

# (Coordinated) non-canonical imperatives

Ksenia Zanon

University of Cambridge, kz292@cam.ac.uk

Under investigation is the construction in (1), which consists of two coordinated perfective verbs appearing in the non-agreeing 2.SG imperative form. Per existing descriptions, this *take.IMP-℘-V.IMP* (dubbed “dramatic/ narrative” imperative) is specialized for encoding **past** sudden, “out of the blue”, events – the actions that are unexpected or inappropriate. Investigators point out its “expressive” component, its register (colloquial), and its specialized function (used in narratives) (Daiber 2009, Fortuin 2008, a.o.). Some of these claims will be challenged. The first conjunct (i.e., *voz'mi*) may be dropped, in which case, the second one has a strong preference to be preceded by *i*.

- (1) A Pozner *voz'mi* (da / <da i> / <i>) brjakni v svoem šou, čto ...  
and Pozner *take.PF.IMP* [DA] / [DA and] / [and] blab.PF.IMP in self's show that ...  
'And Pozner (unexpectedly) blabbed in his show that it is necessary...' (web)

Constructions like (1) fall within the purview of “pseudo-coordination” (PC), where the first element (typically, a verb of movement or position) is semantically bleached or grammaticalized (Biberauer & Vikner 2017, Ross 2021 and ref. therein). For instance, *went* in “*He went and died on me*” does not supply any motion component and hence does not entail a transition to a new physical location. This single-event interpretation in PC contexts motivated various monoclausal analyses, under which the first element is merged in some functional projection above *vP* (e.g., Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001). This project pursues two related objectives: (i) to provide a synchronic explanation of certain idiosyncrasies of Russian PC with “narrative” imperatives (NIs); and (ii) to explicate the route of NI's emergence.

The central claim is that these narrative imperatives ‘borrow’ the (functionally deficient) structure of conventional imperatives with the concomitant loss of the directive force. A retrofit of this sort is motivated by diachronic considerations (the obsolescence of aorist). On the matter of pseudo-coordination proper, I argue for a monoclausal structure with conjuncts introduced at the aspectual level. Centered in this discussion is the status of the bleached conjunct (in narrative and finite contexts alike), reckoned to be a deverbalized element which supplies the meaning that the event encoded by the second conjunct is unexpected.

## References:

- BIBERAUER, T. & VIKNER, S. (2017) Having the edge: A new perspective on pseudo-coordination in Danish and Afrikaans. A Schrift to Fest Kyle Johnson, 77-90. CARDINALETTI, A. & GIUSTI, G. (2001). Semi-lexical motion verbs in Romance and Germanic. *Semi-lexical categories: The function of content words and the content of function words*, 371-414. DAIBER, T. (2009) Metaphorical use of the Russian imperative. *Russian linguistics* 33(1): 11–35. FORTUIN, E. (2008) Polisemija imperativa v russkomazyke. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1: 3–24. HAN, C. H. (2000). *The structure and interpretation of imperatives: Mood and force in universal grammar*. Psychology Press. ROSS, D. (2021) Pseudocoordination, Serial Verb Constructions and Multi-Verb Predicates, Ph.D. diss, University of Illinois.