. (1982), *Topics in Romance Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Joseph, B. & I. Philippaki-Warbuton. (1987), *Modern Greek*, London, Croom Helm.
- Kayne, R. S. (1989), "Null subjects and clitic climbing" in O. Jaeggli & K. Safir, eds., *The Null Subject Parameter*, Dordrecht, Kluwer:239-261.
- Kayne, R. S. (1991a), "Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO", *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:647-686.
- Kayne, R. S. (1991b), "Italian negative infinitival imperatives and clitic climbing", Cuny Manuscript, New York.
- Kitagawa, Y. (1986), *Subjects in Japanese and English*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.
- Laka, I. (1990), *Negation in Syntax: on the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*, Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Meyer-Lübke, W. (1897), "Zur Stellung der tonlosen Objektpronomina", *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 21:313-34.

- Terzi, A. (1993), "Albanian imperatives", ms., University of Ottawa.
- Tobler, A. 1875 (=1912). Review of J. Le Coultre's *De l'ordre des mots dans Chrétien de Troyes. Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik*, Leipzig, Hirzel:395-414.
- Uriagereka, J. (1988), *On Government*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Uriagereka, J. (1992), "A Focus Position in Western Romance", Ms. University of Maryland, to appear in K.E. Kiss, ed., *Discourse Configurational Languages*.
- Wackernagel, J. (1892), "Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung", *Indogermanischen Forschungen* 1:333-436.
- Zanutini, R. (1990), "Two types of Negative Markers", *NELS* 20:517-530, Amherst, GLSA.
- Zanutini, R. (1991), *Syntactic properties of sentential negation: a comparative study of Romance languages*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, The Institute for Research in Cognitive Science, IRCS Report 91-26.