# Imperatives and Negation in Labrador Inuttut

Zoë McKenzie

Cross-linguistically, imperatives are often barred from co-occurring with sentential negation (Han, 2000, Isac, 2015).

1. a) Grapse                    (to)!                                    Greek (Isac, 2015)
      write.perf.imp.2sg    (it)
     "Write (it)!"
b) *Mi   grapse                (to)!                                    Greek (Han, 2000)
     Neg write.perf.imp.2sg    (it)
     "Don't write (it)!"

In this presentation I will be examining the Labrador dialect of Inuktitut, where this ban holds. The mood used for expressing wishes and commands, the optative/imperative, is incompatible with the negation marker found in declarative sentences (henceforth NEG1).

2. a) Participial                                                       Labrador (Smith, 1977)
taku-ja-ga
see-part-1s/3s
"I see him."
b) Negative participial                                                 Labrador (Smith, 1977)
taku-nngi-ta-ga
see-$NEG_1$-part-1s/3s
"I don't see him."
c) Imperative
ikaju- git                                                             Labrador[1]
help- 2s
"Go help!"
b) *Negative imperative
*ikaju-nngi-git                                                        Labrador
help-$NEG_1$-2s
"Don't help!"

Instead, a negative command is expressed by substitution of another form, the negative conjunctive (henceforth NEG2), which appears in mood position:

---

3. a) nigi-kKu-nia-nna-nga                                                  Labrador

    eat-prog?-near.fut-$NEG_2$-1s

   "Don't let me eat."

b) taku-nia-nnak                                                     Labrador (Smith, 1977)

  see-near.fut-$NEG_2$-2s

  "Don't look"

However, this restriction does not appear in the presence of a politeness marker -lauq. When this morpheme is present, NEG1 is allowed to appear:

4. sini-luatla-ngi-lau-git                                              Labrador

  sleep-too.much-NEG1-please-2s

  "Don't let me oversleep."

The puzzle raised by these forms is how to explain the asymmetry in which forms can take NEG1 and which must be replaced with NEG2, and what properties of the forms with -lauq cause them to be exceptions to this asymmetry.

I propose that NEG1 is parasitic on a tense projection, which the optative/imperative and conjunctive moods crucially lack, while NEG2 is modal. This follows Zanuttini's (1991) analysis of negation in Romance languages, as well as Johns & Smallwood's (1993) analysis of the Inuktitut conjunctive as having defective T. The politeness morpheme -lauq is actually the homophonous past tense morpheme -lauq, which merges in T and raises to an intermediate projection. The presence of a TP allows NEG1 to appear in these forms. This analysis has implications for the analysis of tense in Inuktitut, as well as negative imperatives.

**References**

Han, C.-H. (2000). *The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in Universal Grammar.* New York: Garland.

Isac, D. (2015). *The Morphosyntax of Imperatives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johns, A. and Smallwood, C. (1999). On (non-)finiteness in Inuktitut. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics, 17*.

Smith, L. (1977). *Some Grammatical Aspects of Labrador Inuttut (Eskimo): A Survey of the Inflectional Paradigms of Nouns and Verbs*. National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper no. 37. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada.

Zanuttini, R. (1991). *Syntactic Properties of Sentential Negation: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.