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Goals:
1. Establish the main morphosyntactic properties of negative imperatives in CQ.
2. Provide an outline of an Agree-based analysis of negative imperatives in CQ.

I. Negative imperatives in CQ
CQ distinguishes between two different negative heads in indicative (1) a, b. and imperative (2) a, b. sentences:

Negative Declarative
   “You do not cry.”
   b. **Mana-m** papa-ta-chu
   Neg-FOC.EVID potato-NEG.FOC
   miku-chka-nki/nkichik.
   eat-PROG-2.S/2PL
   “You do not eat POTATOES.”
1 1S, 1PL (incl, excl)
2 2S, 2PL
3 3S, 3PL
There is no subjunctive in CQ

Negative Imperative
(2) a. **Ama** waqa-y/ykichik-chu.2
   NEG cry-IMP.SG/PL-NEG.FOC
   “Do not cry.”
   b. **Ama** papa-ta-chu miku-y/ykichik.
   NEG potato-NEG.FOC eat-IMP.SG/PL
   “Do not eat POTATOES.”
2 No other inflectional forms.

Morphosyntactic properties of negative declaratives and imperatives in Cuzco Quechua

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal head negation</th>
<th>Inflection</th>
<th>Neg. concord/Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Declarative</td>
<td><strong>Mana</strong></td>
<td>1S, 1PL (incl, excl)</td>
<td>- Sentence level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2S, 2PL</td>
<td>- Constituent level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Imperative</td>
<td><strong>Ama</strong></td>
<td>2S, 2PL (or addressee sg, pl)</td>
<td>- Sentence level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(or addressee sg, pl)</td>
<td>- Constituent level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main properties of imperatives (Alcazar and Saltarelli 2014):
1. Subject is addressee of speech act. √
2. Unmarked for tense (Zanuttini 1996). √
3. Resistance to embedding. √
4. Lack of a finite phrase √
5. Resistance to negation. ?

(3) a. *Paykuna / *Qayna p’unchay hamu-y/ykichis!
   They/Yesterday/come-IMP.S/PL
   “They/Yesterday come!”
   Come-IMP-ACC tell-PST.REP-3.PL
   “They told us to come.”
   c. Hamu-y-ta muna-ni.
   Come-INF-ACC want-1.SG
   “I want to come (here).”
(4) *Mana-m/Ama hamu-y-chu.
   NEG-FOC.EV/NEG come-IMP.S-FOC
   “Do not come.
II. The ban on “True Negative Imperatives”? (TNI)
In Romance language imperatives a different verb form emerges under negation:

(5) a. Le-e Read
     b. No le-as \textit{Surrogate Imp}
        \textit{NEG read-SUBJ}
        “Don’t read”

Languages like Spanish and Italian impose a ban on TNI.

Previous accounts:
\textit{a. V-to-C is blocked by Neg} (Rivero and Terzi 1995). In languages like Spanish and Modern Greek imperative verbs must raise to C⁰. Neg head blocks raising and a surrogate imperative verb form is needed:

(6) \textit{[CP C } [\textit{NegP Neg [IP V]}]}

\textit{b. Head vs. adjuncts} (Zanuttini 1996)

(6) *Non telefon-a! \textit{(Head negation)}
    \textit{NEG telephone-IMP.2.S}
    “Don't call!”

(7) Non telefon-are! \textit{Surrogate Imp}
    \textit{NEG telephone-NFIN}
    “Don’t call!”
    (Zanuttini 1996: 188)

(8) Parla nen! \textit{(Adjunct negation)}
    Talk-2.S \textit{NEG}
    Don’t talk! (Zanuttini 1996:189)

Head negation requires tense. Imperatives lack tense.

\textit{c. A negative marker that can negate a clause by itself bans TNI’s} (Zanuttini 1997). See (6) and (7) above vs. French:

(9) N’ all-ez pas
    \textit{Neg go-IMP.2 neg}
    “Don’t go”

In Italian, there are two homophonous Neg heads; one subcategorizes for indicative and the other for MoodP:

(10) \textit{[NegP non-1 [MoodP ... [ VP ]]}}

Imperative verbs in Italian are morphologically defective. They lack a [MOOD] feature and therefore they are banned under Neg.

\textit{b. Imperative Op > Negative Op} (Han 2001, Zeijlstra 2006). In Romance languages there is V_{IMP}-to-Neg-to-C leaving the Op Imp in the scope of negation. I will assume:

(11) Op Imp > Neg Op
III. True Negative Imperatives in CQ

a. There is no V-to-C in imperatives. CQ is an SOV language with no evidence of V-movement (Sánchez 2010).

(12) **Ama** papa-ta miku-y-chu.
    NEG potato-ACC eat-IMP.SG-NEG.FOC
    “Do not eat potatoes.”

b. Both Negs behave like heads. *Ama* and *mana* block impressive and emotive suffixes on the verb/predicate:

    NEG that-NEG-IMPR! That-IMPR that-TOP
    ka-n-pis.
    be-3.S-ADD
    ’It is not like that, it is like this’

b. Mana-má hina-chu! Khayna-ma chay-qa
    NEG-IMPR that-NEG! That-IMPR that-TOP
    ka-n-pis.
    be-3.S-ADD
    ’It is not like that, it is like this’
    (Cusihuaman 1976/2001: 231-232)

(14) a. *Ama* phiña-ku-y-ña-chu-ýá
    NEG.IMP.ADDR upset-REFL-IMP-DIS-FOC-EM
    “Please do not get upset.”

b. Ama-ýá phiña-ku-y-ña-chu.
    NEG.-IMP.ADDR-EM upset-REFL-IMP-DIS-FOC
    “Please do not get upset.”

_Emotive suffixes –má, –ýá_ (Cusihumán 1971/1996) are the spell out of a left peripheral Evaluative Mood head (Cinque 1999) located between Speech Act and Force P shows that in order to avoid the blocking effects of negation these suffixes must be spelled out on the Neg head in both cases (Sanchez 2010) as shown for _ama_ in (14) a and b.
Neg blocks agree between Ev Mood and a lower constituent.

Negation has blocking effects for agree between heads above Focus and constituents below NegP.

(i) Syncretic morphemes
–chu is syncretic and can be multiply specified for focus, interrogative in yes/no questions and negative concord.

(16) Hamu-nki.
Come-2.SG
“You come/you are coming.”
(17) Hamu-nki-chu
Come-2.S-INT.FOC
“Are you coming?”
(18) Manahamu-nki-chu
NEG.DECLcome-2.SG-NEG.FOC
“You are not coming”
(19) *Manahamu-nki-chu
NEG.INTcome-2.SG-INT.NEG.FOC
“Are you not coming?”
(20) Mana-chuhamu-nki
NEG.INT-FOCcome-2.SG
“Are you not coming”

(ii) Declarative is the default value in Force P.

(21)
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{INT FocusP} \\
\text{Focus} & \text{NegP} \\
\text{Mana-(chu) TP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{hamu-nki-(chu)}
\end{array}
\]

Negation blocks Agree between heads above Focus P such as Force P or Evaluative Mood P and constituents below Neg P (Sánchez 2010). This provides support for the fact that both mana and ama behave similarly with respect to their properties as Neg heads.

c. Neither mana nor ama can negate a clause without –chu.

(22) *Ama
hamu-y!
NEG.ADD.IMPcome-IMP
“Don’t come”
(23) *Mana-m hamu-nki.
   NEG-FOC.EVID come-2.SG
   “You don’t come.”

Accounts a-c for the ban on TNI have focused on surrogate verb forms in verb raising languages:

a. V-to-C is blocked by Neg in languages that ban TNI.
b. Only adjunct Neg license TNIs.
c. A negative marker that can negate a clause by itself bans TNI.

In CQ: there is not V-to-C movement, Neg words cannot negate a clause by themselves but both Neg words (ama and mana) are heads and should therefore not be able to license TNIs.

CQ, negative imperatives require a different NEG head but all imperatives have the same verb morphology. Why?

IV. Current proposal

Sánchez (2010) proposed that -chu is the syncratic spell out of an agree relation between the Neg (mana) and Focus heads and the projection in the scope of negation (Sánchez 2010).

(24) [ForceP [NegP mana] [VP ... -chu]]

In imperatives Agree between a different lexical head for Neg (ama) and the constituent in the scope of negation is also spelled out as -chu. Ama is itself a syncretic morpheme: the spell out of Neg features in NegP, +Imperative in Force P, and [+Addressee] in Speech Act. Mana is the spell out of [-Imperative] in Force P and Neg.

(25) [Speech Act +Add [ForceP IMP Foc NegP ama]
   [+Addressee, IMP, Neg]
   [VP ... -chu]]

(26) [ForceP -IMP Foc NegP mana]
   [-IMP, Neg]
   [VP ... -chu]]

(27) Speech Act > Evaluative Mood > Force P > Focus P > Negative P > TP > Verb P

\[\text{While Ancient Greek has two negation heads, their distribution is not declarative vs. imperative (see Rivero and Terzi 1995).}
4 For an alternative analysis of Imperatives as involving Jussive Phrase see (Zanuttini, Pak and Portner 2012).\]
V. Restriction on mana
Support for this proposal comes from the fact while both negative words are heads, they differ crucially with respect to their ability to free choice any in some contexts. CQ has some indefinite roots that appear as wh-words or as polarity items:

Wh- questions
(28) Ima-ta-m  muna-nki?
INDEF-ACC-FOC  want-2.S
“What do you want.”

Free choice any
(29) Ima-ta-pas  rura-ni.
INDEF-ACC-ADD  do-PST.ATT.1.S
“I do anything.”
(30) Ima-ta-pas  apamu-y.
INDEF-ACC-ADD  bring-IMP
“Bring anything.”

Episodic contexts
INDEF-ACC-ADD  bring-IMP
“I ate anything/something.”

Chierchia (2004, 2006): FC any is infelicitous in this context because the widening of the domain of relevant members of the set is non-informative.

Restriction on mana in episodic context:
(32) Mana-m  ima-ta-pas
NEG.DECL-FOC.EVID  INDEF-ACC-ADD
ranti-rqa-ni-chu.
buy-PST.ATT.1.S-FOC
“I did not buy anything.”
(√NPI, *free choice interpretation)

(33) Ama  ima-ta-pas  apamu-y-chu.
NEG.IMP.ADDR  INDEF-ACC-ADD  bring-IMP-FOC
“Don’t bring anything.”
(√NPI, √ free choice interpretation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Free choice</th>
<th>NPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mana (+NEG, -IMP/+DECL)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ama (+NEG, IMP, +ADDR)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If imatapas is in the scope of mana [NEG , -IMP / DECL] in an episodic context it cannot receive a free choice interpretation, however if it is in the scope of ama [+Addressee, +IMP, NEG] it can receive either a Free Choice interpretation licensed by IMP in Force or the NPI interpretation licensed by NEG.

Why is Free Choice possible with ama but not with mana?

Declarative episodic contexts have in T a +v [veridicality operator] (Giannakidou 2001).

“A propositional operator [Op p] is veridical iff the truth of Op p in c [context that contains a set M of Models relative to an individual x] requires that p be true in some individual x’s epistemic model ME (x) in c. If the truth of Op p in c does not require that p be true in some such model in c Op is nonveridical.” (Giannakiddou 2001: 671).
In affirmative and negative episodic contexts, the veridicality operator requires that the proposition be true in some individual’s epistemic model.

Unlike *mana, ama* (or IMP, NEG) does not select Tense with a $[+v]$ operator (Giannakidou 2001) that it negates, namely, it does not require the proposition in the scope of NEG to be true in some epistemic model in $c$.

Imperatives do not refer to a single episode:

\[(34)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Ama} \\
\text{NEG.AD.IMP} \\
\text{miku-y-chu} \\
\text{eat-IMP-NEG.FOC}
\end{array}
\]

“Do not eat.”

\[(35)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SpAct} \\
\text{+Addressee} \\
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{+IMP} \\
\text{FocusP} \\
\text{Focus} \\
\text{NegP} \\
\text{Ama} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{VP}
\end{array}
\]

ima

Imperatives do not involve a $[+v$ feature] in T (Sánchez 2010). *Ama* does not select T with a $[+v]$ veridicality operator. This allows both an NPI and a FC interpretation of *ima*.

Indefinite *ima* in the scope of IMP, NEG can be interpreted as an NPI or as FC *any*.
VI. Speech Act: Ama and imperative morphology

(36) \[(\text{Speech Act} \ +\text{Add}) \ \\text{ForceP} \ \text{IMP}\ (\rightarrow \text{Foc}) \ \text{NegP} \ \text{ama} \]

[+Addressee, IMP, Neg]

(37) \[(\text{SpAct}) \]

[+Addressee] \ \text{ForceP}

[+IMP] \ \text{FocusP}

\text{Focus} \ \text{NegP}

\text{Ama} \ \text{TP}

[+Addressee, IMP, Neg]

\text{VP}

\text{phiña-ku-}y

\text{phiña-ku-ykichik}

VII. Concluding remarks

1. CQ has negative heads but does not obey the ban on TNIs. Imperative verb inflection under the Neg head does not differ from affirmative imperatives.

2. Differences between the Neg heads \text{mana} and \text{ama} stem from differences in the spell out of Force (and Speech Act).


4. Affirmative and negative imperatives in CQ show agreement with Speech Act features on the verb.
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