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This paper discusses dictionary form imperatives in Japanese, as exemplified in (1), and proposes a modification to Saito and Haraguchi’s (2012) proposal on CP architecture.

(1) Context: Taro is told to clean his messy room by his mother, but he feels tired and sleepy. His mother happens to see him reluctant to clean his room, and says to him:

\[ \text{Sassato su-ru. [V: Dictionary Form]} \]
\[ \text{quickly do-PRES} \]
\[ \text{‘Do that quickly!’} \]

Under the context given in (1), the dictionary form \textit{su-ru} can be naturally interpreted as an imperative. In spite of their superficial similarity, this paper shows that the structure of a dictionary form imperative is different from that of a declarative.

Moreover, the current proposal is shown to provide cross-linguistic support for Deng’s (2015) claim, which is shown in (2).

(2) I claim that it is universally true that functional heads [that encode specific illocutionary forces] such as \textit{ba} cannot be embedded and will leave the hypothesis for empirical tests in future research.

Saito and Haraguchi (S&H) (2012) present (3) as a cartography of Japanese CP, where TopP and FocP are probably omitted. The point is that ReportP (i.e. indirect quotation) embeds ForceP.

(3) \[ \text{[ReportP [ForceP [FiniteP (no)] (ka)] (to)]} \]

It has been widely accepted (e.g., Lam 2014, Matsuda 2015) that an illocutionary force is determined by ForceP, or other categories related to it, which lie below ForceP. Such a ForceP-based analysis then predicts that any type of imperative can be embedded under ReportP. Indeed, a standard imperative, where an imperative morpheme such as \textit{-ro} is added to the verb, can be embedded under ReportP, as shown in (4).

(4) Haha-wa \[ \text{[watashi-no heya-de benkyoshi-ro to]} \] it-ta.
\[ \text{mother-TOP I-GEN room-in study-IMP to say-PAST} \]
Reading 1: ‘My mother told me to study in my room.’ (Indirect Quotation)
Reading 2: ‘My mother said, “Study in my room!”’ (Direct Quotation)

However, significantly, a dictionary form imperative cannot be embedded under ReportP, as shown in (5).

(5) Haha-wa \[ \text{[watashi-no heya-de benkyosu-ru to]} \] it-ta.
\[ \text{mother-TOP I-GEN room-in study-PRES to say-PAST} \]
*Reading 1: ‘My mother told me to study in my room.’ (Indirect Quotation)
Reading 2: ‘My mother said, “Study in my room!”’ (Direct Quotation)

I, therefore, claim that Speech Act Phrase (SpAP) is responsible for determining the illocutionary force of a dictionary form imperative. As for standard imperatives, they can be embedded under ReportP probably because the imperative morpheme exists below ReportP.

Two pieces of evidence support the current proposal. The first is that, as shown in (6), the distribution of a dictionary form imperative is parallel to that of Japanese sentence final particles (SFPs), which S&H claim head SpAP. Note that the possibility of the readings in (6) is the same as that of (5).

(6) Hanako-wa \[ \text{[Taro-wa kanojo-no ie-ni iru wa to]} \] it-ta.
\[ \text{Hanako-TOP Taro-TOP she-GEN house-at be-Pres wa to say-Past} \]
*Reading 1: ‘Hanako said that Taro was at her house.’ (Indirect Quotation)
Reading 2: ‘Hanako said, “Taro is at her house.”’ (Direct Quotation)

The second is the intonation of a dictionary form imperative. Disregarding intonation, a dictionary form imperative can be interpreted either imperative or declarative. In order for the
sentence to get the illocutionary force of imperative, it has to be pronounced with a special intonation, where originally high-accented moras in the verb get higher accent. The examples are shown in (7), where the square indicates the higher accent.

(7) a. Original: i-ku ‘go’ (L H), no-mu ‘drink’ (H L), ta-be-ru ‘eat’ (L H L), su-wa-ru ‘sit’ (L H H)
   b. Imperative: i-[ku] (L [H]), no-mu (H L), ta-[be]-ru (L [H] L), su-[wa]-ru (L [H] H)

Dejima et al. (2009) and Heim et al. (2014) claim that intonation can head SpAP and is responsible for determining an illocutionary force. Based on that, it can be said that the special intonation of a dictionary form imperative occupies the head of SpAP and is responsible for the illocutionary force of imperative.

Considering this result, I propose (8) as the more refined CP structure of Japanese, where QuoteP (i.e. direct quotation) embeds SpAP.

(8) [ QuoteP [ SpAP [ ReportP [ ForceP [ FinP (no) ] (ka) ] (to1) ] (walyolne/…) ] (to2) ]

This CP architecture can account for the difference between Reading 1 and 2 in (5) and (6). That is, given that dictionary form imperatives and SFPs in Japanese are related to SpAP, they cannot be embedded under ReportP, where SpAP is not included, while they can under QuoteP, where SpAP exists.

The current proposal further provides cross-linguistic support for Deng’s (2015) claim, which is shown in (2). Deng states that ba, a Chinese SFP, shows several illocutionary forces depending on which clause type it adds to. Deng claims that ba eventually heads SpAP and that ba cannot be embedded. One of the examples is shown in (9).

(9) Wo wen [Lisi ta qu-bu-qu ba].
   I ask Lisi he go-not-go ba

*Reading 1: ‘I asked Lisi, if he is going or not.’ (Indirect Quotation)
   Reading 2: ‘I asked Lisi, “Is he going or not?”’ (Direct Quotation)

Interestingly, the possibility of the readings in (9) is parallel to that of (5) and (6). This fact implies that the structure of (8) is cross-linguistically attested. Considering that dictionary form imperatives, as well as Japanese SFPs, cannot be embedded under ReportP because the illocutionary force is determined by SpAP, this supports (2) in the cross-linguistic viewpoint.

In conclusion, I claim in this paper that the illocutionary force of a dictionary form imperative is determined not by ForceP but by SpAP. Given that, the S&H’s (2012) proposal on CP architecture of (3) should be modified, and I propose the more refined CP architecture of (8). Furthermore, the proposal cross-linguistically supports Deng’s (2015) claim of (2).
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