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1. “Non-canonical” uses of imperative forms which seem to deviate from the meaning/function/syntax of imperatives

2. Non-imperative forms which seem to have an imperative meaning/function
..... functions like those that an imperative verb has

The call for papers lists infinitives and optatives in the latter category. And of course there is also the subjunctive (eg Greek) and the future (Hebrew). But are there more?

There are. Plenty of them.
If “command” is an “imperative meaning/function”, then we should at some point come to study commands like the following:

1. Quickly!
2. To the principal!
3. Hands in the air!
4. No loud noises!
5. Silence!

All these are interpreted as commands. And if you think a command is achieved only with functional categories in the extended projection of the verb, you will have some serious eliding to do before deriving (1-5).
And even if you believe that pragmatics plays the crucial role and that the basic syntax is a property, there is still some serious thinking to do for (1-5).

Hausser, Portner, von Fintel and Iatridou and others connect a sentence type to a discourse module, something like the To Do List. The commands in (1-5) are not sentences, so one would have to again consider ellipsis as a possible source.

Otherwise, maybe think about intonation as having the ability to place something on a To Do List?
Today we will look at one such construction whose top node is also not verbal.

6. No talking with your mouth full!
7. No teasing your sister!
8. No reading the newspaper in class!
9. No walking on the grass!

There are several remarkable properties that characterize these sentences. First and foremost is the fact that negation is obligatory:

10. *Studying hard!
11. *Reading the newspaper outside of class
12. *Playing the piano carefully!
13. *Staying off the grass!
So our first question:
Why would negation license a command reading?
We will call this the “Negation-Licensed Command” phenomenon or NLC.

The NLC is the topic of this talk.

I will show its crosslinguistic stability and that several possible accounts fail.

But in the end I will not be able to explain it properly.
The phenomenon of NLC is not reducible to the known problem of combining negation with the imperative verb:

In many languages,
- either a special form of negation ("the prohibitive") is used to combine with an imperative verb
- a non-imperative verb must be used, e.g. subjunctive or infinitive

This is not the same as negation being necessary to express a command (NLC).
So we saw that negation is necessary but not any negation will do. Sentential negation doesn’t:

14. *Not talking with your mouth full!
15. *Not teasing your sister!
16. *Not reading the newspaper in class!
Nor adverbial *never*:

17. *Never talking with your mouth full!*
18. *Never teasing your sister!*
19. *Never reading the newspaper in class!*

The only form of negation that appears to work is the determiner *no*. This means that the remainder might be a nominal projection. Specifically, that it could be a gerund, which is consistent with *-ing*

What sort of gerund is this?
Classifications like Abney 1985, recognize 3 types of gerunds in English:

**ACCing**
20. I am relying on [them solving the problem carefully]

**POSSing**
21. [Their advertising cigars publicly] bothered me

**Ing-of**
22a. [The careful singing of the opera] impressed me

In this common classification, only the ing-of gerund can take the determiner *the*, as in (22a), or the determiner *no’*:
22b. No singing of any opera impressed me
ACC-ing and POSS cannot take *the/no*:

23a. *[The their/them advertising cigars] bothered me
   b. *I am relying on [the their/them solving the problem]

24a. *[No their/them advertising cigars] bothered me
   b. *I am relying on [no their/them solving the problem]

The above may be expected, given the D⁰ status of the pronoun.

But the PRO-ing gerund (sometimes considered a subcase of ACC-ing) also cannot take *the/no*:

25. (*the/no) playing the piano is a wonderful hobby
In general, the belief in the literature is the following:
If a gerund is (verbal enough to be) able to assign Case to its object, it cannot take the/no.

ACCing  -can’t take the/no-
26. I am relying on [them solving (*of) the problem]

POSSing  -can’t take the/no-
27. [their advertising (*of) cigars] bothered me

Ing-of  -can take the/no-
28. [The singing *(of) the opera] impressed me
In addition, the adjective/adverb distinction has been shown to correlate with the “verbalness” of the gerund, i.e. the presence of Case:

ACCing -doesn’t take of-

29. I am relying on [them carefully / *careful solving the problem]

POSSing -doesn’t take of-

30. [their publicly / *public advertising cigars] bothered me

Ing-of -takes of-

31. [The *carefully / careful singing of the opera] impressed me
With these distinctions in mind, we can look at the no-gerund and ask which type of gerund it belongs to.
We will see that it’s behaviour is mixed.
The no-gerund CAN be ing-of, but does not HAVE to be.

It is easy to show that it CAN be ing-of:

32a. No careless playing of the piano!
    b. No aimless walking around!
And the NLC is clearly visible in the presence of adjectives and of:

33a. *Secret reading of the newspaper in class!
   b. *Careful playing of the piano

ing-of is considered a “low” nomimalization, and its maximal projection an NP (or DP).

So the following question arises:

Is the fact that we observe the NLC with ing-of gerunds the result of their being gerunds or the result of their being NPs?
Which indirectly, presupposes we know the answer to the following question: Can we observe the NLC with NPs?

Indeed, NPs can be used as commands, and it may well be that they are subject to the NLC:

34a. No solicitors!
   b. No crank calls!
   c. No dogs! (on a sign)

35a. *Students!
   b. *Cats!
The NLC can be seen with nouns in other languages as well.

For example, in Greek:

36a. Oxi trexamata!
    No run (nominalized verb)
    Don’t run!

b. Oxi pexnidia!
    No playing!
    (pexnidia: toys)

37a. *trexamata!
    intended: “run!”

b. *pexnidia!
    intended: “play!”
Possible counterexamples to the NLC with nouns (though they seem very formulaic to me):

38a. Silence!
   b. Attention!
   c. Caution!

So we should acknowledge the possibility of nouns as non-canonical commands and study them. Possibly the NLC can be observed there as well.

(We will come back to this)

From now on, I will refer to uses of negated ing-of in commands as ‘negated ing-of’.
Now consider the following sentences:

7. No teasing your sister!
8. No secretly reading the newspaper in class!
39. No playing the piano carelessly!
40. No carelessly playing the piano! (%, 39 is preferred by some)

There is no ‘of’ here.
Moreover, we have adverbs in (8, 40-41), and adjectives are out:

41a. *No secret reading the newspaper in class!
vs the negated ing-of:
   b. No secret reading of the newspaper in class!
So we have a gerund that can assign Case and take adverbs, but which can also take a determiner.

This is not a known category of gerund.

Moreover, it cannot appear in argument positions (with one possible exception to which we will return):

42a. *I am relying on no teasing your sister
   b. *I witnessed no teasing your sister
   c. *No teasing your sister impressed me

From now on, I will use the term ‘no-gerund’ for the gerund with the following properties: Case, adverbs, yet can take the determiner no – and no other determiner (and is mostly unable to appear in argument position.)
The fact that the no-gerund cannot be an argument helps us eliminate ellipsis as a possible source.
Ellipsis could in principle be the source of the negated ing-of command:

43a. There is no reading of Anna Karenina allowed
   \[ \rightarrow \text{There is no reading of Anna Karenina allowed} \]

b. No reading of Anna Karenina is allowed
   \[ \rightarrow \text{No reading of Anna Karenina is allowed} \]

Though this still does not address the NLC part. Why not:
44a. *Reading of Anna Karenina is allowed

Nor the modal force:
44b. *No reading of AK is required
But ellipsis cannot be the source of the no gerund because in the pre-ellipsis sentence the absence of ‘of’ is ungrammatical:

45. *There is no reading Anna Karenina allowed
   \[X \rightarrow \text{There is no reading Anna Karenina allowed}\]

46. *No reading Anna Karenina is allowed
   \[X \rightarrow \text{No reading Anna Karenina is allowed}\]
Finally, the no-gerund is very strictly subject the NLC. There is no affirmative counterpart, as we saw in the beginning:

10. *Studying hard!
11. *Reading the newspaper outside of class
12. *Playing the piano carefully!
13. *Staying off the grass!
In summary so far we have found that

• the addition of negation can license commands: NLC.

• This happens with negated ing-of gerunds

• This happens with “no-gerund”, whose properties do not reduce to those of any known gerund.

• This possibly happens with nouns

• We have not (yet) seen the NLC occurring with verbal categories. Only nominal(ization)s so far, including the no-gerund, which is nominalized “at the last minute”.
Is there NLC with verbs?

By and large the non-imperative verb forms that are used in languages without “True negative Imperatives” do not need negation to express a command.

For example, in Greek, negation cannot occur with the imperative verb and instead it combines with negation.

But the subjunctive on its own can also express a command.

There are also some languages where a non-imperative verb can express a command only with negation. Faroese was mentioned as one such example.

This would be the NLC with verbs, which I will not have anything to say about today, and which may be due to different reasons (feature spell-out).
Can we detect the NLC in other languages?
Or is it a quirk of English?

On Participial Imperatives
Johan Rooryck and Gertjan Postma


Many thanks to Gertjan Postma and Hedde Zeijlstra for data and discussion.
RP explore a construction that is quite relevant in our context, but secondary in the paper they discuss.

There are several things to comment on in the paper at large (ask me if you want), but here I will present only the data relevant to us, as well as their analysis.
RP mention in passing a construction that clearly shows the NLC and which is of central importance to us and also completely productive:

47. Geen gepraat! / geprus! / getreuzel! / getoeter! / gedans!
   no GE-vpraat /GE-vpruts / GE-vtreuzel / GE-vtoeter / GE-vdance
   ... no talking / fidgeting / hanging around /honking /dancing

In (47), the negation is required.

These are all interpreted as commands.

The negation in (47), is the negative determiner *geen*. Not the sentential negation *niet*. 
Despite the presence of *ge-* , these are not participles but deverbal nouns.

Eg for the verb *prutsen* (‘to mess around’):

Participle: geprutst
Deverbal noun: gepruts

We will call this construction ‘negated deverbal noun commands’

Negated deverbal noun commands are reminiscent of the English no-gerunds, an observation which RP also make.
These deverbal nouns have (in general) no Case for the object, which must either incorporate, or take *van*; this is preserved in the NLC:

48a. Geen boekengelees hier!
   No book-read here

b. Geen gelees van boeken in mijn tuin!
   No read of books in my garden

Consistently, the modifier must be an adjective (*snel*, “quick”) and not an adverb (*gauw*, “quickly”).

The negated deverbal noun can be an argument, but *without the command reading*:

49. Ik hoorde geen gepraat
   I heard no talk
While these negated deverbal noun commands are very productive, they are not possible with unaccusatives or verbs that have no argument (Postma p.c.):

50a. *geen geval hier
   no fall here

b. *geen geregen op die zwakke stekjes, alsjeblieft (crying to the sky)
   no rain on those weak cuttings, please

But this restriction is not particular to the command use of these deverbal nouns. It comes with these deverbal nouns in general (Postma 1996).
In short, we can detect the NLC in Dutch.

RP propose an explanation for a different construction that the main paper is about (a hortative, which is good in South Dutch, but not North Dutch) and which they say can be extended to the negated deverbal noun commands, even though they do not do this explicitly.

I will lay out their account, along with my questions about it.

Part of the aim of the discussion will be to see if RP’s account of Dutch negated deverbal noun commands can be extended to the NLC in general.
RP: Dutch has the following process of ellipsis:

51a. Ben je naar de kapper geweest?
   are you to the hairdresser’s been
   ‘Did you go to the hairdresser’s?’

   b. Nee, ik heb de verkeerde shampoo gebruikt.
   no I have the wrong shampoo used
   ‘No, I used the wrong shampoo.’

   c. is er nog wat post voor mij?
   is there still some mail for me
   ‘Is there any mail for me?’
The idea is that there is also ellipsis in the case of our negated deverbal noun, even though they do not provide the pre-ellipsis sentence.

“...the ellipted auxiliary is most likely a modal one: the situation described by the participial must be brought about.” p. 8

Q: But this builds in part of the answer. Why would the elided auxiliary be a modal? And why would it be a performative modal? Why could it not have been a reportative modal?

If that was the case, the sentence would report that somebody has an obligation to do something, not bestowing an obligation.
A related question is, why would the elided subject be 2\textsuperscript{nd}?

In other words, postulating an elided performative addressee-oriented modal captures the facts by building them in.

But let’s assume that it is indeed ellipsis that creates the negated devrbal noun commands.

Why should such an ellipsis be possible only under negation? (In our terms, why the NLC?)
To answer this, RP propose the “No-Ambiguity Principle”:

52. No-Ambiguity Principle
   * [...AUX$_{MOD}$...] if AUX$_{MOD}$ is ambiguous

They say that the No-Ambiguity Principle “...is a particular realization of the Principle of Full Interpretation (FI)” (p. 8).

I don’t quite see how this could be a case of FI as language tolerates plenty of (structural) ambiguities, including with modals. But let’s assume that something like (52) holds, regardless of whether or not it is a special case of FI.
RP argue that the No-ambiguity Principle ensures that the elided modal will be of universal force and not of existential force:

Modals that scope under negation can be of universal or of existential force:

53a. She need not leave $\text{Neg} > \text{MOD}_{\text{UNIV}}$
   b. She cannot leave $\text{Neg} > \text{MOD}_{\text{EX}}$

Modals that scope over negation are only of universal force. There is no modal of existential force that scopes over negation:

54a. She must not leave $\text{MOD}_{\text{UNIV}} > \text{Neg}$
   b. ??? $\text{MOD}_{\text{EX}} > \text{Neg}$

(they do not claim to know why (54b) does not exist)
RP: If the elided modal was one that scoped under negation, we would not know whether it is of universal or existential force, and the No-Ambiguity Principle would be violated:

55. \( \text{Neg} \gg \text{MOD}_{\text{UNIV}} / \text{MOD}_{\text{EX}} \)

But if the elided modal scoped over negation, the No-Ambiguity Principle would be satisfied because there is only one type of modal that can scope over negation: a modal of universal force.

56. \( \text{MOD}_{\text{UNIV}} \gg \text{Neg} \)

Hence the elided modal can only be universal.
Q: It is not clear to me how this constraint on ellipsis works.

In general, ellipsis cuts off part of the syntactic tree. This is supposed to be a blind process, with no look-ahead with respect to which elided parts might cause problems later on.

So maybe RP mean for the No-Ambiguity Principle to apply at LF (which would anyway be more consistent with their Minimalist assumptions).

This means that ellipsis can delete ALL modals, but LF will weed out those representations that violate the No Ambiguity Principle.

But the No Ambiguity Principle as a guide to ellipsis, seems a bit puzzling.
In addition to language permitting a host of ambiguities, ambiguities created by ellipsis (including ACD) are also tolerated just fine:

57. John wanted to read the book you did  
<read, wanted to read>

58. I read every book one day before you did  
<read it, read every book>

So the No-Ambiguity Principle as guiding ellipsis, would need more support than it seems to have.

Unless we make it apply ONLY in cases of the particular type of ellipsis involving performative modals.

But this does not seem ideal.
We can now come back to the question of why there is a need for negation. According to RP, the No-Ambiguity Principle forces the presence of negation: in the absence of negation, it will not be clear whether we are dealing with a universal or existential modal. That is, without negation, there is no cue as to how to interpret the ellided modal.

Page 9:
“Let us finally consider the structure in (33), without negation.

[(59)] [...AUX<sub>MOD</sub> ...]

In [(59)], if AUX is not lexical, it can be interpreted as MUST or CAN and, hence, is not well-formed with respect to the No-Ambiguity Principle. “
RP want to attribute the obligatory presence of negation in the deverbal noun command to the No-Ambiguity Principle.

60. * AUX [gepraat]
   GE-Vpraat
   talk

In the absence of negation, there is no cue wrt the quantificational force of the modal. It could be universal or existential, in violation of the No-Ambiguity Principle.

But if negation is present, then there is a way to ensure non-ambiguity, as only the universal modal can scope over negation.
So for RP, it is the Non-Ambiguity Principle that is responsible for the obligatory presence of negation.

But it is unclear why/whether language should object to ambiguities in general, or these ambiguities in particular.

First of all, it has been reported that there are languages where the force of the modal is ambiguous (Salish, Nez Perce). So even if such a principle holds for Dutch, such a general principle cannot be at play across languages.
Moreover, imperative verb forms are known to be ambiguous between a universal and a permission/acquiescence reading:

61. Open the door! (command)

62. A: I want to open the door
   B: Sure. Open the door. (acquiescence)

So the string *Open the door!* has no problem being underdetermined wrt to its quantificational force.
Note that the No-Ambiguity Principle does not say that negation is necessary so that the interpretation is a command. It says that there cannot be ambiguity and negation appears because it disambiguates.

This means that if there is a way to disambiguate without negation, that should be fine too.

And (62) is one such environment, as it only permits the permission reading:

62. A: I want to open the door  
   B: Sure. Open the door. (acquiescence)

But this prediction is not verified.
First the control case: Dutch does have acquiescence with the imperative.
63. In a school class, after asking various times:
   A : Meester, mag ik weg?
       sir,   may I away

   B: Ok, ga maar weg
       ok go MAAR away

But:
64. A: Mag ik naar de bakker rennen?
       may I to the baker run

   B: Ok. *geren

In short, (64) disambiguates, so it should be ok with the No-Ambiguity Principle but the utterance is still not possible.
Another way to disambiguate is with particles. Grosz 2011 shows that particles like ‘bloss’ and ‘ruhig’ in German disambiguate an imperative in favor of the universal and existential reading respectively.

In Dutch there are also such particles (Zeijlstra p.c.):

*Maar* disambiguates towards permission:

65. Zit maar

*Nu* might disambiguate towards commanding:

66. Zit nu

So one should expect that since these particles disambiguate, they should permit the affirmative deverbal noun, as the No-Ambiguity Principle is satisfied. But no:

67a. */???Getoeter maar (int: sure. Go ahead and honk)
    b. */???Gestudeer nu (int: Honk! --as command)

49
So we see that RP’s account of ellipsis and the No-Ambiguity Principle, do not really adequately capture or the explain the facts.

But even if we had grasped the details of the ellipsis in the deverbal noun, there is a problem with extending the RP account to English no-gerunds, something that RP say is possible (though they do not show the derivation).

We saw that the English no-gerund has properties unlike that of any other known gerund and that it cannot be appear in argument position in a full clause.

This means that there is no source for an ellipsis where the remnant is the no-gerund.

Hence the no-gerund cannot be the result of ellipsis. And hence the NLC cannot be the result of the need to disambiguate a remnant of ellipsis.
So unfortunately, RP did not provide us with an explanation of the NLC phenomenon.

Fortunately, though, they did provide us with support that the NLC has some crosslinguistic sway, or at least, is not a quirk of English.
At this point we should ask the following question:
Are the NLCs imperatives (as RP call them)?
Or are they commands?

What is the difference?
If they are like imperative verbs, they should be able to do other things that imperative verbs do, notably acquiescence uses, and IaDs.
If they are simply commands, they should not.

von Fintel and Iatridou 2017: a verb form that can do IaDs, can do acquiescence.
It seems that NLCs in English and Dutch do not pattern with imperative verbs. They can only be commands. They cannot do IaDs:

68a. ignore your homework and you will fail  
    b. *no reading the textbook and you will fail  
69a. work hard and you will succeed  
    b. *No ignoring your work and you will succeed  

Nor acquiescence:  
70. A: I don’t want to read Anna Karenina  
    B: Fine. Don’t read Anna Karenina  
71. A: I don’t want to read Anna Karenina  
    B: Fine. #No reading Anna Karenina
The same conclusion is to be drawn for Dutch:

No LaDs:

72a. *Geen gestudeer en je zakt voor je examens.
    no study and you fail your exams

b. *Geen gepruts en alles zal goet gaan
    no mess around and everything goes well
No acquiescence:
Moeder B vraagt aan A om nu echt gauw naar de bakker te gaan want het loopt tegen zessen.

approaches 6

73. A. Maar ik heb pijn in mijn voeten van het sporten
    but I have pain in my feet from the sporting

    B. #Ok, geen gerén naar de bakker!
    #ok no run to the baker
In other words, NLCs are properly named. They are commands. Not “imperatives”, with all the flexibility that imperative verbs have.

Possibly, ‘commands’, unlike imperatives are implicitly modalized, and this is why they cannot appear in environments that demand quantificational flexibility, acquiescence and IaDs.

Consistent with this position, is the fact that English and Dutch NLCs CAN appear in IoDs:
The difference between IaDs and IoDs: unlike IaDs, an IoD tolerates/needs a modal in the first disjunct:

74a. *You have to invest in this company and you will become rich   IaD
   b. You have to cover your pipes or they will freeze   IoD

75. Je moet studieren of je zakt voor je examen
   you must study or you fail your exams

And the NLCs can appear in IoDs:

76a. No ignoring your homework or your will fail!

   b. Geen gepruts of je zakt voor je examens!
      No messing around or you fail your exams
So the English and Dutch NLCs differ from imperative verbs:

- NLCs can only be commands.
- NLCs behave as if they are (strongly) modalized: no acquiescence, no IaDs
- Of course they require negation, unlike imperative verbs
- Their subject can be PROarb, unlike imperatives:

77a. No washing oneself in public!
   b. *Don’t wash oneself in public.
Next Stop: Russian

(thanks to Sergei Tatevosov and David Pesetsky for data and discussion of the data)
Russian shows the NLC as well, and again also with nominalizations.

78. ni-kak-ogo  gulja-nij-a  v  parke!
NI-which-GEN.SG  walk-NMN-GEN.SG  in  park
No walking in the park!

79. ni-kak-ogo  pe-nij-a  pesen!
NI-which-GEN.SG  sing-NMN-GEN.SG  song.GEN.PL
no singing of songs!

The negation is obligatory. ie. We see the NLC here.
A bit about the morphology:

80. ni-kak-ogo     gulja-nij-a     v    parke!
     NI-which-GEN.SG   walk-NMN-GEN.SG  in    park
     No walking in the park!

-nij- a regular productive deverbal noun; only takes a GEN object both in and outside NLCs
kakoj ‘which, what kind of’
GEN ogo is obligatory. No other Case will do.

ni: negative conjunction:

81. Ni Vasja, ni Petja
     neither Basil, nor Peter
ni-kak-ogo

=s\text{sort of}=

Dutch $geen$ = NEG+indefinite determiner

$=$no$_{\text{DET}}$

NI-which-GEN.SG

ni-kak-ogo
gulja-nij-a

= geen geloop = no walking

Geen/no -GEN walk_{\text{NMN}} no walk_{\text{DV.N}}

But why the Genitive on ni-kak-ogo ?

Russian is a negative concord language – unlike Dutch, hence the “sort of”.

ni-kak-ogo is an N-word. That means that there should be sentential negation in the sentence. Only it is not visible:
This would mean that the Genitive on ni-kak-ogo could be the famous Russian Genitive of Negation.

Possible objection: Genitive of Negation is typically optional. The Genitive in NLC is not:

83* ni-kak-oje pe-nij-e pesen!
   NEG sing-NMN-NOM.SG song.GEN.PL
   int.: ‘no singing of (the) songs!’
(*in MASC or any other gender)
However, Babyonishev et al 2001, citing Babby 1980 and Chvany 1975, point to cases of obligatory Genitive of Negation with verbs that assert “existence, nonexistence, or presence at a location” p. 14:

84a. V gorode ne bylo vrača.
    in town not was-NEU.SG doctor-GEN.SG
    ‘There was no doctor in town./The doctor was not in town.’

b. *V gorode ne byl vrač.
    in town not was-MASC.SG doctor-NOM.SG
If one squints, one might be able to see the NLC as falling under predicates of “existence, nonexistence, or presence at a location” in that they assert the non-existence of permission.

(And wait for Turkish, which looks even more like that)

So if the genitive is genitive of negation, we would have to conclude to the presence of a covert negation, because the prefix ni- would not be negation itself, but the morphological ark of n-words in a negative concord language:

85. $\text{OP}_{\text{NEG}}$ \text{ni-kak-ogo} $\text{gulja-nij-a}$

$\text{OP}_{\text{NEG}}$ \text{no_{N.word}} walking *(overt $\text{OP}_{\text{NEG}}$. Why? )
Morover, as in English, not any negation will do. Verbal negation won’t do:

86. * ne  pe-nij-a pesen!

   NEG  sing-NMN-GEN.SG  song.GEN.PL

intended: ‘no singing of (the) songs!’

87. * ne  pe-nij-e pesen!

   NEG  sing-NMN-NOM.SG  song.GEN.PL

int.: ‘no singing of (the) songs!’

(these differ in Case only)
As for the NLC’s nominalization, it behaves like other nominalizations.

For example, the adjective/adverb distinction, has a certain pattern: and adjective before, an adverb after the nominalization:

88. gromk-oje  pe-nij-e  pesen  
    loud-NOM.SG  sing-NMN-NOM.SG  song.GEN.PL  
    loud singing of (the) songs

89. pe-nij-e  pesen  gromk-o  
    sing-NMN-NOM.SG  song.GEN.PL  loud-ADV  
    singing of (the) songs loudly

(this pattern also holds for ing-of nominalizations in English for some, though not all speakers. Fu et al)
The same holds for the NLC:

90. ni-kak-ogo  gromk-ogo  pe-nij-a  pesen!
   NI-which-GEN.SG  loud-GEN.SG  sing-NMN-GEN.SG  song.GEN.PL
   no loud singing of (the) songs!

91. ni-kak-ogo  pe-nij-a  pesen  gromk-o
   NI-which-GEN.SG  sing-NMN-NOM.SG  song.GEN.PL  loud-ADV
   no singing of (the) songs loudly!
This nominalization can appear in argument position:

92. Jan ne slyshal [ni-kak-ogo pe-nij-a pesen]
    I NEG hear.PST NI-which-GEN.SG sing-NMN-NOM.SG song.GEN.PL
    I did not hear any singing of (the) songs.

As for the IaD, Acquiescence and IoD tests, Russian behaves like English and Dutch:
Ok in IoD
BAD in Acquiescence
BAD in non-endorsing IaD
BADish in endorsing IaD
So far, we have seen certain similarities between English, Dutch and Russian:
- NLC
- NLC with a nominal category
- The (visible) negation is incorporated into a determiner.
- The NLC behaves like a command, not an imperative

The fact that NLCs happen with nominal categories, raises the question of a reduction to the NLC on nouns. This might works for English and Dutch:

93. Geen honden!
   No dogs!
This does not hold exactly the same for Russian. The following is ungrammatical on signs

94. Nikakix sobak  
   no-GEN.PL dog.GEN.PL

However, one can utter it upon seeing someone with a dog entering a space where dogs are not allowed. (Privoznov p.c.) Why it is bad on a sign, I do not know.

So it still looks like it is possible to reduce the NLC with deverbal categories to the NLC with nouns.

(though this would still be only a reduction, not an explanation)
So we see that the NLC holds in Germanic as well as in one Slavic language. But it can also be seen in non-Indo-European.

Let’s go to Turkish.
Thanks to Ömer Demirok for data and discussion.

The NLC can be seen in the obligatory presence of the negated copula ‘yok’ on a nominalized clause. The affirmative copula ‘var’ is not permitted.

Here is the negated existential copula:
95. Dolap-ta süt yok.
  fridge-LOC milk YOK
"There isn’t milk in the fridge."
Here are the NLCs:

96. Geç saat-te TV izle-mek yok!
late hour-LOC watch-NOML YOK
Lit: "There isn’t watching TV late at night!”
‘No watching TV at night!’

97. Sınıf- ta sakız çiğne-mek yok!
class-LOC gum chew-NOML YOK
Lit: "There isn’t chewing gum in class!”
‘No chewing gum in class’

98. Bu kapı- yi aç-mak yok!
this door-ACC open-NOML YOK
Lit: “There isn’t opening this door!”
‘Don’t open this door’
Here is the affirmative copula ‘var’:

99. Dolap-ta süt var.
    fridge-LOC milk VAR
    "There is milk in the fridge."

But a command is not possible with it:

100. *Yaşlı yolcu-lar-a öncelik ver-mek var!
    elderly passenger-PL-DAT priority give-NOML VAR
    Int: "Give priority to elderly passengers!"
The nominalization that is the complement of YOK is quite high, as it contains Case for the object, even the Accusative associated with specificity, as in (98). But this is common for Turkish nominalizations.

So we see that the NLC can be observed in Turkish as well.

And again, it is negation on some type of nominalization (though just for Turkish, this would not say much because there is a lot of nominalization in the language).
Turkish gives us the chance to explore one more point. Consider (96) again:

96. Geç saat-te TV izle-mek yok!
   late hour-LOC watch-NOML YOK
   Lit: "There isn’t watching TV late at night!"
   ‘No watching TV at night!’

Given the literal meaning and the absence of imperative morphology, one might think that there is a (most likely pragmatic) phenomenon going on that can also be observed in English:

101a. In this house, we do not watch TV at night.
   b. Don’t watch TV at night!

It is entirely possible to understand (101a) as a negative command like (101b).
Possibly this comes about by a reasoning along the following lines: if there is no TV watching at night, it must be because it is not allowed.

But such an interpretation is optional:

102. In this house we do not watch TV at night because the power goes off at 8

Moreover, there is no NLC here, that is, negation is not obligatory. Even when interpreted as command, the following is just fine:

103. In this house we brush our teeth at 8pm!
Could it be that the negated existential copula in Turkish brings about a command in a pragmatic way?

104. Geç saat-te TV izle-mek yok!
    late hour-LOC watch-NOML YOK
    Lit: "There isn’t watching TV late at night!"
    ‘No watching TV at night!’

The answer is no.

If it was an assertion that is pragmatically interpreted as a command, one would expect negation to be optional, as it is in 10. But we already saw that that is not possible.
Moreover, it is not possible to interpret it simply as a description of facts, like (102):

102. In this house we do not watch TV at night because the power goes off at 8

105. #Maalesef, gece TV izle-mek yok
unfortunately night TV watch-NOML YOK

çünkü akşamları elektrik gid-iyor
because evenings electricity go-IMPF

The meaning of (105) is only an NLC, hence (105) has the somewhat incoherent following meaning:
"Unfortunately, it is forbidden to watch TV at night because the electricity goes out in the evening"
So the Turkish negated existential command is not a pragmatically interpreted command. There is an inescapable modal meaning.

Moreover, the inescapable modal meaning does not come from YOK, as the following does not mean that milk is forbidden in the house:

106. Dolap-ta süt yok.
   fridge-LOC milk YOK
"There isn’t milk in the fridge."
NOT: ‘No milk in the house!’
Even though nominalization is present, the NLC cannot be reduced to an NLC on nouns, as there is no NLC that is productive on nouns:

107. *Köpek-ler yok!
   Dog-pl YOK

Demirok pc: There are some good examples with NP+YOK like the ones below but they seem very restricted.

108. TV yok!
   TV YOK
   "No TV!"
In summary, Turkish has NLC and it cannot be reduced to the NLC on nouns.

Since RP had us talk about ellipsis, and Turkish brought us to the topic of existential sentences, let’s briefly look at a possible source of English no-gerunds. Unfortunately, it will not be possible to reduce the NLC to this source either.

This is a construction described in Kjellmer 1980.
109a. There was no mistaking that scream
    b. There was no shouting, no merry-making, no waving of flags

What is the difference?

“By and large it could be said that the modal gerund can take a direct object, especially an object clause, that it must occur in the singular, that it hardly takes any other adjectival adjunct than no and that it can be turned into a passive. The non-modal gerund, on the other hand, takes a direct object only in special circumstances, and never an object clause, it can be turned into a plural and have various adjuncts other than no and it can hardly be made passive.” p. 60

Kjellmer has no further explanation of this phenomenon, and as far as I know, no one else has come up with one either.
The non-modal one does not require negation:

110. There was shouting, merry-making and waving of flags

And when it takes negation, any negation will do:

111a. There wasn’t shouting or merry-making or waving of flags
    b. There was never shouting
    c. There was seldom shouting
    d. There was hardly shouting
The modal one requires negation:

112. *There was mistaking that scream

But not any negation will do:

113a. There was no mistaking that scream
   b. *There was not mistaking that scream
   c. *There was never mistaking that scream
   d. *There was seldom mistaking that scream
   e. *There was hardly mistaking that scream
Can we derive the no-gerund from Kjellmer’s gerunds by a RP-style ellipsis?

114. There was no smoking!

The no-gerund and the Kjlemmer gerund do share properties, e.g., DET, Case for the object. Unfortunately, this seems rather a non-promising path nevertheless.

First, the no-gerund has no verb class restriction and can be intransitive, as seen in (114), unlike Kjellmer’s gerunds, which can be modal only with an object:

115a. There was no merrymaking or shouting   (not modal)
     b. There was no mistaking that scream!   (modal)

116a. There was no smoking   (not modal)
     b. There was no smoking that cigar.   (modal)
One might rebut that (117) is modal (with the present tense):

117. There is no whispering in his house.

But this is a case of a pragmatically induced rule as we saw earlier, and such an interpretation, unlike with the no-gerund, is always optional.

118. There is no whispering in this house as everybody is by nature loud.
Second (and very crucially), the modality is very different in the two cases. In the no-gerund, it is deontic (and performative). While in the Kjellmer gerund it is ability or dynamic (and reportative).

119. There was no mistaking that scream =
    it was not possible to mistake that scream.
    (NOT: it is forbidden to mistake that scream)

120. There is no killing that rat =
    it is not possible to kill the rat
    (NOT: it is forbidden to kill that rat)
In other words, despite some apparent similarities, the no-gerund cannot be reduced to the Kjellmer gerund.

Moreover, several languages have the NLC but I know of the existence of the Kjellmer gerund only in English.

Even in Turkish, which, as we saw, shows the NLC with negated existential copulas (which would make it close to There is no...), the relevant sentences cannot receive the interpretation of the Kjellmer gerund, but only the command reading.

Having said this, the role of negation in the Kjellmer modal is mysterious. But whatever it is, it is not an instantiation of the NLC, given that it is not a command to begin with. Possibly both the Kjellmer gerund and the NLC are part of something bigger, but I leave that for a different occasion.
So we still do not have a good candidate to reduce the NLC to, nor an obvious explanation for it.

Next, one more non-Indo European case: The Niger-Congo language Buli, as spoken in Ghana.

Thanks to Abdul-Razak Sulemana for data and discussion.
Buli has an imperative verb, which can be negated.

The choice of negation determines whether it is a “forever” command or a “right now” command, the latter being most plausible when the action is already ongoing:

121. ṇū sīgāārī!
   drink cigarettes
   ‘smoke cigarettes’

122a. Kā ṇū sīgāārī!
   Neg drink cigarettes
   ‘Don’t smoke cigarettes’ (right now)

b. Kā à ṇū sīgāārī
   Neg  ASP drink cigarettes
   ‘Don’t smoke!’ (in general)
As in Turkish, it is impossible to get a string that corresponds to *No dogs*. (And unlike in Turkish, there may be no counterexamples to this general statement.) Instead what is said is the following:

123. Bāāsā  kà dē!
   dogs not here

So despite the difficulty of reducing the NLC with nominalizations to the NLC with nouns, one would be tempted to look here first, and indeed we find them:
124. Sīgāārī ṇūkkā kà dē!
cigarettes drink-NM Neg here
“No smoking here”

And the location can be made more precise:

125. sīgāārī ṇūkkā ká ṇīŋsā sōkā dōkkú pō
cigarettes drink-NM Neg body bath-NM room inside
`No smoking in the bathroom'
A quick note about Buli nominalizations.
In a nominalization, the suffix –ka appears on the verb.

Buli has no overt Case morphology.

With a verb: V O
In nominalizations: O V_{NM}

We get O V_{NM} the NLC:

124. Sīgāārī ḋūkka kà-dē!
cigarettes drink-NM Neg-here
“No smoking (here)”
The object must precede the (nominalized) verb:

126. * Ṽūkkā sīgāārī kà-dē!
   drink-NM cigarettes Neg-here

Moreover, the plain imperative verb cannot appear in this construction:

127a. * Ṽū sigaari kà-dē
   drink cigarettes neg-here

b. *Kàn Ṽū sīgāārī kà-dē
   not drink cigarettes not-here
So what we have is a negated nominalization that serves as command.

And moreover, it is an NLC:

128a. *Sīgāārī ɲūkkā  
cigarettes  drink-NM  
Intended: “smoke!”

b. *Sīgāārī ɲūkkā dē!  
cigarettes  drink-NM  here  
Intended: “smoke here!”

The NLC strikes again!
Until now, I argued for the existence of Negation Licensed Commands. We saw that this happens in several languages and with nominalizations.

We also saw that some possible candidates for being the source of NLC, did not pan out in the end.

In the rest of the talk I will attempt one more reduction of NLC to something else.
Let’s start with this question:

Is there an environment E that permits the ‘NLC-minus-negation’ to appear as a command?

If so, we might be able to understand the NLC better by exploring whether negation plays the same role as E, in saving the structure.

We saw that just removing negation will not do:

127a. *Smoking!
   b. *Staying of the grass!

But maybe we can still find such an E.
Consider the following:

128. Smoking, on the balcony!

For now, I will paraphrase (128) as follows:

129a. If you want to smoke, you have to do it on the balcony
   b. If there is smoking, it has to happen on the balcony

We can see a similar phenomenon with nouns:
130a. *dogs!  (no good as command)
   b. No dogs!

But now imagine a party with lots of people invited, many of whom are likely to bring dogs:

131a. Dogs, on the porch!
   b. If you have brought a dog, you must put it on the porch.

(This is not unlike the famous *Dogs must be carried.*)
The same holds for the Dutch deverbal noun command (and intonation sounds the same):

132a. Geen gepraat!  
  b. *gepraat!  
  c. Gepraat, op the straat, niet in huis  
  Talking on the street, not in house

133a. Geen gepruts!  
  b. *gepruts!  
  c. Gepruts, in de garage  
  Tinkering, in the garage

134a. Geen getoeter!  
  b. *getoeter!  
  c. Getoeter alleen op konginnedag  
  Honking, on on Queen’s Day
135a. Dogs must be carried:
   if you have a dog, you must carry it

b. Smoking on the balcony:
   If you (want to) smoke, you must do it on the balcony

c. No smoking: if you (want to) smoke, you must not do it
   it is forbidden

Negation brings in some tri-partite structure of sorts?
English and Dutch seem amenable to this view. What about other languages?
Russian:
Indeed, the nominalization in question looks to be able to appear without NEG when another constituent is there:

136. *Guljanije s sobakoj!
    walk-NMN-NOM with dog.INSTR
    Walking with a dog

137. Guljanije s sobakoj — (tol’ko) vo dvore
    walk-NMN-NOM with dog.INSTR only in yard
    Walking with a dog, only in the yard!
(and of course the genitive is gone, as there is no negation)
But things are harder with Turkish.
Here, part of the paradigm is duplicatable:

138. * köpek-ler
    dog-PL
    dogs!

139. köpek-ler, balkon-a!
    dog-PL    balcony-DAT
    "dogs, to the porch!"
But unfortunately, not the NLC part:

Here is the NLC again:

140. balkon-da sigara iç-mek yok!

   balcony-LOC smoke-NOML YOK
   No smoking on the balcony!

But removing the negation and keeping the balcony won’t work:
141a. *sigara iç-mek, balkon-da!
   smoke-NOML balcony-LOC

b. *sigara iç-mek var, balkon-da!
   smoke-NOML VAR balcony-LOC

c. *balkon-da sigara iç-mek var!
   balcony-LOC smoke-NOML VAR
And neither does it work for Buli.

The equivalent of *Smoking, on the balcony* is not possible:

142 *Sigāārī žūkkā vērāndā wá pō
cigarettes drink-NM balcony DEM inside

So reducing NLC to negation creating a tripartite structure, is not the general solution for the crosslinguistic picture.
Next questions:

-- Is the NLC with these nominal categories reducible to the NLC with NPs?
   -- What is the NLC with NPs due to?

-- Probably ellipsis is not the source of NLC. The correct source has not been found yet but we also see that in some languages, eg Turkish, nothing obvious seems to be missing.

-- NEG > ∃_{modal} or ∀_{modal} > NEG?

-- an NPI ∃_{modal}?

-- What to try next? Brute force? A “forbidden” operator?

-- Role of intonation?