Overview. In the literature, it has been argued that imperatives cannot be embedded (e.g., Han 1998). However, recently, many counterexamples have been observed (Kaufmann 2015 and references therein). In this paper, I investigate a distribution of embedded imperatives in Japanese, considering three syntactic environments. I then show novel typological observation that there are at least four types of languages regarding embedded imperatives. I also demonstrate that there is an implicational relation in embedded imperatives, and propose a parameter hierarchy to capture the state of affairs.


(1) Mary-ga John-ni [watasi-no hon-o yom-e] to itta
Mary-Nom John-ni my book.Acc read-Imp C said
‘Mary said to John that he should read my/her book.’ (Kaufmann 2012: 200)

In (1), the pronoun ‘my’ can refer to the actual speaker, which suggests that (1) involves true embedding, not a direct quotation (for true embedding, see e.g. Crnič & Trinh 2009, Stegovec & Kaufmann 2014). However, (1) is not only the environment in which embedded imperatives can appear. As illustrated in (2), Japanese allows those in complement clauses of nouns, such as ‘order’, ‘instruction’, ‘advice’, and ‘wish’.

(2) John-wa [kono hon-ka-e toiu meirei/sizi]-o musisi-ta
John-Top this book.Acc buy-Imp C order/instruction-Acc ignore-Past
‘John ignored the order/instruction that he should buy this book’

It should be noted that (2) also involves true embedding, considering the diagnostics offered by Crnič & Trinh (2009). In (2), for example, the indexical kono ‘this’ can be accompanied by the pointing gesture by the (actual) speaker. As the third type of embedded imperatives, embedded imperatives in relative clauses seem the most restricted type among languages. Slovenian and Ancient Greek allow this type, as in (3) (Sheppard & Golden 2002, Stegovec & Kaufmann 2014, Medeiros 2013). However, Japanese does not allow it, as in (4).

(3) oish-
know-2Sg.perfect.indicative.active then which-things do.2sg.aorist.Imp.active
‘Do you know then which things you [must] do?’ (Ancient Greek, Medeiros 2013: 18)

(4) *John-wa [[yom-e] hon]-o ka-ta
John-Top read-imp book-Acc buy-Past
‘John bought a book we/he should read.’

Parameterizing embedded imperatives. Considering the three environments above (complement clauses of verbs and nouns, and relative clauses), it turns out that there are cross-linguistic variations regarding embedded imperatives. We obtain the typology of embedded imperatives in (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Complement of V</th>
<th>Complement of N</th>
<th>Relative clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian, Russian</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, Chinese, Turkish</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese (Korean)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian, Ancient Greek</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, English allows embedded imperatives in complement clauses of verbs such as say, as in (6), but not those in complement clauses of nouns and relative clauses, as in (7a) and (7b), respectively.

(6) John1 said call his1 mom
(7) a. * John followed the order/advice that read the book!
    b. * That professor, to whom introduce yourself, was my adviser!

Furthermore, there seems an implicational relation in embedded imperatives. If, for example, a language allows embedded imperatives in relative clauses (e.g. Slovenian), it should allow those in complement clauses of verbs and nouns as well.

In the literature, cross-linguistic variations of embedded imperatives have not been studied well. Medeiros (2013) proposes a syntactic parameter on embedded imperatives as below, assuming Feature Transfer (Chomsky 2008).

(8) a. P[+phi] Cannot select imperative T (English)
    b. P[+phi] Can select imperative T (Ancient Greek)

However, (8) raises several problems given the observation in (5). The most serious problem of (8) is that it cannot explain the variation in (5); for example, Japanese and English allow...
embedded imperatives in complement clauses of verbs, but only the former allows those in complement clauses of nouns, as shown in (2) and (7a). The dichotomy in (8) is not sufficient to describe (at least) four patterns of embedded imperatives among languages. Moreover, it cannot explain the implicational relation of the possibility of embedded imperatives. It should be noted that English is categorized as the ‘non-embedding’ type. Medeiros suggests that the “richness of morphology” (“having overt and distinct morphological imperative verb forms beyond 2nd person”) determines the parametric choice in (8); the morphological property differentiates Ancient Greek and Slovenian from the English/Korean type. Consequently, his account puts aside embedded imperatives in e.g. English and Korean. Furthermore, for Korean and English, Medeiros claims that embedded imperatives in these languages are restricted compared to those in Slovenian and Ancient Greek in that the subject of the embedded imperative must co-refer with the referent of the matrix indirect object or subset thereof if present. However, this generalization does not hold at least in Japanese. Japanese, with morphologically poor inflections like Korean, allows ‘non-control’ type of embedded imperatives even if the matrix indirect object is present; the embedded subject can differ from the indirect object.

(9) Mary-ga Taro-ni [John-ga ronbun-o kak-e to] i-tta
Mary-Nom Taro-to John-Nom paper-Acc write-Imp C say-Past
‘Mary said to Taro that John should write a paper’

Context: Taro and John are doing some joint-work, but they are thinking that either Taro or John should write a paper as a single-authored one. Only Taro asked Mary what they should do, then Mary said ‘John should write a paper (as a single author)’. After that, the speaker of (9) (neither Taro nor John) said (9) to an addressee (, which does not have to be John).

It should be noted that (9) involves true embedding, not a direct quotation; the diagnostics offered by Crnič & Trinh (2009), including the scope of embedded wh-phrase, scrambling, and embedded indexicals, differentiate (9) from (10), which involves a direct quotation, indicated by the use of the interjection hora ‘hey’.

(10) Mary-ga/wa Taro-ni [hora, John-ga ronbun-o kak-e to] i-tta
Mary-Nom/Top Taro-to hey John-Nom paper-Acc write-Imp C say-Past
‘Mary said to Taro: “Hey John, write a paper!”’

Hence, Medeiros’s proposal in (8) is not sufficient because it cannot describe/explain (i) four patterns and (ii) the implicational relation in (5), and because (iii) neither morphological richness nor the lack of obligatory control is necessary or sufficient to tell which type(s) of embedding is allowed in a given language. Furthermore, as a null hypothesis, the theory of embedded imperatives should not put aside Korean/English/Japanese type.

**Parameter hierarchy.** I propose a parameter hierarchy in (11) to capture the four types and the implicational relation in (5) (cf. Baker 2002). This hierarchy straightforwardly captures the common pattern across languages; embedded imperatives are not allowed at all, or only those in complement clauses of verbs are allowed. Also (11) captures the observation that languages with embedded imperatives in relative clauses (e.g. Slovenian) are relatively rare.

(11) a. Are embedded imperatives in complement clauses of verbs allowed?

   YES
   |                          | YES: Ancient Greek, Slovenian |
   Italian, Russian          | NO: Japanese (Korean)        |

b. Are embedded imperatives in complement clauses of nouns allowed?

   YES
   |                          | YES: Ancient Greek, Slovenian |
   English, Chinese          | NO: Japanese (Korean)        |

I suggest that (11) can be further formalized by adopting Feature Economy (Roberts & Roussou 2003) and Input Generalization (Roberts 2007), considering language acquisition. Also, I claim that (11) can be more formally restated in terms of islands, i.e. Complex NP island for (11b), and wh-island for (11c).