

## Why imperatives cannot (always) be embedded

Miok Pak, Paul Portner, Raffaella Zanuttini

Imperatives are not freely embeddable. While there are languages where they can be embedded (Ancient Greek, Korean, Mandarin, Old Germanic, Slovenian), there are many others where they cannot. Even in languages that allow embedded imperatives, their grammatical context is limited. A common intuition is that imperatives syntactically encode directive force, and that force markers cannot be embedded. In this talk, we argue that the restriction is not due to the marking of a directive speech act. Rather, it's the consequence of the 'social meaning' of imperatives, specifically what they encode about the social/hierarchical relation between the speaker and addressee.

We build on the ideas that (i) Grammar utilizes a [status] feature that encodes the speaker/addressee relation (e.g. [status: S>A]) in diverse elements including speech style markers and polite/familiar pronouns; (ii) [status] cannot be semantically embedded due to the type of performative meaning it expresses; (iii) When [status] is marked on DPs in embedded clauses (politeness pronouns), it is interpreted at the root level via agreement with a functional head *c.* (Portner et al. to appear). We also assume that (iv) imperatives contain a distinct functional head Jussive (Zanuttini et al. 2012; similar to Mood<sub>IMP</sub>, Rivero-Terzi 1995, or Modal<sub>IMP</sub>, Kaufmann 2012) which agrees with the subject and restricts it to second person.

Adopting these ideas, we propose that languages differ in whether the imperative form necessarily includes [status]. That is, in some languages, Jussive can be expressed separately from [status]. Imperatives without [status] can be embedded. In other languages, Jussive is always expressed together with [status]. Because [status] cannot be embedded, there are no embedded imperatives. We provide evidence from two types of languages, exemplified by Korean and Italian.

Our analysis has close connections to recent work on discourse particles, allocutive agreement, and conjunct/disjunct agreement (Hill 2014, Miyagawa 2017, Zu 2018).