

Statives've Gone Imperatives

Taiseer Flaiyih Hesana, ^aCollege of Education for Humanities, University of Thi-qar, Iraq, Email: Taiseer-f@utq.edu.iq

This study is collaboration between syntax and semantics. It tries to investigate how, what the researcher calls the imperative mood-lexical aspect dichotomy, affects certain stative verbs, and makes them used imperatively. The study aims to answer some questions like, 'Can all stative verbs be imperative? And if they are used imperatively, can such verbs be used for the default imperative purpose of commanding?' It is hypothesised that not all statives can be used imperatively, and such verbs cannot be used to fulfill commands which are the basic purpose behind imperatives. The procedures followed here include surveying the literature available for the imperative mood, aspect, statives and dynamics. Then, the researcher tries to establish the relation between mood and aspect, with special focus on such a relation in the domain of stative verbs that can be changed into dynamic. The researcher collects examples from the available references of English grammar to show and explain how such group of verbs can be used imperatively. The study concludes that such stative verbs, which the researcher calls the grey area verbs, suffer from a change in their semantics and specifically their lexical aspect. It is this kind of change which allows them to be used imperatively. It is also concluded that only stative verbs that change their lexical aspect into activity or process, may be capable of occurring in the imperative mood.

Key words: *Imperatives, lexical aspect, statives, dynamics.*

Introduction

This study is collaboration between syntax and semantics. Generally speaking, the imperative mood, which is a property of syntax, can be allowed with predicates (verb+ its obligatory complements) that are dynamic, a property of verb semantics. To elaborate, when a certain verb or predicate is said to be stative or dynamic, it is the lexical aspect that is called upon. According to Richards and Schmidt (2010:34,555), it is the lexical aspect or 'the internal semantics' of verbs that renders them as stative or dynamic. Verbs like *understand, know, feel* are stative, if their internal semantics is related to states of perception or cognition. On

the other hand, verbs like *walk*, *play*, *write* are dynamic since their semantics relate to activity or process. Typically, it is the dynamic verbs that can be used in the imperative mood for example *Write your lesson* since stative verbs cannot normally be used in the imperative **Know Louise*. Still, some stative verbs can be used dynamically and hence imperatively as in *Know what you are doing before you go!* It is this grey area of verbs that the researcher is interested in, where verbs that are normally characterised as stative are being used in the imperative.

According to Quirk et al. (1985: 827-828), stative predicates 'are easily available with a dynamic interpretation for imperatives: *Forgive us*'. What is meant here is that *forgive* is a stative verb and hence cannot normally be used imperatively. Still, in this particular example this verb is interpreted dynamically and thus accepted in the imperative mood. That is, this change in the syntax of this verb from non-imperative into imperative is attributed to change of its meaning from stative into dynamic. The researcher thinks that this acceptability is due to collaboration of the syntax and the semantics of this verb and other similar verbs. She chooses to call this collaboration as the mood-aspect dichotomy, since when surveying the primary available sources such a relation is never explained. The collaboration between aspect and tense has been explained in the primary sources of English grammar. For example, Leech and Svartvik (1994:400-401), Jacobs (1995: 194-193, 201), Swan (1995:464), Tallerman (1998:53-54) and Miller (2000:194) all have discussed tense and aspect together, shedding light on their collaboration as properties of verbs. For example, Jacobs (ibid.) discusses the progressive aspect as a combination of aspect and tense in *Jane Austen was writing her greatest novel*. In this sentence, the tense is past (due to *was*) and the aspect is progressive. The situation the sentence tries to communicate is the writing of the novel was in the past and that writing was going on or in progress at that past time. Even more, Carnie (2011:88) speaks of 'Combined tense, mood and voice' in English.

Still, as far as the researcher knows, mood and aspect have never been discussed together explicitly. It is true that reference has been made to the fact that dynamic verbs, a distinction based on lexical aspect, can occur in imperatives, a distinction of mood. But mood and aspect collaboration has never been explained. The researcher seeks to study their collaboration in the grey area where some stative verbs can be used imperatively.

The Imperative Mood

Generally speaking, mood is a grammatical category of verbs and it can be used as a criterion in the classifications of English clauses. Crystal (2008:312) concentrates on the role of verbs in showing the mood of the clause saying it 'refers to a set of syntactic and semantic contrasts signalled by alternative paradigms of the verb'. Syntactically, the form of the verb might be one that is used in declaratives and question, and it is the indicative mood that is being sought. Or the form of the verb that is used might be *were* or *be* and in this case it is the

subjunctive mood. And finally, the base form of the verb could be the one used in commands, and hence it is the imperative mood that is being tackled. Semantically, mood expresses the viewpoint or attitude of the speaker towards the situation expressed by the clause. According to Brinton (2000:115) and Richards and Schmidt (2010:375), the indicative mood shows the situation as factual. Still, the subjunctive and the imperative moods can be related to non-factual situations.

The researcher is concerned with imperative mood. Typically, speakers use the imperative mood when their attitude towards the situation is that of issuing an order or command. Generally, the syntax of the clause in the imperative is that of the base form of the verb plus the verb complement if any, and the subject is omitted but understood as second person *you* as in *Run!* and *Throw the ball.*

Obviously, this is not the only reason speakers have in mind when they choose to use the imperative mood. Griffith (2006:155) assumes that the imperative in *Help yourself to milk and sugar* is used with a perspective not that of order but of offer. Swan (1995:254) thinks that in *Try again- you nearly did it, Please do not lean out of the window, Enjoy your holiday*, the imperative is respectively for encouraging, giving advice and expressing 'wishes for people's welfare'. Richards and Schmidt (ibid. :272) explain that *Look what you've done now!* is to express discomfort and annoyance. Also, Bussmann (1996: 540) in *Lose my book and I'll make you buy me a new one* the imperative is used as conditional.

As for how to punctuate, Strumpf and Douglas (1999:2960) claim that periods and exclamation marks can end imperatives.

As to verbs which can be used in the imperative mood, it is customarily assumed that imperatives can be freely used with dynamic verbs, but it cannot normally be used with stative verbs. What is more, Crystal (2008: 159, 452) mainly considers the imperative mood as one of the 'distinguishing criteria' for stativity and dynamism in verbs.

Aspect: grammatical and Lexical

Basically, aspect is one of the categories of verbs along with tense and mood. It is related to how speakers use language to view or visualise the situations around them. Incidentally, 'situations' is synonymous with events. It is true that aspect is related to time and how these situations can be considered with respect to time. Still, aspect is different from tense, though both are time-related. Thus, Kearns (2000:200) writes 'aspect expresses characteristics of the 'internal structure' of an event, independently of the event's placement in the past, present or future'. That is, by aspect speakers can think of structure of the situations or events as going on in progress or completed. They are not after viewing that situation from tense perspective

by characterising it as present, past or future. In support of this, Carnie (2011: 334) thinks of aspects as ‘defined by making reference to some point in time, other than the speech time, then looking at when the event happens relative to that reference point’. The researcher thinks that the phrase *other than the speech time* in Carnie’s terms is what Kearns (ibid.) means by *the internal structure* of the event. That is, the speech time is related to locating the event on the tense scale; while looking at when the event itself happens in relation to a certain time reference which the speaker has in mind is related to aspect. For example, in *Mary is working*, the speaker is viewing the situation described by the utterance as internally going on and Mary’s work is in progress. Being in progress or completed is the most distinct aspect contrasts and such contrasts are usually marked by the grammar of English. Richards and Schmidt (2010:35) labels this aspect ‘grammatical aspect’ and English has two grammatical aspects progressive and perfect.

Still, sometimes aspect is approached semantically, that is, as part of the lexical semantics of the verb. A different label is even sometimes used to cover such aspect which is *Aktionsart* from German. Here, the internal temporal structure of the event or aspect can be indicated through the semantics of the verb, that is, its lexical meaning. In other words, the speaker can depend on the meaning of the verb to communicate his viewpoint concerning the event in question. Saeed (2009:120) writes in this respect ‘certain lexical categories, in particular verbs, inherently describe different situation types’. That is why Richards and Schmidt (2010:34) calls this kind of aspect ‘inherent lexical aspect’.

Accordingly, in describing a situation or event, speakers might have resorts other than the grammatical aspect of the progressive and the perfect. In this respect, Vendler (1967) (cited in Griffiths, 2006:66, 75) in an article called *Verbs and times* concentrates on the roles played by verbs in distributing events in time.

Such a distribution is related to the study of aspect and specifically lexical aspect. In this distribution, verbs are classed, four-fold, based on whether the meaning of the verb is that of state or action, and its distribution in time. Thus, verbs and hence the situations denoted by the verbs are either stative or dynamic. The latter includes process, achievement and accomplishment.

It is the lexical aspect that the researcher is pursuing. This is because the use of verbs in the imperative mood is affected by whether these verbs are stative or dynamic; a matter of lexical aspect. That is why the imperative mood is considered as a test and a distinguishing criterion, in classifying verbs into statives or dynamics. It is to be noted that this classification of verbs is not clear-cut since certain verbs can change from being stative to dynamic. It is this group of verbs that the research is concerned with. The researcher calls these verbs the grey area

verbs, since they occupy the area between statives and dynamics being caught in the middle. The following explains statives, dynamics and the grey area verbs.

Statives

When a verb is 'stative', its lexical aspect is called upon. In support of this, Kreidler (1998:198) assumes that 'aspect also depends on the nature of the predicate, a lexical matter: differences of aspect are communicated in the semantic features of different predicates'. That is why stativity is a semantic property of verbs.

Statives are just one aspectual category of verbs, i.e., a category based on aspect. The other aspectual category is dynamics. Crystal (2008:452) uses various terms for such verbs like 'statives, static or state verbs'.

Bussmann (1996:1120) describes statives as verbs having the semantic feature (⁺ state). In other words, Rothmayr (2009: 3) claims that when a verb and hence a situation denoted by that verb is given the typology of being a state, this typology is part of the verb denotation or literal meaning.

Now, what are the semantic components that should be available in a verb rendering it as stative? Kearns (2000:201-204) uses certain parameters in distinguishing statives from other dynamic verbs. Three parameters are in play: endpoint, time occupying and marking of change. A verb is characterised in the light of absence or presence of these three. For example, in *Clive knows my bother*, the verb *knows* here is stative since there is no indication that knowing my brother has come to an end. That is, there is no termination to the state of Clive knowing someone. Besides, one can know Clive since childhood, and in this case that knowing is occupying a period of time. Finally, if someone knows Clive today, he will know him the next day and the day after. The researcher thinks that there is no change to the state of knowing someone in normal condition, unless the person knowing Clive is suffering from brain injury. As a result, this verb can be marked for the three parameters in the following way: no endpoint, time-occupying, no change.

Other grammarians like Jacobs (1995:164,206) approach statives by concentrating on one feature above, that of no change, assuming that they are used to 'signify state (mental or physical), relations and attributes. Nothing is viewed as happening, it just "is"'. Verbs used statively include: *know, believe, resemble, own, signify* etc. That is why, Miller (2002:144) sets the question *What happened?* as a criterion for distinguishing stative from non-stative verbs. It is assumed that statives fail in answering that question since nothing is happening.

Examine:

- What happened?
- * They knew his parents.
- * They were very cold.

The last two sentences cannot be answers to this question since they contain the statives *knew* and *be cold*. The former refers to a mental state and the latter refers to a physical one.

Kreidler (1998:201-202) gives examples of statives. Verbs like *abhor, adore, desire, enjoy, hate, like, envy, fear, long for, mind, prefer, regret, want, wish* express feeling and thus they are stative. Others like *believe, doubt, expect, intend, interest, know, suppose, suspect, think, understand* are showing mental states. Crystal (2008:452) describes such verbs as showing ‘inactive perceptual or cognitive process’. Another group is that of relating two entities: *belong, consists, contain, cost, deserve, equal, fit, include, involve, keep, lack, matter, mean, need, owe, own, remain, require, resemble*. Verbs like *kneel, lean, lie, sit, stand* can express physical position. Finally, verbs like *remain, stay, wait* can indicate non-action.

As to syntax, a stative verb cannot normally be used in the imperative mood. With regard to this, Bussmann (1996: 1120) claims that statives:

describe properties or relations which do not imply a change in state or motion and which cannot be directly controlled by the entity possessing the property, i.e. stative situations cannot be started, stopped, interrupted, or brought about easily or voluntarily. Related to this is the fact that stative verbs cannot usually occur in the imperative.

Griffiths (2006:152) claims that the meaning of the ‘directives’, which is a pragmatic label for the imperative, is to convey ‘a proposition about a future act of the addressee that the speaker desires, and the point is to try to get the addressee to commit to making the proposition true’. Following Jacobs (1995:11-13), a proposition is the semantic equivalent of a clause, and it consists of predicate plus the arguments (noun phrases) required by that predicate. Like any other clause type, the imperative clause can be viewed as a proposition consisting of a predicate and its arguments. The choice of the predicate is conditioned by getting the addressee doing something. Thus, the semantics of the imperatives require that the meaning of the verb is related to doing or changing *Come here quickly*. And hence, using statives in the imperative construction will cause mismatch between the so called verb-construction semantics. This is because statives denote a static situation- a state of affairs that exists (Young, 1984:47). Supporting this, Brinton (2000: 210) writes ‘Generally, states cannot occur in the imperative because someone cannot be commanded to be in a state. A

state is not a matter of will and hence cannot be brought about volitionally'. Thus, the ungrammaticality of **Resemble your father!* and **Have brown eyes*, since one cannot have control over resembling someone else or having brown eyes. The researcher believes that resembling someone or having brown eyes is a state that just exists, and such states are separate from the person's will since he cannot bring them about. This will lead to another point related to statives; that of their subject. Following Kearns (2000:211-113) in **Understand the chaos theory!*, the implied subject is not agentive of the stative *understand*. Kearns (ibid.) assumes that agentivity, a thematic or semantic role of the subject, can be related to aspectual verb distinctions of statives and dynamics. This is because both a predicate and its argument(s) contribute to the portrayal of the situation or event structure. As explained earlier, the subject in statives has no control over the property or situation denoted by that verb. Thus, Kearns (ibid. 237-238) claims that agents are identified by certain tests like the use in the imperative. In **Resemble your father!* or **Recognise the woman in the doorway!* for example, *resemble* and *recognise* are statives. Their subject is not agentive, since normally one cannot have control over his heredity or his recognition. That is why Griffiths (2006:71) marks states as minus agent assuming that an argument is agentive if 'the language encodes it as consciously responsible for what happens'. With statives, nothing is conscious since states are separate from someone's will.

Brown and Miller (1980:326-327) summarise these two conditions for forming the imperatives, by saying that the verb should be an action verb and the subject should be an agent. They (ibid.) call such conditions 'restrictions' and these restrictions account for unacceptable sentences like **Have a book*.

Accordingly, the subject in these statives is not agentive. Kearns (2000: 190) proposes that when an 'entity, human or animal, has an emotional or psychological state or experience, its thematic role is that of experiencer. Similarly, Kreider (1998:70) proposes that when an argument takes the role of affecting another argument 'without any action', it has the thematic role of 'affecting' as in *Betty likes Opera*. Another role assumed by Kreider (ibid.) is that of 'associate' in which the argument tells something about the 'status or identity' of another argument as in *Roger is a students*.

Accordingly, the researcher thinks that the thematic role of the subject in statives is that of experiencer. Also, Brown and Miller (ibid. :428) claim that the argument that experiences something is the subject of a state.

Dynamics

Dynamics cover the other class of verbs on the basis of their lexical aspect. The first class is statives. Just like statives, the dynamic aspectual contrast, a contrast based on lexical aspect,

can also be reflected by the semantics of the verb. Such verbs are discussed using different terminology. Crystal (2008: 159) calls them 'dynamic verbs'. Bussmann (1996: 1120) terms them 'active verbs'. Miller (2002:143) considers them 'non-stative'. Lieber (2004:30) characterises them as 'event verbs' giving them the semantic feature (+ dynamic). A verb is said to be dynamic when the lexical meaning of that verb is that of 'action, movement or change' (Trask, 1993:87). Back to Miller's (ibid.) *what happened ?* test, dynamic verbs successfully answer this question. For example, *They went home* is an acceptable answer to such a question since *went* is an action verb. Kreider (ibid. :201) summarises what dynamism in a verb or predicate means, saying it 'reports a situation that will continue if there is a continual input of energy, but it ceases to be when energy is no longer expended'.

Following the previously mentioned Kearns' (ibid.:201-204) parameters, dynamics and hence the situations expressed by these verbs can be of three types: activity or process, accomplishments and achievements. The three parameters are endpoint, time occupying and marking of change. The researcher thinks that although it is true that these dynamic verbs share dynamism or action, still speakers differ as to how to view or depict the situation as dynamic.

Starting with verbs of activity or process, these verbs indicate no endpoint. That is, the situation or event can continue without being terminated. For example, Saeed (2009: 123) says in *Harry was gazing at the sea*, the process of gazing can continue 'indefinitely' unless interrupted. To elaborate, gazing may continue for seconds, minutes, hours, nights and days, years etc. and this meaning is inherent in the semantics of the verb *gaze* and other similar verbs. On the other hand, in *Harry was building a raft* the verb *build* is not an activity verb, since the situation denoted by that verb can come to an end when the raft is completed.

As far as the other situation-type indicating parameters are concerned, activity verbs are durative, i.e., they are time-occupying and can last for differing times. In *Lucy wrote for half an hour*, Kreidler (1998: 207) declares that activities or processes like that of writing 'occur throughout a period of time'. Finally, verbs of activity are dynamic and are marked for change. Saeed (2009: 120) clarifies that in *Mary learned to drive sports cars*, there are 'phases' of change or steps in the process of learning: from not being able to drive to being able to handle such a thing. Thus, activity or process verbs can be marked for the three parameters as following: no endpoint, time-occupying and changing.

The second type of dynamics is that of achievement verbs. Kearns (2000:203) describes them as 'the transition from one state to another'. In *they reached the summit*, the situation is transmitted from the state of not being on the summit to the state of being on that summit. As for the duration parameter, achievements are described as 'instantaneous', that is, they occur immediately. To explain, Griffiths (2006:67) assumes that in *She got her ankle sprained*,

‘there is not usually enough time to avoid the outcome by stopping partway through’. That is there is not enough period of time separating the state of not having one’s ankle suddenly twisted to the state of having it twisted. Twisting is so instantaneous that it could barely take time. Even more, Kreidler (1998: 206) assumes that in *Sandra died*, the death event occur in no time no matter how long it took Sandra to reach that state of death.

Saeed (2009: 125) describes the following achievement verb phrases *recognise, find, stop, reach the top, win the race, spot someone* as ‘point events’. The researcher thinks that this is an indication to the end-point parameter. That is, being transitory from one state to another state achievements end with having a new state. It means that achievements have the endpoint parameter. Again, this changing from one state to another marks achievement verbs for change. Thus achievement verb parameters can be summarised as following: no duration, still with endpoint and change.

As for the third type of dynamics, it is called accomplishment. Kreidler (1998:207) describes accomplishments as ‘expenditure of effort during a period leading to the result accomplished’. As for duration, an achievement verb is marked positively for that parameter. For example, in *She got better* the situation of getting better or healthy usually takes time, since it cannot occur instantly or suddenly. Also, accomplishments have a final result or outcome with a sense of finishing in Kearns’ (2000:203) words. For example, being sick ends with getting well. As for the change parameter, accomplishment verbs are clearly marked for change and this is encoded through a process leading to the accomplished results. To sum up, accomplishment verbs are durative, with endpoint and change.

As for occurrence with the imperative mood, surprisingly not all dynamic verbs freely occur in the imperative. Although it is true that dynamics are marked positively for action or change, still agentivity which is the other restriction on forming the imperative (page 7-8) is not present in all types of dynamics.

As previously mentioned, semantic roles of arguments and the aspectual class of the predicate collaborate to build the situation. Kearns (2000:211) agrees with this saying ‘agentivity and aspectual class do not seem to be entirely independent’. Bussmann (1996: 1119) in turn asserts that only verbs denoting action, provided that this action is caused by an agent, can be made imperative. That is, this action is created at a subject’s will and of his own volition. Kearns (ibid. :237-239) calls volition and control as ‘the key agent properties’ and considers the imperative as one test for agentivity. That is, if the action denoted by a certain verb is created under the control and will of that subject, then the verb is allowed to be imperative.

It is assumed that of the dynamics, only activity and accomplishment verbs are open to the imperative mood. Achievements cannot be used with such a mood.

- Eat the pie!
- Build a barn!
- Walk in the park!
- Chat among yourself!
- *Notice the mark on the wallpaper!
- *Turn fifty.

Kearns (ibid. : 211-112)

The verbs *eat*, *build*, *walk*, *chat* are denoting activity and accomplishments and are created under the will and control of their implied subjects. That is, the requirement of agentivity is there since one normally has full control over his eating or building something, walking somewhere and chatting with others. Accordingly, they are fully accepted in the imperative mood. On the other hand, verbs like *notice*, *turn* are achievement verbs and the elements of will and volition are missing in their implied subject since people normally cannot control their senses or ages. The nervous system of someone seeing something is just responding to the thing being seen, and then this response is transmitted through the nerves to the senses. Such transmission is out of the person's control. The case is similar with aging since it is a matter of years passing by and having inherently natural changes for which the person, under normal conditions, has no responsibility.

Imperative Mood- Lexical Aspect Dichotomy: The Grey Area

As it has been already mentioned, the researcher thinks that there is no direct reference to the collaboration between mood and aspect. Thus, this study is an attempt to establish the mood-aspect dichotomy, specifically the imperative mood- lexical aspect dichotomy. More specifically, the latter dichotomy in verbs of the grey area between statives and dynamics is the main concern of this study.

Classifying verbs into statives and dynamics is not clear-cut, since some verbs can change their lexical identity from being statives into that of being dynamics. Crystal (2008:452) asserts that this classification is disturbed by verbs that can be found as both statives and dynamics. The researcher describes these verbs as occupying the grey area between statives and dynamics. Reference to such verbs in the available literature is made in a brief way. It is the researcher's role to shed light on how these verbs are approached with respect to their occurrence in the imperative mood.

As for Jacobs (1995:164), it is claimed that predicates like *know Chinese!* and *Be my cousin!* are *grammatically* acceptable if the verbs *know* and *be* are no longer considered as statives. In such a context, Jacob (ibid.) supposes that these verbs are accepted in the imperative only

because they ‘can only be understood as requiring action’. The researcher thinks that these verbs have changed in their lexical aspect, from being stative to being dynamic. Accordingly, she assumes that *Know* in *Know Chinese* communicates action that involves going to the library to borrow Chinese references, joining Chinese courses or asking a Chinese specialist. Similarly, the *be* in *Be my cousin* indicates behaviour that involves taking care of someone or offering help when needed. Accordingly, the verbs *know* and *be* in the examples above are activity verbs. They have no end points since knowing Chinese cannot stop when the learner knows the vocabulary of Chinese. The learner should be knowledgeable about Chinese grammar or pronunciation. As a result, Knowing Chinese should take time in order to manage these language levels. Finally, to Know Chinese can be marked for change and dynamism which involves studying Chinese references and joining courses.

Alternatively, Kearns (2000:212-213) gives the following examples *Be good!*, *Be quiet!*, *Don't be stupid!* and *Be nice!* It is assumed that these examples are acceptable in the imperative due to the presence of what Kearns (ibid.) calls ‘agentive be’. To illustrate, agentivity is one of the restrictions of allowing a verb to be used imperatively. Besides, the verb *Be* is usually stative but in these examples it is dynamic. It is claimed that these examples are not meant as commands to be in the states or characteristics of being good, peaceful, stupid or nice. These are commands to behave in a certain fashion. That is why, Kearns (ibid.) describes *be* as a ‘process predicate’. Another example of *be* in the imperative *Be serious* is given by Young (1984:65) where this verb is completely acceptable in the imperative. Again, the meaning here is that of asking someone to behave in a serious manner. This completely acceptable use of *be* is disturbed by the unacceptability **Be hungry* where the situation is quite different. Here, there is no action to be elucidated or taken when it comes to the state of hunger. Hunger is out of the will or volition of human beings. One cannot decide when he should feel hungry.

Similarly, Panther and Thornburg (2007:252) gives the sentence **Be tall* describing it as odd. It is claimed that this sentence is not open to be interpreted as action taking since “‘tallness’ is not seen as the outcome of an intentional act’. It is a property that cannot be brought about by human choice.

Again, the verb *be* in these examples has suffered a change in its lexical aspect from that of being stative into that of being dynamic and especially of the activity or process dynamics. The researcher thinks that *be* in these examples are process or activity verbs since they have no endpoint. That is, one cannot ask another to behave nicely or well in a certain situation and behave badly in other situations. Also, this verb is marked for duration this is because normally a change in behaviour in a certain way should take time and cannot happen instantly or suddenly. Finally, the verb *be* is marked for change since it can be assumed that when one

is asked to behave nicely this entails that previously he is behaving badly and change in that behaviour or activity is needed at the time of utterance.

Griffiths (2000:120-121) approaches the idea that some statives can be imperatives in a rather different way. It is assumed that ‘Some verbs may be strongly stative than others; remain for example, pattern like other stative verbs in not having the progressive....., but it does allow the imperative as in .. *Remain at your posts!*’.

The researcher thinks what is meant here is that the verb *remain* above has a weak affinity for its lexical aspect as a stative verb. That is, statives are customarily known for not accepting the progressive and the imperative. As for *remain* here, it still refuses to occur progressively as a stative. Still, in the example above this verb has shifted its lexical aspect into that of dynamic. That is, in *remain silent* or *remain motionless*, this verb is describing a state and thus stative; while in *Remain at your posts!* the verb is dynamic and expressing the meaning of not to leave. Thus, this verb is a weakly stative verb or it is a stative verb to a certain degree.

Leiber (2004:100) mentions the verb *remain* as a stative verb having the semantic feature [+Location] to refer to existence along with other statives like *dwell, stay, exist, have, own*. The researcher thinks that it is this feature which endows the dynamic interpretation to this verb in *Remain at your posts!*

As mentioned earlier, the researcher thinks that this verb has become dynamic. But what kind of dynamic is this verb? It is thought that this verb is of the activity or process type. This is because it has no endpoint since when a commander for instance is commanding his soldiers to hold and keep their positions saying *Remain at your posts!* there is no indication to the limit of their staying there. In addition, the situation denoted by this sentence is marked for duration or it is a time-taking activity. Finally, the situation is marked for change since holding a position includes asking the soldiers to watch, inspect and scan the location to be held and protect the frontiers.

The researcher supposes that the way Griffiths approaches these verbs is somehow similar to that in which Quirk et al. (1985:827) discuss them. That is, examples like *Forgive us, Owe nobody anything* are given by the latter where it is assumed that such verbs are stative since they reject the progressive. Still, when it comes to the imperative, such verbs may be used imperatively provided that they are interpreted dynamically. Accordingly, *forgive* and *owe* are not strongly statives in Griffiths’ own terms.

Brinton (2000:210) also mentions some statives that can be used imperatively. It is claimed that statives can be used in the imperative if they ‘can be given an active reading’. For example:

- Know the answer by tomorrow!
- Have a good time!
- Be content with what you’ve got!

Brinton (ibid.)

The verbs *know*, *have*, *be* are not statives and thus are licensed to be used imperatively. The verb *know* is a dynamic verb with the meaning of *learn* which is basically a dynamic verb. The other two verbs are also inherently statives. That is, *have* is usually a stative verb expressing a property like *She has brown eyes* and thus with the latter meaning the verb cannot be made imperative **Have brown eyes*. Still, in the above sentences it is no longer stative since the researcher thinks that it has the active meaning of amusing oneself. The same is with *be* which is normally stative as in *He is a demanding person* where the verb is describing a permanent state. With dynamic reading, the verb is denoting the meaning of behaving or acting happily and satisfactorily with what one has got in his life.

Again, the researcher assumes that the verbs *know*, *have*, *be* are dynamic verbs of the activity type. First, they have no endpoint since one cannot ask people to stop having good time or acting contentedly and satisfied.

Other examples of this type include:

- Know the poem by heart by the next lesson.
- Be a pilot.
- Don’t be a stranger.
- Be early.
- Be glad that escaped without injury.

Quirk et al. (1985:82700)

Rapp (1977) (cited in Rothmayr, 2009:117-119) also claims that some statives like love, hate and admire can have “an active component” of meaning. Thus, they are termed ‘PSYCHO-DO type’. Because of this component, they can occur in the imperative mood. For example, in *Love Thy Neighbour!* the verb *love* is a stative of the do-type, since the researcher supposes that activity in loving one’s neighbour lies in treating them well and not hurting them in any possible way. Due to this interpretation, there is no ban on such verb participation in the imperative. Other examples are:

- Love your enemy.

- Owe nobody anything.

Quirk et al. (ibid.)

Conclusions

1- It is the imperative mood - lexical aspect dichotomy that causes certain statives to be used imperatively. This is because the imperative mood can allow only statives which suffer from a change in their lexical aspect into dynamics.

2- Also, the imperatives can be available for statives which can change their lexical aspect into dynamics and specifically the activity or process type of dynamics. Such statives are called the grey area verbs in this study.

3- Among the three parameters, it is the parameter of change marking that can mainly be responsible for making the grey area statives easily available for the imperatives.

4- Agentivity can also be vital to assign the imperative mood to these statives. It is conditioned that the entity responsible for this change- marking in the grey area statives should be responsible for bringing this change out.

5- When statives are used imperatively, they do not directly fulfill the default commanding purpose of imperatives since their literal lexical semantics of stativity is not open to that purpose. Thus, they should first shift their lexical semantics to that of dynamism and then fulfill commanding.

6- Typically, the imperative mood requires the verb to be dynamic to be used imperatively. With the grey area verbs, it seems that the shift from stativity into dynamism can be responsible for their occurring in the imperative.



REFERENCES

- Brinton, L.J. (2000). **The Structure Of Modern English**. A Linguistic Introduction. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Brown, E.K. and J.E. Miller. (1980). **Syntax: A Linguistic Introduction to Sentence Structure**. London: Hutchinson.
- Bussmann, H.(1996). **Dictionary of Language and Linguistics**. Routledge: London.
- Carnie, A. (2004). **Modern Syntax: A Course Book**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Crystal, D. (2008). **A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Griffiths, P. (2006). **An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics**. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Hornby, A. S. (2010). (8thed). **Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobs, R. A.(1995). **English Syntax. A Grammar for English Language Professionals**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kearns, K. (2000). **Modern Linguistics Semantics**. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- kreidler, Ch. W. (1998). **Introducing English Semantics**. London: Routledge.
- Leech, G. and J. Svartvik. (1994). **A Communicative Grammar of English**. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Lieber, R. (2004). **Morphology and Lexical Semantics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Löbner, S. (2002). **Understanding Semantics**. London: Arnold.
- Miller, J. (2002). **An Introduction to English Syntax**. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.



Panther, K.U. and L.L.Thornburg. (2007). “Metonymy”, in Geeraerts, D. and H. Cuyckens (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Quirk, R. , Greenbaum, S., Leech , G. and G. Svartvik .(1985). **Comprehensive Grammar Of The English Language**. London: Longman.

Richards, J. C. and R. Schmidt (2010). (4th ed.). **Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics**. Harlow :Pearson Education Limited.

Rothmayr, A. (2009). **The Structure of Stative Verbs**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Saeed, J. I. (2009). (3rd ed.). **Semantics**. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Strumph, M. and A. Douglas (1999). **The Grammar Bible**. Los Angeles: Quality book, Inc.

Swan, M. (1995).2nd ed. **Practical English Usage**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tallerman, M. (1998). **Understanding Syntax**. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Trask, R. L.(1993). **A Dictionary Of Grammatical Terms In Linguistics**. London: Routledge.

Young, D. (1984). **Introducing English Grammar**. London: Routledge.