



Title	The But-Conditional Imperative : An Emergent Construction
Author(s)	Mori, Hideki
Citation	OUPEL(Osaka University Papers in English Linguistics). 2009, 13, p. 83-101
Version Type	VoR
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.18910/58072">https://doi.org/10.18910/58072</a>
rights	
Note	

*The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

## THE *BUT*-CONDITIONAL IMPERATIVE: AN EMERGENT CONSTRUCTION<sup>\*</sup>

### 1 INTRODUCTION

English imperative forms do not always express a literal imperative meaning. This paper is concerned with one type of those imperatives, which has escaped much attention in the literature. Consider (1a)-(1f), for example.

- (1) a. Tell him that you do love him, but you will have very little time and energy to show that love while you are forced to worry about where the next meal is coming from. (BNC; A70 120)
- b. See It, Touch It...but You Still Can't Buy It.  
(Factiva; *Sunday Age*, March 3, 1996)
- c. Spit on me, curse me and stone me, but I suffer for your sins.  
(SS; *On the Waterfront*)
- d. Believe what you like, but you can't make me take you seriously.  
(Factiva; *The Independent*, November 26, 2000)
- e. THINK what you like, but Glasgow talks a good game.  
(Factiva; *The Evening Times*, November 18, 2004)
- f. Call me what you like but I'm still inclined to believe Blair over Iraq.  
(Factiva; *The Daily Express*, May 13, 2006)

The imperative forms in (1) have conditional meaning, not a literal imperative sense (e.g. a command or request). In fact, they can be paraphrased as concessive conditionals, such as 'even if' in (1a)-(1c) and 'no matter what' or 'whatever' in (1d)-(1f). In this paper, following Takahashi (2004), I will regard the imperative form that is joined by a conjunction to a declarative sentence and that is interpreted as a conditional clause as the *conjunction*-conditional imperative. The present study is aimed at revealing the properties and the development of *but*-conditional imperatives.

*But*-conditional imperatives in (1) are not an isolated pattern in English; rather,

---

<sup>\*</sup> This paper is an extended version of Chapter 4 of Mori (2007). I would like to express my gratitude to Yukio Oba and Sadayuki Okada for their valuable comments on my doctoral thesis. This research was partially supported by Gifu Shotoku Gakuen University Research Fund.

they are a variant of the already well-known conditional imperatives such as (2) and (3).

- (2) a. Give Palace's manager Steve Coppel the dosh and he will show you what to do with it. (BNC; A9R 374)
- b. Go into a London pub and you'll be surprised by the linguistic competence, Urdu to Xhosa. (Factiva; *The Independent*, August 18, 2002)
- c. Log on to the Amazon internet bookshop today and you will be offered an unusual opportunity. (Factiva; *The Independent*, March 7, 2004)
- (3) a. So get away from this door and get out of this place, or I'll hurt you --- put my foot in your face. (IMDb; *Moonlighting*)
- b. Okay, then, back off or I'll tell you the P.T.A. (IMDb; *Daria*)
- c. Stop that or you're going straight to hell. (IMDb; *21Grams*)

The conditional imperatives in (2) and (3) have been discussed in the literature under the names of "pseudo-imperative" (Jespersen 1940), "conditional imperative" (Bolinger 1977), "imperative-like conditionals" and "imperative-like ultimatums" (Davies 1986), "paratactic conditionals" (Declerck and Reed 2001) and "and/or-conditional imperative" (Takahashi 2004). *And/or* types have been analyzed from various perspectives: A comprehensive description (Bolinger 1977; Davies 1986), an analysis in terms of Relevance Theory (Clark 1993) and a cognitive and functional approach (Takahashi 2004). No attention, however, has been paid to the conditional imperative followed by *but*.<sup>1</sup> With this background, the present study intends to explore the possibility that the *but*-conditional imperative is an emergent construction that has analogically developed from the existing types.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 compares and contrasts the properties of *but*-conditional imperatives with the characteristics of *and/or*-conditional imperatives, thereby differentiating *but*-conditional imperatives from *and/or* types. Section 3 discusses the development of conditional imperatives including *but*-conditional imperatives in terms of grammaticalization of coordinate structures, and then considers degrees of grammaticalization processes in each type of coordinate structure. Section 4 turns to three conjunctions used in three types of conditional imperatives. Section 5 concludes this paper with a summary of the findings of the present study.

---

<sup>1</sup> The following type of imperative is not regarded as the *but*-conditional imperative under discussion.

- (i) a. Don't misunderstand me, but it might be better if you waited awhile before applying to graduate school. (Baker 1975: 39)
- b. Take a letter. But I don't want you to send it right away. (Fraser 1998: 305)

As claimed in this paper, *but*-conditional imperatives can be paraphrased as a concessive conditional clause. In (i) there is no concessive conditional relation between the imperative and the declarative. In (ia) the imperative and *but* function to control the possible criticism of the subsequent statement; in (ib) the declarative carries the illocutionary force of a request, thereby establishing a contrastive relation between the imperative and the declarative.

2 PROPERTIES OF *BUT*-CONDITIONAL IMPERATIVES2.1 *Concessive Conditional Readings*

In this section, I will show that *but*-conditional imperatives are interpreted as a concessive conditional clause. For comparison, consider the interpretation of *and/or*-conditional imperatives. It is well-known that (4) and (5) have a conditional reading, such as (4') and (5').

- (4) Bring alcohol to school and you'll be suspended.
- (5) Be careful or you'll lose your bag.
- (4') If you bring alcohol to school, you'll be suspended.
- (5') If you aren't careful, you'll lose your bag. (Takahashi 2004: 121-122)

Schematically, *and*-conditional imperatives 'P and Q' are interpreted as the affirmative conditional 'if P, Q,' while *or*-conditional imperatives 'P or Q' have the negative conditional reading 'if not-P, Q.'

Similarly, *but*-conditional imperatives have conditional meaning, and they can best be interpreted as a concessive conditional clause. The most reasonable interpretations of (6), for example, are shown by (6').

- (6) a. These days you study very hard, but it's simply a waste of time. Study as hard as possible but you'll fail the exam. It's too difficult.
- b. Just stop making excuses. Call the situation what you like but it's clearly bullying. Apologize to him immediately.
- (6') a. Even if you study as hard as possible, you'll fail the exam.
- b. No matter what you call the situation, it's clearly bullying.

*But*-conditional imperatives 'P but Q' have concessive conditional readings such as 'even if P, Q' and 'no matter *wh* P, Q.' These two types of interpretations correspond to the "scalar" and "universal" readings of concessive conditionals, respectively (König 1985, 1986; Haspelmath and König 1998; etc.).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> An "alternative" reading ('whether ... or not') is another type of concessive conditional meaning (see König 1985, 1986 and Haspelmath and König 1998). The alternative type was not attested to in the database accessed for this study, but some *but*-conditional imperatives do have such a reading (p.c. Lyn Judge). Examples (i) are interpreted as alternative as well as scalar, such as (i'). Note that *don't* in (i) is intended as an expression of permission: 'you can not-V' or 'you are allowed to not-V.'

- (i) a. You said you disliked school, didn't you? Don't go to school but you can get a high-paying job (anyway). You're multi-talented.
- b. Why are you so nervous? Don't study hard, but you'll easily pass the Japanese exam. You're Japanese!
- (i') a. Whether you go to school or not, you can get a good job.
- b. Whether you study hard or not, you'll easily pass the Japanese exam.

The non-concessive conditional interpretations of *and/or* types do not apply perfectly to *but*-conditional imperatives. Suppose that *if* in (6'') and (6''') has no concessive meaning.

- (6'') a. If you study as hard as possible, you'll fail the exam. (≠ (6a))
- b. If you call the situation what you like, it's clearly bullying. (≠ (6b))
- (6''') a. If you don't study as hard as possible, you'll fail the exam. (≠ (6a))
- b. If you don't call the situation what you like, it's clearly bullying. (≠ (6b))

(6'a) and (6'b) show *and* type reading 'if P, Q'; (6''a) and (6''b) illustrate *or* type reading 'if not-P, Q.' Neither (6'') nor (6''') can express the original meanings of (6). Conversely, the concessive conditional reading of *but*-conditional imperatives cannot serve as an interpretation of *and/or*-conditional imperatives. Consider (4'') and (5'').

- (4'') Even if you bring alcohol to school, you'll be suspended. (≠ (4))
- (5'') a. Even if you are careful, you'll lose your bag. (≠ (5))
- b. No matter how careful you are, you'll lose your bag. (≠ (5))

(4) does not correspond with (4''). (5) cannot be paraphrased as (5''), either. Thus, *but*-conditional imperatives have a conditional reading that is not involved in *and/or*-conditional imperatives. The above observation supports the claim that *but*-conditional imperatives have a conditional meaning, which differs significantly from the conditional meanings of *and/or*-conditional imperatives.

## 2.2 Concessive Conditional Readings and Structural Patterns

It has been demonstrated that *but*-conditional imperatives typically have concessive conditional interpretations: Scalar and universal. In the following, I will provide as many naturally occurring examples of *but*-conditional imperatives as possible, and I will argue that in addition to the configuration 'the imperative + *but* + the declarative,' *but*-conditional imperatives have unique structural patterns according to the type of concessive conditional interpretation.

First, consider *but*-conditional imperatives with scalar meaning. This type is likely to be followed by a parenthesis such as *if you like/wish*.

- (7) a. Scorn drama critics if you wish, but it benefits no one.  
(Factiva; *The Toronto Star*, June 26, 1993)
- b. TRY AND BAN THEM IF YOU LIKE - BUT YOU WON'T  
CHANGE THE UNDENIABLE FACT - POPPERS RULE.  
(Factiva; *The Independent*, January 17, 1997)

- c. Blame it on Hollywood if you wish, but college life in America is commonly perceived these days as a world of killer parties, keg stands and cutting classes.  
(Factiva; *Cox News Service*, December 30, 2005)
- d. Blame Bush, if you like, but he can't fix gas prices.  
(Factiva; *The Pantagraph*, April 29, 2006)

The frequent use of the expression *if you like/wish* makes a given imperative a concession or permission. Accordingly, as will be discussed later, *but*-conditional imperatives serve as a type of permission imperative. Next, *but*-conditional imperatives with universal meaning frequently co-occur with a verb of speech such as *call/say* and a relative clause containing *like*.

- (8) a. So with that call it coincidence, call it what you like but one of these low-loaders come in to pick up a caravan or something like.  
(BNC; KCN 4564)
- b. CALL it a lack of self-belief, a defeatist attitude or simply inexperience - call it what you like, but Westar Rules whipping boy Peel will not be calling for excuses much longer.  
(Factiva; *The West Australian*, May 8, 2000)
- c. SCARLET, cranberry, raspberry, - call it what you like, but red is the colour of Christmas!  
(Factiva; *The Evening Times*, December 23, 2000)
- d. Say what you like, but Tony Blair is no cowboy.  
(Factiva; *The Independent*, March 31, 2002)

Note that I am not claiming here that the scalar or universal reading is unambiguously determined according to the type of structural pattern. In fact, the above two tendencies, i.e. the expression *if you like/wish* in (7) and the verb of speech in (8), further form a more highly productive pattern, which is considered ambiguous between the scalar and universal readings.

- (9) a. CALL me stupid if you like but as far as I'm concerned I was, in a sense, tickled pink at how frighteningly au fait you were in addressing the issue at hand.  
(Factiva; *The Guardian*, January 25, 1996)
- b. CALL them optimistic if you like, but bookies don't believe the Brownlow Medal is a two-horse race between Andrew McLeod and Michael Voss.  
(Factiva; *Herald-Sun*, September 20, 2001)
- c. Call me old-fashioned if you like, but when I was a boy we had a word for people like this.  
(Factiva; *The Times*, January 18, 2003)
- d. Call us a diva if you wish, but Counter Culture wouldn't consider using a drugstore brand of daily moisturizer.  
(Factiva; *The Toronto Star*, July 21, 2005)

Imperative (9a), for instance, can have scalar or universal meaning depending on the context, as in (10a) or (10b).

- (10) a. Even if you call me stupid, ...  
       b. Whatever you call me, ...

The authentic data clearly illustrate that *but*-conditional imperatives have a unique coordinate structure, which exhibits certain patterns according to the type of interpretation. The abovementioned findings strongly suggest that *but*-conditional imperatives are by no means a random, ad hoc or absolutely fixed expression; rather, they constitute a basic construction with some degree of productivity. Of course, the findings are merely a tendency in naturally occurring examples; further data collection and research are thus needed in order to prove the meaning-form correspondence.

### 3 EMERGENCE OF *BUT*-CONDITIONAL IMPERATIVES

In order to reveal how *but*-conditional imperatives have emerged in English, this section considers three types of conditional imperatives from a historical point of view. I will begin with the discussion of the development of *and*-conditional imperatives with reference to the grammaticalization of the coordinate conjunction *and*. The claim is that *or/but*-conditional imperatives have developed through the analogy of the development of *and*-conditional imperatives. I will also discuss the degrees of grammaticalization of each type of conditional imperative in terms of illocutionary forces as imperatives.

#### 3.1 *The Development of Conditional Imperatives*

I will begin by demonstrating that the coordinate conjunction *and*, in other words, *and* coordinate structure, underwent grammaticalization into the semantically subordinate conjunction expressing a conditional relationship. The Oxford English Dictionary (*OED*) (2nd edition) mentions that *and* has been used to connect words, coordinate clauses or sentences (i.e. juxtaposition) since the 8th century, such as (11), while causal (conditional) meaning appeared in between the 10th and 11th centuries, as in (12).

- (11) Adqueve, ænd suilcæ  
       ‘Adqueve, and suilcæ’

- (c700 *Epinal Gl.* (Sweet O.E.T. 42); cited in the *OED*)<sup>3</sup>
- (12) a. Her Cerdic forþferde, 7 [? ond] Cynric his sunu riscode.  
       ‘Cerdic passed away, and Cynric his son reigned.’<sup>4</sup>  
       b. Werke by counseil, and thou schalt nat rewe.  
       ‘Work by advice and you shall never regret.’  
       (1386 CHAUCER *Millar’s T.* 344; cited in the *OED*)

Coordinate usage historically precedes subordinate usage. The two types of *and* differ from each other syntactically as well as semantically. For example, consider (13a) and (13b).

- (13) a. Tom goes to school and Jerry stays here. [juxtaposition]  
       b. He studied hard and (thus) he passed the exam. [causal]  
       (13’) a. Jerry stays here and Tom goes to school.  
       b. \*He passed the exam and (thus) he studied hard.

Unlike the juxtaposition in (13a), the two constituents in (13b) cannot be replaced, suggesting that those two establish a subordinate relationship. Conditional imperatives such as (14) belong to the type shown in (13b).

- (14) Make any noise and the baby will cry.  
       (14’) \*The baby will cry and (you) make any noise.

The two events in (14), for example, are not just juxtaposed; rather, making any noise is stated as a condition for the baby’s cry. The order of the two constituents is fixed and cannot be changed, as in (14’).

With the above statement in mind, I will claim that the *and* in *and*-conditional imperatives originates from the coordinate conjunction *and* that underwent grammaticalization. Here, consider the grammaticalization of the *and* coordinate structure in terms of “host-class expansion” (Himmelfmann 2004; Brinton and Traugott 2005). Host-class expansion can be observed in the process of grammaticalization, and not in that of lexicalization. *And*-conditional imperatives do not follow the standard rule of conjunctions in English. Coordination in conditional imperatives is against the “Coordinate Constituent Constraint” (Schachter 1977). This constraint requires the two constituents to belong to the same syntactic category and semantic function, such as ‘S and S,’ ‘VP and VP,’ etc.; accordingly, the imperative cannot be conjoined with the declarative (for other relevant discussions of this issue, see Gleitman 1965; Schmerling 1975; and Mittwoch 1976). The violation of Coordinate Constituent Constraint in *and*-conditional imperatives can automatically

<sup>3</sup> Throughout this paper, the publications years of literary works are mentioned only when examples are given as historical data.

<sup>4</sup> The translation of this example is from ‘The sources on Vortigern --- Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: The Text of Years 381-601 AD.’ by Robert Vermaat (for more details see <http://www.vortigernstudies.org.uk/arhist/vortigernquotesasc.htm>).

be explained by the claim that they result from the grammaticalization of the coordinate conjunction *and*. Recall that grammaticalization processes lead to host-class expansion. The host-class of the conjunction *and* expanded due to grammaticalization. In the coordinate structure ‘X and S,’ for example, X used to be limited to S in order to fulfill the Coordinate Constituent Constraint; over time, grammaticalization processes expanded X from S to S, VP and NP, as in (15a)-(15c), respectively.

- (15) a. You drink another can of beer and I’m leaving.
- b. Say anything and I’ll call the police.
- c. One more can of beer and I’m leaving.

(Culicover and Jackendoff 1997: 196-214)

One of these subordinate *and* structures can be regarded as *and*-conditional imperatives. In fact, Culicover and Jackendoff (1997) refer to all of the examples in (15) as the left-subordinating *and* (<sub>LS</sub>*and*) construction. Takahashi (2004) demonstrates that *and*-conditional imperatives instantiate the <sub>LS</sub>*and* construction based on their common properties. First, both constructions follow the order of temporal iconicity. The sequence of the left and right conjuncts reflects the fact that the event of the left occurs before that of the right. Second, the two conjuncts are dependent on each other in interpretation; neither can stand alone. Third, the speaker’s epistemic attitude toward the propositional content of the two conjuncts is symmetric. If the left is desirable, the right is desirable; if the left is undesirable, the right is undesirable, and if the left is neutral, the right is neutral. Finally, <sub>LS</sub>*and* does not concern the truth of the propositional content of two conjuncts.

Next, I will discuss *or*-conditional imperatives through the analogy of *and*-conditional imperatives. The claim is that *or*-conditional imperatives developed from the coordinate conjunction *or*. First of all, Takahashi (2004) demonstrates that *or*-conditional imperatives are one instance of “asymmetric *or*” (Lakoff 1971) as in (16).

- (16) a. I left early or I would have missed the train.
- b. Give me liberty or give me death!
- c. Your money or your life!

(Takahashi 2004: 156)

According to Takahashi (2004: 154-160), as in the <sub>LS</sub>*and* and *and*-conditional imperatives, asymmetric *or* and *or*-conditional imperatives share several features. First, the left conjunct is focal in prominence, while the right functions as the background. Second, the two conjuncts are related to each other in a temporally iconic manner. The event of the right conjunct is preceded by failure to fulfill the event of the left, as can be seen from irreversibility of the two conjuncts.

- (17) a. ?I would have missed the train or I left early.
- b. ?Give me death or give me liberty!

c. ?You life or your money!

(Takahashi 2004: 156)

Third, the left conjunct is interpreted independently of the right, while the right needs the left. Finally, the speaker has an asymmetric epistemic stance on each conjunct. Typically, the propositional content of the left conjunct is desirable, while that of the right is undesirable. Such common properties strongly suggest that *or*-conditional imperatives exemplify asymmetric *or* expressions. On the analogy of the development of *and*-conditional imperatives in (18), I will propose that *or*-conditional imperatives, i.e. the causal (conditional) use of *or*, emerged from the grammaticalization processes of the coordinate structure, symmetric *or*, as shown in (19).

- (18) a. S and S [juxtaposition]  
       ↓ Grammaticalization  
       b. VP and S/VP/NP [causal (conditional)]
- (19) a. S or S [symmetric]  
       ↓ Grammaticalization  
       b. VP or S/VP/NP [asymmetric, causal (conditional)]

(18a) shows the original coordinate structure, while (18b) indicates the subordinate structure as causal uses of *and*-conditional imperatives. The shift in (19) is analogous to that in (18). Both concern the coordinate structure ‘S + a conjunction + S.’

There is historical evidence for the shift in (19). According to the *OED*, the alternative use of symmetric *or* has been observed since the 12th to 13th centuries; the causal (conditional) use appeared in the 14th century. (20) exemplifies the alternative use, while (21) exemplifies the causal use.

- (20) Leoun or wulf  
       ‘lion or wolf’ (c 1300 *Havelok* 573-4; cited in the *OED*)
- (21) Loue me al atones, Or I wol dyen.  
       ‘Love me immediately, or I will die.’  
       (c 1386 CHAUCER *Miller’s T.* 95; cited in the *OED*)

Interestingly, the appearance of the causal use of *or* follows that of *and* in the history of English. This supports the assumption that *or*-conditional imperatives developed parallel to the development of *and*-conditional imperatives.

The proposed shift from (19a) to (19b) also shows the characteristic of grammaticalization, host-class expansion. It is obvious that *or*-conditional imperatives violate the “Coordinate Constituent Constraint” (Schachter 1977). This violation, however, can easily be understood in terms of the grammaticalization of the coordinate structure into the subordinate structure. Grammaticalization processes led to host-class expansion and the host-class of the conjunction expanded accordingly. That is, in the coordinate structure ‘X or S,’ for example, X used to be limited to S in order to fulfill the Coordinate Constituent Constraint; over time, grammaticalization processes expanded X from S to S, VP and NP, as in (22a)-(22c), respectively.

- (22) a. You hide that loot right now or we're in big trouble.  
 b. Sit down, please, or I'll call the police.  
 c. Another beer or I'm leaving.

(Culicover and Jackendoff 1997: 213-214)

The development of asymmetric *or* uses in (22) can be considered through the analogy of that of the left-subordinating *and* construction. *Or*-conditional imperatives turn out to be one of the examples of such asymmetric uses.

It can also be assumed that *but*-conditional imperatives have developed analogically from the development of the two other types discussed above. Previous research mentions the imperatives that have a concessive conditional interpretation. Davies (1986: 219-228), for example, deals with "imperative-like concessives," such as (23), and then relates (23) to (23').

- (23) a. Offer me a thousand for it, I still won't sell.  
 b. Say what you like, he won't be persuaded.  
 (23') a. Even if you offer me a thousand for it, I still won't sell.  
 b. Whatever you like to say, he won't be persuaded.

This type of imperative form is also dealt with in Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Takahashi (2004) as concession imperatives such as (24), which "have lost all directive force" (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 931).

- (24) a. Double any offer: I still won't sell.  
 b. Say what you like, it won't make any difference.

The examples in (23) and (24) contain no connective, but they exemplify *but*-conditional imperatives with scalar or universal meaning. In fact, the conjunction *but* can be inserted between imperatives and declaratives in both (23) and (24). Thus, when *but*-conditional imperatives are mentioned in previous research, the conjunction *but* is not included. This indicates that *but*-conditional imperatives are not such established patterns as *and/or*-conditional imperatives and that *but* types have escaped much attention in the literature of imperatives. Given the fact that *but* is a coordinate conjunction, it is reasonable to assume that *but* underwent the same change as *and* and *or*: Over time, the coordinate *but* changed into the subordinate *but* which has concessive conditional use. Then, the concessive conditional meaning that was once expressed without *but* has come to be expressed more overtly by placing the conjunction in-between.

Historically, the coordinate use of *but* (adversative) is observed in the 9th century, while subordinate (concessive conditional) *but* in the 16th century. The former is shown in (25), the latter in (26).

- (25) Nawðer ne on Fresisc ꝥescæpene ne on Denisc, bute swa him selfum

ðuhte þæt hie nytwyrðoste beon meahten.

‘They were not shaped either after the Frisian or the Danish model, but so as he himself thought that they might be most serviceable’<sup>5</sup>

(897 *O.E. Chron.*; cited in the *OED*)

- (26) It shall goe hard but he will wind in his opportunity.

‘Even if it shall go hard, he will wind in his opportunity.’

(1628 EARLE *Microcosm.* xxxi. (Arb.) 53; cited in the *OED*)

It is interesting to note that the subordinate use of *but* is preceded by that of *and* (10th-11th centuries) and that of *or* (14th century). This fact is in accordance with the assumption that subordinate *but* has developed through the analogy of subordinate *and/or*. The development from the coordinate *but* to the subordinate *but* can be summarized as in (27).

- (27) a. S but S [adversative]  
           ↓ Grammaticalization  
       b. VP but S/VP/NP [concessive conditional]

It is obvious that the shift in (27) can be considered parallel with (18) and (19). To discuss the development in terms of grammaticalization processes, consider these examples of the subordinate *but*.

- (28) a. You don’t like vegetables, but you have to eat them.  
           (Intended: Even if you don’t like vegetables, you have to eat them.)  
       b. Study a lot but you’ll fail the exam.  
           (Intended: Even if you study a lot, you’ll fail the exam.)  
       c. Another beer but I’m leaving.  
           (Intended: Even if you order another beer for me, I’m leaving.)

It is shown that in the structure ‘X but S,’ X can become S, VP and NP. Since *but* is a coordinate conjunction, it follows that (28b) and (28c) violate the Coordinate Constituent Constraint. This violation, however, can be understood in terms of the host-class expansion of the grammaticalization of *but*. In the coordinate structure ‘X but S,’ grammaticalization processes expanded X from S to S, VP and NP, as in (28a)-(28c), respectively. Thus, *but*-conditional imperatives exemplify one of the subordinate conditional uses of the word *but*.

<sup>5</sup> The translation of Old English in this example is cited from the website at (library.iapm.edu.ua/metod\_disc/PDF/zagalnyj/3078\_Ist\_in\_mov.pdf).

### 3.2 Degrees of Grammaticalization Processes

The discussion above revealed that the subordinate, conditional use of coordinate conjunctions has appeared at different stages in the history of English, i.e. *and*, then *or* and finally *but*. This historical fact implies that each type of conjunction involves varying degrees of grammaticalization processes. It was also shown that the grammaticalized, subordinate structure ‘X + *and/or/but* + S’ allows S, VP and NP to appear in the left conjunct X, but the subordinate *but* does not select VP or NP as often as the subordinated *and* and *or*. These two findings suggest that each type of conjunction has different degrees of grammaticalization processes. To examine this more closely, I will consider various types of conditional imperatives in terms of the illocutionary forces involved.

Three types of conditional imperatives differ from each other in the illocutionary force available in the left conjunct. To begin with, the illocutionary force of *and*-conditional imperatives is a request or a threat.<sup>6</sup>

- (29) a. Come closer and I’ll give you five pounds.  
       b. Come one step closer and I’ll shoot. (Clark 1993: 79)

In (29a) the speaker requests the addressee to come closer to the speaker. On the other hand, in (29b), the speaker does not request the addressee to do so; rather, the speaker warns the address against coming closer to the speaker. The negative version, *Don’t come one step closer*, is implied in (29b). (29a) functions as a request imperative, while (29b) functions as a threat. Both a request and threat can thus be involved in *and*-conditional imperatives. However, *or*-conditional imperatives lack the illocutionary force of a threat. Compare (30a) and (30b).

- (30) a. Study hard or you’ll fail the exam.  
       b. \*Drink too much alcohol or you’ll feel better.  
           (Intended: Don’t drink too much alcohol./If you don’t drink too much alcohol, you’ll feel better.)

The speaker in (30a) requests the addressee to study hard. (30b) neither has a threat reading nor implies its negative counterpart, *Don’t drink too much*. This means that the illocutionary force of a threat is not included in *or*-conditional imperatives. Now, consider *but*-conditional imperatives.

---

<sup>6</sup> In addition to request and threat imperatives, some *and* types seem to have no imperative illocutionary force. Consider the following.

(i) Open the Guardian and you’ll find three misprints on every page. (Clark 1993: 79)  
 The speaker does not order the addressee to open the Guardian or not to open it. Clark (1993) claims that this type of imperative has a neutral interpretation, while (29a) and (29b) have positive and negative interpretations. For types of illocutionary forces of conditional imperatives, see also Takahashi (2004).

- (31) a. \*Study as hard as possible, please, but you'll fail the exam.  
 b. \*Call the situation what you like, please, but it's clearly bullying.

In (31), *please* which can express the speaker's intention of a request cannot be added to imperatives. That is, the illocutionary force of a request is not involved in *but*-conditional imperatives.

- (32) a. \*Study as hard as possible, but you'll fail the exam.  
 (Intended: Don't study as hard as possible. / If (= non-concessive) you don't study as hard as possible, you'll fail the exam.)  
 b. \*Call the situation what you like, but it's clearly bullying.  
 (Intended: Don't call the situation what you like. / If (= non-concessive) you call the situation what you like, it's clearly bullying.)

(32a) and (32b) also show that *but*-conditional imperatives cannot function as threat imperatives. Neither scalar nor universal meaning is compatible with a threat, which can imply a negative imperative. Instead, *but*-conditional imperatives serve as permission/concession imperatives.

- (33) a. Study as hard as possible, but you'll fail the exam.  
 b. Call the situation what you like, but it's clearly bullying.  
 (33') a. You may/can study as hard as possible, but you'll fail the exam.  
 b. You may/can call the situation what you like, but it's clearly bullying.

(33a) and (33b) are paraphrased as (33'a) and (33'b), in which the meaning of permission is made more obvious by the use of the auxiliary verb of permission *may/can*.

The discussion above is summarized in Table 1. 'YES' and 'NO' represent whether a request or threat is involved in types of conditional imperatives. The distribution in Table 1 shows that *and*-conditional imperatives have the highest type frequency of illocutionary forces.

	Request	Threat
<i>And</i> -Conditional Imperatives	YES	YES
<i>Or</i> -Conditional Imperatives	YES	NO
<i>But</i> -Conditional Imperatives	NO	NO

Table 1: Distribution of Illocutionary Forces

The higher the type frequency of a given expression is, the more established that expression is (for details about frequency effects, see Barlow and Kemmer (eds.) 2000; Bybee and Hopper (eds.) 2001; etc.). Hence, the difference in the type frequency in Table 1 can be considered in terms of the degree to which a given coordinate structure has been grammaticalized and established in English grammar. From the findings about illocutionary forces, it follows that the development of *and* underwent a semantic change further than that of *or*, whereas *or* was grammaticalized further than *but*. If grammaticalization processes proceed further, one can predict that *or*-conditional imperatives also function as threat imperatives and that *but*-conditional imperatives have the illocutionary forces of a request and threat.

#### 4 THREE CONJUNCTIONS IN CONDITIONAL IMPERATIVES

From the discussion above, it follows that three conjunctions can be theoretically used in conditional imperatives to express subordinate meaning. In this section I will compare and contrast the nature of conditionality implied by the conjunctions. Consider *and*, *or* and *but* in the following conditional imperatives and their implied conditionals.

- (34) Make any noise and you'll be scolded.  
(> If you make any noise, you'll be scolded.)
- (35) Study harder or you'll fail the exam.  
(> If you don't study harder, you'll fail the exam.)
- (36) a. Study a lot but you'll still fail the exam.  
(> Even if you study a lot, you'll fail the exam.)  
b. Call the situation what you like, but it's clearly bullying.  
(> No matter what you call the situation, it's clearly bullying.)

*And* and *or* can be distinguished according to whether or not a negative conditional is implied. Only this criterion, however, fails to differentiate *and* from *but*, because the two conjunctions imply no negative conditionals. Recall that the meaning of *but* is concessive in nature. Such concessivity plays a crucial role in the classification of the three conjunctions.

It is well-known that *but* in general can be semantically and cross-linguistically divided into at least two types (e.g. Dascal and Katriel 1977; Blakemore 1989; Azar 1997; among others). For the sake of particular relevance to this research, I will consider two types of concession relations as described in Azar (1997). The two types are exemplified by (37a) and (37b).

- (37) a. Indeed, it was very cold in the room, but (nevertheless) they did not  
turn on the heater. (Azar 1997: 307)
- b. True, his car has broken down, but there is always public

transportation.

(ibid.: 310)

In the conjoined structure ‘P but Q,’ *but* serves to either directly or indirectly reject the expectation ‘ $P \rightarrow \text{not-Q}$ ,’ or the so-called natural course based on common encyclopedic knowledge. The implication of this expectation decides whether *but* denotes “direct-rejection concessivity” or “indirect-rejection concessivity” (Azar (1997: 306, 310)). The direct-rejection concessive *but* rejects the expectation directly because the expectation is actually implied, whereas the indirect-rejection concessive *but* rejects the expectation indirectly because the expectation is *not* implied. (37a) implies the expectation, whereas (37b) does not, as shown below.

- (38) a. ‘it was very cold in the room  $\rightarrow$  they turned on the heater’  
[= the expectation of (37a)]
- b. ‘his car has broken down  $\rightarrow$  there is not always public transportation’  
[ $\neq$  the expectation of (37b)]

Thus, *but* in (37a) denotes a direct-rejection concessive relationship between P and Q, while *but* in (37b) expresses indirect-rejection concessivity. *But* in (36) also functions to reject the expectation directly or indirectly, thereby establishing the two types of concessive relations. (39a) and (39b) show whether ‘P but Q’ in (36) implies the expectation ‘ $P \rightarrow \text{not-Q}$ .’

- (39) a. ‘(you) study a lot  $\rightarrow$  you won’t fail the exam’  
[= the expectation of (36a)]
- b. ‘(you) call the situation what you like  $\rightarrow$  it’s not clearly bullying’  
[ $\neq$  the expectation of (36b)]

Thus, it follows that *but* in (36a) denotes direct-rejection concessivity and *but* in (36b) expresses indirect-rejection concessivity. In the same vein, consider *and* and *or* in (34) and (35).

- (40) ‘(you) make any noise  $\rightarrow$  ‘you won’t be scolded’  
[ $\neq$  the expectation of (34)]
- (41) ‘(you) study harder  $\rightarrow$  you won’t fail the exam’  
[= the expectation of (35)]

*And* and *or* do not reject the non-expectation or the expectation in (40) and (41). Notice, however, that *and* is similar to *but* in (36b) while *or* is similar to *but* in (36a) with respect to the implication of the expectation ‘ $P \rightarrow \text{not-Q}$ ,’<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Regarding a relationship between *but* in natural language and the conjunction (&) in symbolic logic, Partee et al. (1993: 100) state that “[i]n translating from English into statement logic the sentential connective *but* is often rendered as &; thus, *John smokes but Jane snores* might be translated into  $(p \ \& \ q)$ , where the & carries none of the connotations of contrast or unexpectedness of the English connective.”

The discussion above can make explicit the semantic relationship among the possible conjunctions in the structure ‘the imperative (P) + a conjunction + the declarative (Q).’ The semantics of each conjunction is summarized in Table 2, where the expectation ‘ $P \rightarrow \text{not-Q}$ ’ is expressed as E.

	E is not rejected (= non-concessive)	E is rejected (= concessive)
E is not implied	<i>and</i>	<i>but</i> (indirect-rejection concessivity)
E is implied	<i>or</i>	<i>but</i> (direct-rejection concessivity)

Table 2: Semantics of the Conjunctions in Conditional Imperatives

Each column shows whether or not a given conjunction concerns a concessive relationship between P and Q: *And/or* versus *but*. If a relation is concessive in nature, the expectation ‘ $P \rightarrow \text{not-Q}$ ’ is rejected directly or indirectly. Each row indicates whether or not the expectation ‘ $P \rightarrow \text{not-Q}$ ’ is implied: *And*/indirect-rejection concessive *but* versus *or*/direct-rejection concessive *but*. Although many attempts have been made to compare coordinate conjunctions (e.g. Lakoff 1971; van Dijk 1979; Sweetser 1990), little attention has been paid to the semantics of the coordinate conjunctions of conditional imperatives. An otherwise complex relationship among *and*, *or* and *but* used in conditional imperatives was made obvious by relating them to the two aspects: A concessive relationship between P and Q and an implication of the expectation ‘ $P \rightarrow \text{not-Q}$ .’

## 5 CONCLUSION

I have discussed English conditional imperatives, in which imperative forms induce conditional meaning. In the literature on imperatives, conditional imperatives have been divided into two types: Imperatives followed by *and* (*and*-conditional imperatives) and those followed by *or* (*or*-conditional imperatives). Using naturally occurring data, the present paper revealed another type of imperative, i.e. the *but*-conditional imperative, which accompanies *but* and carries conditional meaning. This type differs from the existing types in several ways. First of all, *but*-conditional imperatives are characterized by concessive conditional meaning such as scalar and universal readings. Such meaning then seems to have several structural patterns: Scalar meaning tends to be compatible with the expression *if you like*, while universal meaning frequently co-occurs with a verb of speech such as *call* and the relative clause containing *like*. I also considered the development of *but*-conditional imperatives with reference to that of the other types. Historical data show that the

coordinate *and/or/but* developed into subordinate ones, resulting in host-class expansion, a defining feature of grammaticalization. Among grammaticalized, subordinate structures, there are differences in the type of the left conjunct and in the type frequency of the illocutionary forces of conditional imperatives. This means that the grammaticalization processes involved have varying degrees and indicates that *but*-conditional imperatives are not yet so established as the two others. Finally, the semantics of the three conjunctions of conditional imperatives were systematically compared with one another. The discussion of *but*-conditional imperatives in this paper can bring about a better understanding of coordinate conjunctions as well as conditional imperatives in English.

## REFERENCES

- Azar, Moshe (1997) "Concession Relations as Argumentation," *Text* 17, 301-316.
- Baker, Charlotte (1975) "This is Just a First Approximation, but...", *CLS* 11, 37-47.
- Barlow, Michael and Suzanne Kemmer (eds.) (2000) *Usage-Based Models of Language*, CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Blakemore, Diane (1989) "Denial and Contrast: A Relevance Theoretic Analysis of *But*," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12, 15-37.
- Bolinger, Dwight (1977) *Meaning and Form*, Longman, London.
- Brinton, Laurel and Elizabeth C. Traugott (2005) *Lexicalization and Language Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bybee, Joan L. and Paul Hopper (eds.) (2001) *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Clark, Billy (1993) "Relevance and 'Pseudo-Imperatives'," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16, 79-121.
- Culicover, Peter W. and Ray Jackendoff (1997) "Semantic Subordination despite Syntactic Coordination," *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 195-217.
- Dascal, Marcelo and Tamar Katriel (1977) "Between Semantics and Pragmatics: The Two Types of 'But': Hebrew 'Aval' and 'Ela'," *Theoretical Linguistics* 4, 143-172.
- Davies, Eirlys (1986) *The English Imperative*, Croom Helm, London.
- Declerck, Renaat and Susan Reed (2001) *Conditionals: A Comprehensive Empirical Analysis*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin and New York.
- Fraser, Bruce (1998) "Contrastive Discourse Markers in English," *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*, ed. by Andreas H. Jucker and Yeal Ziv, 301-326, John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- Gleitman, Lila (1965) "Coordinating Conjunctions in English," *Language* 41, 260-293.
- Haspelmath, Martin and Ekkehard König (1998) "Concessive Conditionals in the Languages of Europe," *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, ed. by Johan van der Auwera, 563-640, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin and New York.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. (2004) "Lexicalization and Grammaticalization: Opposite or Orthogonal?," *What Makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and*

- its Components*, ed. by Walter Bisang, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, and Björn Wiemer, 21-42, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin and New York.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Jespersen, Otto (1940) *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* V, George Allen and Unwin, London.
- König, Ekkehard (1985) "On the History of Concessive Connectives in English: Diachronic and Synchronic Evidence," *Lingua* 66, 1-19.
- König, Ekkehard (1986) "Conditionals, Concessive Conditionals and Concessives: Areas of Contrast, Overlap and Neutralization," *On Conditionals*, ed. by Elizabeth C. Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judith S. Reilly and Charles Ferguson, 229-246, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lakoff, Robin (1971) "If's, And's and But's about Conjunction," *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*, ed. by Charles Fillmore and Terence Langendoen, 114-149, Holt, Reinhart and Winston, New York.
- Mittwoch, Anita (1976) "Grammar and Illocutionary Force," *Lingua* 40, 21-42.
- Mori, Hideki (2007) *Three Types of Imperatives and Related Constructions: A Contrastive Study of English and Japanese*, Doctoral thesis, Osaka University.
- Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd Edition) on CD-ROM, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Partee, Barbara H., Alice ter Meulen and Robert E. Wall (1993) *Mathematical Methods in Linguistics*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, Boston and London.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of Contemporary English*, Longman, London.
- Schachter, Paul (1977) "Constraints on Coordination," *Language* 53, 86-103.
- Schmerling, Susan (1975) "Asymmetric Conjunction and Rules of Conversation," *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerry P. Morgan, 211-231, Academic Press, New York.
- Sweetser, Eve (1990) *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Takahashi, Hidemitsu (2004) *The English Imperative: A Cognitive and Functional Analysis*, Doctoral thesis, Hokkaido University.
- van Dijk, Teun (1979) "Pragmatic Connectives," *Journal of Pragmatics* 3, 447-456.

## CORPORA

BNC (British National Corpus) (<http://sara.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/lookup.html>)  
 Factiva (<http://www.factiva.com/>)  
 IMDb (The Internet Movie Database) (<http://www.imdb.com/>)  
 SS (Simply Scripts) (<http://www.simplyscripts.com/movie.html>)

*Hideki Mori*  
godjnca@hotmail.com