1. Observations.

1.1. It has been claimed that imperatives do not occur in embedded positions (Rivero and Terzi 1995, Platzack and Rosengren 1998, Han 1998, among others). Counterexamples have been pointed out for a small number of languages—e.g. Slovenian, Old Scandinavian (Platzack 2007), Korean (Portner 2007)—but it has been universally assumed that English does not have embedded imperatives. This assumption is supported by data such as (1) and (2). However, (3a) shows that the verb *say* **can** take an imperative as its object. A similar fact holds in German, as shown by (3b) which is a literal translation of (3a).

1.2. Several facts show that imperatives under *say*, such as *call Mary* in (3a), are genuine instances of indirect discourse, not quotations. First, deictic elements in embedded imperatives are evaluated with respect to the actual utterance situation. This is not the case with quotations (4). Second, elements inside a quote cannot associate with a focus-sensitive operator outside the quote. Embedded imperatives do not show this restriction (5). Third, NPIs inside an embedded imperative, unlike those inside a quote, can be licensed by elements outside of it (6). Fourth, (7a) does not seem to imply (7b), but (8a) does imply (8b).

1.3. There is also evidence that embedded imperatives are not *to*-infinitives with an elided *to*. First, *wh*-movement out of *to*-infinitives is unrestricted, but not out of embedded imperatives (9). Second, QR is possible out of *to*-infinitives, but not out of embedded imperatives (10). Finally, negated *to*-infinitives are different from negated embedded imperatives (11).

1.4. It is true that embedded imperatives do not issue a command like matrix ones do (12). However, the relevant illocution is transfered to the speech act associated with the embedding verb. Thus suppose S says to Bill: "John said call Mary." S is **not** being truthful if John's original statement was merely a **description** of an obligation, as in (13a). But S **is** being truthful if John **created** an obligation with his utterance, i.e. if he uttered something like (13b). This suggests that what is embedded under *say* must be such that, were it not embedded under *say*, it would be something that creates an obligation, i.e. an imperative.

1.5. Finally, embedded imperatives in English cannot be introduced by the complementizer *that* (2b).

2. Proposal

2.1. Imperatives – matrix and embedded – are CPs headed by an imperative operator, IMP (cf. Han 2001, Zeijlstra 2007). English *that* cannot be identified with IMP. It follows that verbs which can embed imperatives must satisfy two conditions: (A) their semantics must be compatible with IMP (cf. 14a), and (B) they must be able to take *that*-less complements (cf. 14b). It also follows that if a language has an overt C which **can** be identified with IMP, the class of imperatives embedding verbs should be larger because these must satisfy only (A). This is the case with Korean, Slovenian and Vietnamese, among others.

2.2. An analysis is developed which combines the ideas of Schwager (2005, 2006) and Hacquard (2006, 2007). Following Schwager (2005, 2006), IMP is taken to be a deontic modal with the restriction that the speaker of the sentence is an authority on the relevant conversational background(s), and following Hacquard (2006, 2007), this modal is relativized to eventualities which contain recoverable information about the speaker and addressee (15). We take worlds to be maximal events. The logical form and interpretation of a matrix imperative is given in (16). Also following Hacquard (2006, 2007), locality conditions are imposed on the binding of event variables. Thus when IMP is embedded, the event variable inside the IMP complex must be bound by the event argument of the matrix verbum dicendi. Restriction (A) of 2.1. then follows. Also, the facts in 1.4. are derived, since the matrix subject becomes the authority on the conversational background(s) associated with the embedded IMP (17).

2.3. The IP-complement of IMP contains an explicit subject, *pro* (Potsdam 1998); *pro* has [+2nd], the second person feature (Bennis 2007). Consequently, it denotes the addressee of a speech event (cf. Zanuttini 2008 among others), which may either be the actual or the reported speech event. The choice depends on the value of another feature on *pro*, [± actual speech act] (cf. Schlenker 2003). It is then expected that languages with embedded imperatives can vary with respect to the interpretation of *pro*, which is indeed the case (e.g. Slovenian *pro* is [+actual speech act], English *pro* is [±actual speech act]).

3. Conclusion and Further Work

It turns out that independently motivated analyses for matrix imperatives and embedded modal sentences can be combined to yield a relatively adequate analysis for embedded imperatives in English, a newly discovered phenomenon. An intriguing correlation between embedded imperatives and the nature of the respective complementizer phrases obtains in English. This should be explored in more detail. Furthermore, analogous limitations on context-shifting attitude verbs have been noticed in languages like Amharic (Schlenker 1998, 2003), Slave, and Zazaki (Anand and Nevins 2004). A further inquiry into this issue should also shed light on why embedded imperatives are not more widely attested in world languages.

(1) a. Give me the book!
     b. *I demand that give me the book (Han 2007)
(2) a. Call Mary!
     b. *John said that call Mary
(3) a. John said call Mary
     b. Hans sagte, ruf Maria an
(4) a. John said: "Hey, call my$_2$ mom!"   [2 = John, 2 ≠ the actual speaker]
     a'. John said call my$_2$ mom   [2 ≠ John, 2 = the actual speaker]
     b. John said: "Hey, buy that book!"   [# speaker pointing at a book nearby]
     b'. John said buy that book   [speaker pointing at a book nearby]
(5) a. John only said: "Hey, call Mary$_F$!"   [# ∀x((John said: "Call x!") → x = Mary)]
     b. John only said call Mary$_F$ [∀x((John said call x) → x = Mary)]
(6) a. $^?$You should relax. No one said read anything.
     b. #You should relax. No one said: "Read anything!"
(7) a. John said: "Call Bill and Mary!"
     b. ↛John said: "Call Mary and Bill!"
(8) a. John said call Bill and Mary
     b. →John said call Mary and Bill
(9) a. Who did John say to call at 3pm?
     b. $^{??}$Who did John say call at 3pm?
(10) a. Some professor said to buy every book   [∃ > ∀, ∀ > ∃]
     b. Some professor said buy every book   [∃ > ∀, #∀ > ∃]
(11) a. John said not to buy the book
     b. John said don't buy the book
(12) a. John said call Mary, but I don't think you should
     b. #Call Mary! But I don't think you should (cf. Ninan 2005)
(13) a. "Bill has an obligation to call Mary"
     b. "I hereby declare that Bill must call Mary"
(14) a. *John believed/claimed call Mary
     b. *John ordered that call Mary
(15) a. ⟦ IMP ⟧^{s} = λf$_{⟨v,⟨s,t⟩⟩}$.λe$_v$:SPEAKER(e)∈AUTH(f)(e).λq$_{⟨s,t⟩}$.λw:e≤w. ∀w'∈f(e).q(w') = 1
     b. AUTH(e)(f)={x$_e$|x=AGENT(e) & ∀w∈CG(e). ∀w'∈∩CONTENT$_{BELIEF}$(e).f(w) = f(w')}
     c. CONTENT$_{BELIEF}$(e) = {p | AGENT(e) believes p}
     d. CG(e) = the common ground of e
     e. AGENT(e) = the agent of e
(16) a. [SPEECH-ACT+e* [IMP+f+e* [λw [∃e≤w [ADRESSEE+e* call+e Mary]]]]]
     b. ⟦ (16a) ⟧^{s} is defined only if the actual speaker is an authority in e*. If defined: ⟦ (16a) ⟧^{s}
         = 1 iff at each world w compatible with CONTENT$_{PREFERENCE}$(e*), there is an event e in w of
         the actual addressee calling Mary
(17) a. [John said+e [IMP+f+e [λw [∃e'≤w [ADRESSEE+e call+e' Mary]]]]]
     b. ⟦ (17a) ⟧^{s} is defined only if the speaker of the speech event e, i.e. John, is an authority in
         e. If defined, ⟦ (17a) ⟧^{s} = 1 iff at each world w in CONTENT$_{PREFERENCE}$(e), there is an event e'
         in w where the addressee of e, i.e. the addressee of John's speech, calls Mary

4. Selected References
Anand, P. & A. Nevins (2004) Shifty operators in Changing Contexts. *SALT* 14. **Bennis, H.** (2007)
Featuring the subject in Dutch imperatives. In: v. d. Wurff (ed) *Imperative Clauses in Generative
Grammar.* **Hacquard, V.** (2006) Aspects of Modality. PhD thesis, MIT. **Hacquard, V.** (2007)
Speaker-oriented vs. subject-oriented modals. *SuB* 11. **Han, C.-H.** (1998). *The structure and
interpretation of imperatives: Mood and force in Universal Grammar.* PhD thesis, UPenn. **Han, C.-
H.** (2001) Force, negation and imperatives. *Linguistic Review* 18. **Han, C.-H.** (2007) Imperatives.
MS, SFU. **Ninan, D.** (2005) Two Puzzles About Deontic Necessity. In Gajewski et al. (eds.) *New
Work on Modality.* **Platzack, C. & I. Rosengren** (1997) On the subject of imperatives; a minimalist
account of the imperative clause. *JCGL* 1. **Platzack, C.** (2007) Embedded imperatives. In: van der
Wurff. **Portner, P.** (2007) Imperatives and modality. *NALS 15.* **Potsdam, E.** (1998) *Syntactic issues
in the English imperative.* **Rivero, M.-L. & A. Terzi** (1995) Imperatives, V-movement and logical
mood. *JL* 31. **Schlenker, P.** (1998) *Propositional Attitudes and Indexicality: A Cross-Categorial
Approach.* PhD thesis, MIT. **Schlenker, P.** (2003) A Plea for Monsters. *L & P* 26. **Schlenker, P.**
(2004) Context of thought and context of utterance. *Mind and Language* 19. **Schwager, M.** (2005)
Interpreting Imperatives. PhD thesis, Uni Frankfurt. **Schwager, M.** (2006) Conditionalized
Imperatives. *SALT* 16. **Zanuttini, R.** (2008) Encoding the addressee in the syntax. *NLLT* 26.
Zeijlstra, H.H. (2007) Not in the first place. MS, UvA.