

1	Clause type and speech acts	159
2	Interrogatives and questions	161
3	Exclamatives	168
4	Imperatives and directives	170
5	Minor clause types	172

1 Clause type and speech acts

Philosophers use the term **speech acts** for things you can do with sentences of your language – things like making **statements**, asking **questions**, issuing **commands**, or uttering **exclamations**. (All of these speech acts can of course be performed with written language too.) Which of these you can do with a given sentence depends to a large extent on its syntactic form. The syntax of English distinguishes a set of **clause types** that are characteristically used to perform different kinds of speech acts. The major types are the five illustrated in [1]:

[1]	i	DECLARATIVE	<i>You are very tactful.</i>
	ii	CLOSED INTERROGATIVE	<i>Are you very tactful?</i>
	iii	OPEN INTERROGATIVE	<i>How tactful are you?</i>
	iv	EXCLAMATIVE	<i>How tactful you are!</i>
	v	IMPERATIVE	<i>Be very tactful.</i>

(See §2 below for an explanation of closed versus open interrogatives.)

Although the correspondence between these clause types and the speech acts they can be used to perform is not one-to-one, speech acts do have a characteristic correlation with clause types. We show the default correlation in [2]:

[2]	CLAUSE TYPE	CHARACTERISTIC SPEECH ACT
	i declarative	making a statement
	ii closed interrogative	asking a closed question
	iii open interrogative	asking an open question
	iv exclamative	making an exclamatory statement
	v imperative	issuing a directive

- **Directive** covers commands, instructions, requests, entreaties and the like.
- A **closed question** is one with a closed set of answers. For example, there are just two answers to the closed question *Is Sue here?* – namely *Yes, she's here* and *No, she isn't here*.
- *Where is Sue?*, by contrast, is an **open question**: the set of answers is open-ended.

The correlations in [2] could provide for general definitions of the clause types. For example, the imperative clause type can be defined as a clause construction CHARACTERISTICALLY USED TO ISSUE DIRECTIVES.

However, it's important that 'imperative' and 'directive' are terms for entirely different things, and they DO NOT ALWAYS CORRESPOND. They cannot be used as language-particular definitions. This chapter is concerned with the syntactic properties of the clause types and the way in which they line up with clause meanings and speech acts. The correlation isn't anywhere near as simple as you might have expected.

Where the correlation fails

One example in [3] shows a directive that isn't expressed by an imperative, and the other shows an imperative that doesn't express a directive:

- [3] i CLOSED INTERROGATIVE *Could you please open the door.*
 ii IMPERATIVE *Turn up late* and you'll be fired.

- Example [i] would normally be used and understood as a directive (specifically, a polite request); but it is of closed interrogative form. It's not an imperative.
- The underlined clause of [ii] has imperative form, but would not be naturally interpreted as a directive: I'm not telling you to turn up late. The whole sentence is understood as if it had a conditional adjunct: it means "If you turn up late, you'll be fired". This of course implies that you should NOT turn up late, so the sentence does the opposite of telling you to turn up late!

This shows that we have to distinguish carefully between CLAUSE TYPE and SPEECH ACT – between imperative and directive, between interrogative and question, and so on. Clause type is the major factor determining what kind of speech act will be performed, but it is not the only one.

Clause type, not sentence type

As the term makes clear, the clause types are categories of CLAUSE. In the simplest cases the terms can be applied derivatively to sentences, but in more complex cases they cannot. Consider the following examples:

- [4] i *Kim made a mistake.*
 ii *Kim made a mistake, but does it really matter?*
 iii *Do you think Kim made a mistake?*

- In [i] we have a sentence with the form of a declarative clause, so this is one of the simple cases where we could say, derivatively, that [i] is a 'declarative sentence'.

In [ii] the sentence has the form of a coordination of clauses, the first of declarative type and the second of closed interrogative type. In such cases it doesn't make sense to ask which of the five types the sentence as a whole belongs to.

In [iii] the underlined sequence of words is a declarative clause, but it is merely a part of the larger clause that forms the whole sentence. The underlined clause isn't a sentence, and therefore it's not a declarative sentence.

Clause type in main and subordinate clauses

The reason we say that *Kim made a mistake* is a declarative clause in [4iii], when it isn't a main clause and doesn't make a statement, is that essentially the same contrasts are found in subordinate clauses as in main clauses. There is one exception: imperatives are normally confined to main clauses. But the other categories are applicable to subordinate clauses too. This is illustrated in [5], where underlining marks the subordinate clauses in the [b] examples:

[5]	MAIN CLAUSE	SUBORDINATE CLAUSE
i	a. <i>It was a success.</i>	b. <i>Sue thinks <u>it was a success.</u></i>
ii	a. <i>Was it a success?</i>	b. <i>She didn't say <u>whether it was a success.</u></i>
iii	a. <i>How big a success was it?</i>	b. <i>She wants to know <u>how big a success it was.</u></i>
iv	a. <i>What a success it was!</i>	b. <i>He told me <u>what a success it was.</u></i>

This further reinforces the need to distinguish between clause type and speech acts: by saying [ib] I don't claim it was a success, by saying [iib] or [iiib] I'm not asking questions about its success, and by uttering [ivb] I'm not making an exclamation about how successful it was.

In this chapter, though, we'll confine our attention to main clauses; clause type in subordinate clauses is dealt with in Ch. 10.

Declarative as the default clause type

The declarative type can be regarded as the default clause type – the type that all canonical clauses belong to. Declaratives simply lack the special syntactic properties of the other clause types. In this chapter, then, we can focus on the **non-declarative** clause types: closed and open **interrogatives** (§2), **exclamatives** (§3); and **imperatives** (§4), with a few other minor types illustrated in §5.

2 Interrogatives and questions

We've mentioned interrogative clauses in earlier chapters without drawing the distinction between the types that we now call **closed** and **open**. The syntactic structure of the two is significantly different.

The terms 'closed' and 'open'

These terms apply in the first instance to questions. As noted above, a **closed question** like *Is Sue here?* has just two answers, whereas an **open question** like *Where*

is Sue? has an open-ended set of answers. The terms are then applied derivatively to interrogatives: **closed interrogatives** and **open interrogatives** are clause types characteristically used to ask closed and open questions respectively.

Note that we distinguish between an **answer** to a question and a **response** to it. A response is whatever someone says as a result of being asked some question. I might ask: *Is Sue here?*, and you might say *I'm not sure*. That would be a response, but not an answer. It was a closed question, and it has only two answers: *Yes* or *No*. (Lawyers often have to remind witnesses about this.) If I ask: *Where is Sue?*, I've asked an open question whose answer will give the location of Sue, but again, if you said: *Why do you ask?*, that would be a response, not an answer to my question.

2.1 The form of closed interrogatives

Closed interrogative form is marked by subject–auxiliary inversion: the subject occurs after the auxiliary verb, as in the [b] members of the pairs in [6].

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|
| [6] | DECLARATIVE | CLOSED INTERROGATIVE |
| i | a. <i>It is raining.</i> | b. <i>Is it raining?</i> |
| ii | a. <i>He can't swim.</i> | b. <i>Can't he swim?</i> |
| iii | a. <i>The doctor recommended it.</i> | b. <i>Did the doctor recommend it?</i> |

In [i–ii] the closed interrogative differs from its declarative counterpart by having subject and auxiliary verb in the reverse order.

If, as in [iiia], the declarative does not contain an auxiliary, the dummy auxiliary *do* appears in the interrogative, as described in Ch. 3, §3.1.

Closed interrogatives vs other subject–auxiliary inversion clauses

Inversion is not restricted to closed interrogatives, but elsewhere it normally occurs only when certain kinds of element occupy initial position in the clause, as in [7]:

- | | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| [7] | i <i>Never had I seen her so furious.</i> | } [declarative] |
| | ii <i>Jill approved of it and [<u>so</u> did her husband].</i> | |
| | iii <i>Why are you looking at me like that?</i> | [open interrogative] |

In [i] and [ii], belonging to the default declarative category, the inversion is triggered by the occurrence in initial position of a negative element (*never*) and a connective (*so*).

In [iii] the inversion is triggered by the initial interrogative element *why*, a marker of the open interrogative type.

Rising intonation as a marker of questions

A closed question can be signalled by means of a rise in the **intonation** (represented by '↗') instead of by a different syntactic form:

- | | |
|-----|---|
| [8] | i <i>You're sure you can afford it? ↗</i> |
| | ii <i>So they offered her \$50 but she refused? ↗</i> |

These are closed QUESTIONS, but they are not closed INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES. Use of intonation to mark a question does not change syntactic clause type. This is evident from examples like [ii]. We saw above that clause type applies specifically to clauses, but here we have a coordination of clauses, and the rising intonation gives a question meaning to the coordination as a whole, not the individual clauses. The answers are *Yes, they offered her \$50 but she refused* and *No, it's not the case that they offered her \$50 but she refused*. The two clauses are declaratives, but INTONATION OVERRIDES CLAUSE TYPE in determining what kind of speech act is performed. As we pointed out in §1, clause type is the major factor in determining what kind of speech act is performed, but it isn't the only one. Intonation is one of the additional factors.

2.2 Polar questions and alternative questions

There are two kinds of closed question, depending on how the answers are derivable from the question: **polar** questions and **alternative** questions.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----|----------------------|---|--|
| [9] | i | a. | POLAR QUESTION | { | <i>Did he read her note?</i> |
| | | b. | | } | <i>Didn't he read her note?</i> |
| | ii | a. | ALTERNATIVE QUESTION | { | <i>Is the meeting today, tomorrow, or next Monday?</i> |
| | | b. | | } | <i>Is the Kensington Runestone genuine, or is it a hoax?</i> |

(a) Polar questions

In a **polar question** one answer is derivable directly from the question itself, while the other is its polar opposite, i.e. its negative or positive counterpart.

In [ia] one answer is *Yes, he read it*, and the other is its negation: *No, he didn't read it*.

These are also the answers to [ib], but here it's the negative answer, *No, he didn't read it*, that is derivable directly from the question itself.

(b) Alternative questions

An **alternative question** contains a coordination of elements linked by *or*, and the answers derive from the separate coordinated elements.

In [iia] there are thus three answers: *It is today*; *It is tomorrow*; and *It is next Monday*.

Similarly in [iib] there are two answers: *It is genuine*, and *It is a hoax*.

Note that the *or* in [9iib] joins whole clauses, so it's not a marker of a distinct clause type. What we have is a coordination of TWO CLOSED INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES expressing A SINGLE ALTERNATIVE QUESTION.

While an *or*-coordination is an essential component of an alternative question, it's possible to have an *or*-coordination in other kinds of speech act, which means

that an *or*-coordination may occur coincidentally in a polar question. However, we can tell them apart because of an intonation difference, as seen in [10]:

- [10] i *Do you want me to give it to mum ↗ or dad ↘?* [alternative question]
 ii *Do you want me to give it to mum or dad ↗?* [polar question]

The arrows indicate the main direction of the intonation towards the end.

Version [i], with rising intonation on *mum* and falling intonation on *dad*, is an alternative question: I take it for granted that you want me to give it to one parent, and ask which one. The answers are thus *I want you to give it to mum* and *I want you to give it to dad*.

Version [ii] does not have a separate intonational rise on *mum*, but has a rise at the end. It is a polar question, with the answers *Yes, I want you to give it to mum or dad* and *No, I don't want you to give it to mum or dad*.

2.3 Interrogative tags

A special case of the closed interrogative is in the **interrogative tags** that are appended to some clauses, usually declaratives:

- [11] i *Your brother looked pretty embarrassed, didn't he?*
 ii *We haven't done anything wrong, have we?*

The tags here are closed interrogatives reduced to just an auxiliary verb and a pronoun subject. Everything else is left implicit, because it's recoverable from the preceding clause.

As noted in Ch. 8, §1, the most usual construction has a **reversed polarity tag**: the polarity of the tag is the reverse of that of the first clause.

In [i], for example, the declarative is positive and the tag negative.

In [ii], by contrast, the declarative is negative and the tag positive.

Such tags express a need for confirmation of the statement expressed in the declarative.

2.4 The form of open interrogatives

Open interrogatives are marked by the presence of one (or more) of the interrogative words given in [12]:

- [12] *who whom whose what which when where why how*

Interrogative phrases and their position

The interrogative word, alone or in combination with other words such as the head noun in *what books* or *which version*, forms an **interrogative phrase**. This can have a variety of functions in the clause, such as subject, object, predicative complement, and so on.

The important syntactic distinction is between subjects and non-subjects. Non-subjects are usually **fronted**. That is, they are placed before the subject, rather than later, where non-subject elements in canonical clauses would go.

- | | | | | |
|------|-----|-------------|--|---------------|
| [13] | i | SUBJECT | <u>Who</u> called the police? | |
| | ii | | { <u>Which version</u> did they recommend? } | [fronted] |
| | iii | NON-SUBJECT | | |
| | iv | | And after that they went <u>where</u> ? | [not fronted] |

In [i], the interrogative phrase *who* is subject. It's in the usual subject position, before the predicator.

In [ii], *which version* is object of *recommend*, and in [iii], *what* is predicative complement. They are non-subjects. They occur fronted, and the fronting is accompanied by obligatory subject–auxiliary inversion.

In [iv], *where* is a locative complement, i.e., a non-subject. It is not fronted, though. It occurs in the position where you'd expect a locative PP to be in a canonical clause.

The last construction is restricted to contexts that typically involve sustained questioning: in court, or in quizzes or game shows (*Tirana is the capital of which European country?*). In other contexts, non-subject interrogative phrases are normally fronted.

Case

Who, *whom* and *whose* are respectively nominative, accusative and genitive forms of the pronoun *who*. The choice between *who* and *whom* – like the choice between nominative and accusative forms of the personal pronouns (Ch. 5, §8.3) – depends on two factors: **function** and **style level**. The style factor, however, applies differently than it does with the personal pronouns. With the personal pronouns the accusative form is used in certain constructions as a less formal variant of the nominative. With *who*, things are the other way round: it's the nominative form that is less formal. Compare [14] with [55] of Ch. 5:

- | | | | |
|------|-----|--|--|
| [14] | i | <u>Who</u> wrote the editorial? | [subject: nominative] |
| | ii | <u>Whom</u> / <u>Who</u> did Kim meet in Paris? | [object of verb: accusative or nominative] |
| | iii | a. <u>To whom</u> / * <u>To who</u> is he talking? | [object of prep: accusative or nominative] |
| | | b. <u>Whom</u> / <u>Who</u> is he talking to? | |
| | iv | <u>Who</u> was she? | [PC: nominative] |

When the pronoun is subject of a finite clause it again appears in the nominative, as in [i], but this is the only place where *who* follows the pattern of the personal pronouns.

When it is object of the verb, as in [ii], both cases are found, but *whom* is formal; *who* is preferred in conversational spoken English by most people.

When the pronoun is object of a preposition we need to distinguish between the two constructions discussed in Ch. 7, §5.

- In [iiia] the preposition is fronted with *who* and forms part of the interrogative phrase. This is quite formal, and normally requires accusative *whom*.

- In [iiib] the preposition is stranded (and hence not part of the interrogative phrase). This is very much more common except in formal style, and strongly favours *who*.

When fronted *who* is a predicative complement it is always nominative, as in [iv].

Multiple interrogative phrases

It is possible to have more than one interrogative phrase in a clause; but only one can be fronted:

- [15] i Who went where?
 ii How much did you give to whom?

2.5 Open questions and their answers

We've said that open interrogatives are characteristically used to express open questions – questions with an open-ended set of answers, derivable from the questions by replacing the interrogative phrases by appropriate non-interrogative ones which we'll call **replacement phrases**. Thus possible answers to the questions in [13] are given in [16] (the replacement phrase is underlined):

- [16] i Her father called the police.
 ii They recommended the most recent version.
 iii They are microscopes.
 iv And after that they went home.

Very often the answer is reduced to JUST THE REPLACEMENT PHRASE, since the rest is recoverable from the question without alteration.

Appropriate replacements

What counts as an appropriate replacement phrase depends on the interrogative phrase, especially on the particular interrogative word it contains. Here are some very simple cases where the interrogative word is head of the interrogative phrase:

Who and *whom* need replacements denoting **personal** entities – humans, or sometimes animals and robots (*Who is that bone for? – Rex*).

Whose is personal too, but needs a genitive replacement (*Whose is this bike? – Mary's*).

What is **non-personal** (*What was he wearing? – A suit*), but when it's a predicative complement its replacement can be an indication of occupation, religion, etc. (*What is Jill? – She's a Catholic*).

When, *where* and *why* call for replacements denoting times, places and reasons, respectively (*When did they leave? – Yesterday*; *Where are you going? – To the bank*; *Why are you late? – Because I missed my flight*).

When *how* is an adverb in adjunct function it generally questions manner or means (*How did you fix it? – By changing the battery*; *How did you sleep? – Very well*).

How can also be an adjective, functioning as predicative complement. Here it permits a fairly small range of answers, typically indicating state of health or evaluation (*How are you?* – *Very well*; *How was the concert?* – *Excellent*).

There are also cases where the interrogative word is a dependent:

When *what* and *which* function as determiner in NP structure, the replacements must be consistent with the head noun. So *What video shall we get?* and *Which video shall we get?* need replacements referring to a video. (The difference between *what* and *which* is that the latter implies selection from some definite set; in the example given, *which* suggests prior mention of a number of videos, with the question asking for a choice between them.)

How can function as degree modifier of adjectives, determinatives or adverbs, and the replacement must have the right sort of meaning to fit the function: *How wide is it?* – *Two inches* (or *Two inches wide*); *How many copies do you need?* – *Fifteen*; *How fast were they going?* – *About fifty miles an hour*.

2.6 Information questions and direction questions

In all the questions considered so far, the answers have been statements. We call these **information questions**. There's also a less frequent type of question, **direction questions**, whose answers are directives. The questions in the [a] examples in [17] are closed (polar), those in the [b] ones open.

[17]	i	INFORMATION QUESTION	POSSIBLE ANSWER (STATEMENT)
	a.	<i>Did you open the window?</i>	<i>Yes, I did.</i>
	b.	<i>What did you give her?</i>	<i>I gave her a CD.</i>
	ii	DIRECTION QUESTION	POSSIBLE ANSWER (DIRECTIVE)
	a.	<i>Shall I open the window?</i>	<i>Yes, please do.</i>
	b.	<i>What shall we give her?</i>	<i>Let's give her a CD.</i>

2.7 Echo questions

One distinctive type of (information) question is the **echo question**, uttered in response to a preceding utterance which we call the **stimulus**:

[18]	STIMULUS	ECHO QUESTION	
	i A: <i>She wrote to the minister.</i>	B: <i>She wrote to the minister?</i>	[closed (polar)]
	ii A: <i>He invited Arthur.</i>	B: <i>He invited who?</i>	[open]

Echo questions serve to check or clarify a stimulus that wasn't clearly perceived or was surprising. They can be closed or open. Closed echo questions are usually of the polar type.

A polar echo typically repeats the stimulus in full or in reduced form and has sharply rising intonation; it's used to check whether I correctly heard what you said (or meant to say).

An open echo repeats the stimulus with a question word substituted for part of it – the part that’s specifically in need of confirmation or clarification. The echo question word is never fronted: it occupies the same position as the part of the stimulus that it substitutes for.

3 Exclamatives

3.1 The structure of exclamative clauses

Exclamative clauses are marked by an exclamative phrase containing *what* or *how*. Again, this phrase may have a range of functions, the major distinction again being between subject and non-subject. An exclamative subject occupies its basic position, whereas an exclamative non-subject is obligatorily fronted:

- | | | | |
|------|-----|-------------|--|
| [19] | i | SUBJECT | <i>What unpleasant people work in this restaurant!</i> |
| | ii | | { <i>How clever you are!</i> |
| | iii | NON-SUBJECT | |

When a non-subject is fronted the subject itself usually precedes the verb, as in [ii]. It is possible to have subject–auxiliary inversion, as in [iii], but this is much less likely than the uninverted *What a disaster it would be if they were to appoint his son!*

Exclamatives and exclamations

There are many ways of conveying **exclamatory meaning** besides using exclamative clause type. Compare, for example:

- | | | | |
|------|-----|--|---|
| [20] | i | a. <i>Get the hell out of here.</i> | b. <i>What the hell are you doing?</i> |
| | ii | a. <i>Look at that fantastic sunset!</i> | b. <i>Who saw that fantastic sunset?</i> |
| | iii | a. <i>Don't be so pathetically stupid.</i> | b. <i>Why are you so pathetically stupid?</i> |

The exclamatory meaning is expressed here by *the hell* in [i], *fantastic* [ii], and *so pathetically* in [iii], but these are independent of clause type. They combine with imperative structure in the [a] examples and with open interrogatives in the [b] ones. *What* and *how* in [19], by contrast, are restricted to the particular clause type we call exclamative. Note, for example, the impossibility of inserting them in imperatives or open interrogatives:

- | | | | | |
|------|----|---------------------------------|----|------------------------------------|
| [21] | a. | <i>*Don't be what a tyrant.</i> | b. | <i>*Why are you what a tyrant?</i> |
|------|----|---------------------------------|----|------------------------------------|

That’s why we originally gave the characteristic use of exclamatives (in [2]) as making an **exclamatory statement**, rather than simply an exclamation.

3.2 Exclamative *what* and *how*

What and *how* occur in either exclamative or open interrogative clauses, but with some differences in grammar and meaning.

(a) *What*

Exclamative *what* has the syntax of an **adjective**. It always occurs in NPs with a following head, and can never be a pronoun like the interrogative pronoun *what* (as in *What was that?*). The difference between exclamative *what* and interrogative *what* is clearest in count singular NPs, where exclamative *what* precedes the indefinite article *a*. Compare:

[22]		EXCLAMATIVE	INTERROGATIVE
	i a. COUNT SING	<u>What a car</u> that was!	b. <u>What car</u> was that?
	ii a. PLURAL	<u>What sights</u> we saw!	b. <u>What sights</u> did we see?
	iii a. NON-COUNT	<u>What talent</u> she had!	b. <u>What talent</u> did she have?

In [i], where singular *car* has a count interpretation, we see an overt difference between exclamative *what a car* (with *a* as determiner, and *what* as external modifier) and interrogative *what car* (with *what* as determiner). In [ii–iii] the exclamative and interrogative phrases are alike, but we still have the same meaning difference as in [i].

Interrogative *what* questions identity: answers to the [b] questions will identify the relevant car, sights and talent.

Exclamative *what* is concerned with quality or degree: a remarkable car, remarkable sights, remarkable talent.

(b) *How*

Exclamative *how* is invariably an adverb: it has no use comparable to the interrogative predicative adjective *how* of *How was the concert?*, etc. Exclamative and interrogative uses of adverbial *how* are contrasted in [23]:

[23]	EXCLAMATIVE	INTERROGATIVE
	i a. <u>How old</u> he is!	b. <u>How old</u> is he?
	ii a. <u>How</u> they deceived us!	b. <u>How</u> did they deceive us?

In [i], the adverb *how* is a degree modifier in AdjP structure. The exclamative use in [ia] indicates a notably high degree – it comments on his being amazingly old. The interrogative use in [ib] merely asks what his age is (he may be very young). In [ii], *how* is an adjunct in clause structure, but of two different semantic types. The exclamative use in [iia] suggests some really major deception. The interrogative use in [iib] merely questions the manner (it means “In what way did they deceive us?”).

4 Imperatives and directives

4.1 The form of imperative clauses

The major syntactic features distinguishing imperative clauses from declaratives are as stated in [24]. Examples are given in [25].

- [24] i A 2nd person subject is omissible.
 ii The verb is in the plain form.
 iii Auxiliary *do* is required in verbal negation even with *be*.

[25]	DECLARATIVE	IMPERATIVE
i	a. <i>You told her the truth.</i>	b. <i>Tell her the truth.</i>
ii	a. <i>You are more tolerant.</i>	b. <i>Be more tolerant.</i>
iii	a. <i>Everybody follows me.</i>	b. <i>Everybody follow me.</i>
iv	a. <i>You aren't impetuous.</i>	b. <i>Don't be impetuous.</i>

In [ia] the subject is obligatory, whereas [ib] illustrates the usual form of imperatives, with the subject *you* understood. It's possible to include *you* (*You tell her the truth!*), but this is much less common.

Examples [ii] and [iii] show the verb-form difference: *are* and *follows* are present tense forms; *be* and *follow* are plain forms. As we noted in Ch. 3, §1.2, plain present tense forms and plain forms are nearly always the same; as a result, the verb in an imperative is distinct from that of a present tense declarative in just two cases: with the verb *be* as in [ii], and with a 3rd person singular subject, like the *everybody* of [iii].

In [iv] we see the difference with respect to auxiliary *do*: it's not permitted in the declarative version but it's required in the imperative.

4.2 First person imperatives

Most imperative clauses have a 2nd person subject, either overtly expressed as *you* or understood that way. In some cases 3rd person subjects are found, like *everybody* in [25iii] (it means "everybody among you"). But there is also a distinct subtype of imperative construction understood as **1st person plural**. It is marked by a specialised use of the verb *let*, differing from the ordinary verb *let* ("allow") in four ways:

[26]	ORDINARY LET	1ST PERSON IMPERATIVE LET
i	a. <i>They let us have our ball back.</i>	b. <i>Let's get our ball back.</i>
ii	a. <i>He didn't let us attend the meeting.</i>	b. <i>Don't let's attend the meeting.</i>
iii	a. <i>He let us not attend the meeting.</i>	b. <i>Let's not attend the meeting.</i>

The specialised *let* CANNOT HAVE A SUBJECT (cf. **You let's get our ball back*). It's the verb FOLLOWING *let* that is understood with a 1st person plural subject.

There's a clear meaning difference between [iia] and [iiaa]: [iia] means "He refused us permission to attend" (*let* is WITHIN the scope of negation), while

[iia] means “He gave us permission to stay away” (*let* is OUTSIDE the scope of negation). There’s no such difference between [iib] and [iib]: *let* is just a marker of the construction, with no independent meaning, so the question of whether or not it falls within the scope of the negation doesn’t arise.

Specialised *let* allows **reduction** to ’s for the pronoun *us* (in fact it’s almost always reduced; spelling it out as *us* is very formal style). This is not possible with ordinary *let*.

Normally *us* can refer to either you and me or me and someone else (see Ch. 5, §8.2). But in 1st person imperatives the *us* (or ’s) is always understood as INCLUSIVE OF THE ADDRESSEE(S): in [ib], for example, it’s a matter of me and you getting our ball back.

4.3 Uses of the imperative

(a) Imperatives as directives

Issuing directives is the characteristic use of imperatives. Directives include a wide range of more specific types of speech act:

[27]	i ORDERS:	<i>Stand up. Keep off the grass. Get out of my way. Take aim!</i>
	ii REQUESTS:	<i>Please pass the salt. Kindly tell Sir Randolph we’re here.</i>
	iii INSTRUCTIONS:	<i>Shake well before using. Press TUNE MODE and select ‘Manual’.</i>
	iv ADVICE:	<i>Sell now while prices are high. Watch your step.</i>
	v INVITATIONS:	<i>Come and have lunch. Step this way. Feel free to contact me.</i>
	vi PERMISSIONS:	<i>Come in. Make yourself at home. Take as many as you need.</i>

What kind of directive an utterance is understood to issue will depend on such factors as context and tone of voice, though there are some linguistic devices that serve to distinguish requests from orders, such as *please* and *kindly* in [ii].

(b) Imperatives as wishes

Imperatives can be used to express certain kinds of wish:

[28] *Sleep well. Have a great week-end. Get well soon.*

These differ from directives in that the situations concerned are generally not regarded as being under your control. I’m not instructing you to sleep well, have a great weekend, recover: I’m expressing a hope. This usage is restricted to a quite narrow range of situations like being comfortable, having fun, getting well.

(c) Imperatives as conditions

[29] i *Invite one without the other* and there’ll be trouble.
 ii *Help me this once* and I’ll never ask you again.

Here the imperative clauses (underlined) are the first element in a coordination construction that has a conditional interpretation: “If you invite one without the other, there’ll be trouble”, “If you help me this once I’ll never ask you again”. The second element in the coordination indicates the consequence of fulfilling the condition

that is indirectly expressed in the imperative. The interpretation of the whole depends on whether the consequence is assumed to be undesirable or desirable.

In [i], trouble is undesirable, so you certainly won't take the imperative as a directive. In [ii], however, the consequence (my never asking you for help again) is desirable, so the imperative retains its force as a request.

4.4 Non-imperative directives

The imperative construction can be used for various kinds of directive, both telling (where I expect compliance) and asking (where you may decline). But other clause types are often used to make the speaker's intentions somewhat clearer.

(a) Interrogatives as directives

It is particularly common for closed interrogatives to be used for requests:

- [30] i *Will you feed the cat.*
 ii *Could you help me with the washing-up.*
 iii *Would you mind turning your radio down a little.*

In many contexts directives of this form are considered more polite than imperatives.

(b) Declaratives as directives

- [31] i *I order/beg you to leave while there's still time.*
 ii *You will drive her to the airport and then report back to me.*
 iii *I want you to mow the lawn this week-end.*

In [i] the verbs *order* and *beg* denote speech acts and hence make explicit what kind of directive is intended: an order or an entreaty.

In [ii] I'm telling you what you will be doing, but since the situation is under your control (you're the driver), in effect I'm giving you an order, though indirectly and implicitly.

In [iii] I'm saying what I want you to do, and in a context where I have some relevant kind of authority or control over you I am indirectly or implicitly telling you to do it.

5 Minor clause types

Most main clauses fall into one or other of the five clause types listed in [1] at the beginning of this chapter. But there are a few other minor patterns, mostly involving fixed formulae or fragmentary structures. The following is a small sample, the examples in [i] being main clause subjunctives, as mentioned in Ch. 3, §2:

- [32] i *Long live the Queen. Suffice it to say that the matter is being investigated. So be it. God help you if you do this again. God bless America.*
 ii *May you be forgiven. Would to God I had never heard of Enron.*
 iii *Out of my way! Off with his head! Hands up! Into the bin with it!*
 iv *The more the merrier. No pain, no gain. Out of sight, out of mind.*