# Deferred imperatives across Indo-Aryan

NEIL BANERJEE[1], *Massachusetts Institute of Technology*
GURMEET KAUR[2], *Georg-August-Universität Göttingen*

ABSTRACT

Exploring the morphosyntax of deferred imperatives in three Indo-Aryan/IA languages: Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi and Bangla, this paper makes two claims. First, Bangla allows negation only in deferred imperatives but not immediate imperatives, and hence seems to pattern with 'surrogate negative imperative' languages. Crucially however, there is no alignment between morphological uniqueness of the directive's verbal form and its negative (in)effability in the language. Secondly, since the morphology based true-surrogate divide is not instructive in determining the status of imperatives in IA, we employ two syntactic-semantic diagnostics: (a) performativity and (b) addressee-restriction on the subject, to claim that deferred commands in all IA languages are real imperatives on par with immediate imperatives. The paper also notes variation in the distribution of negated deferred imperatives, subject to factors like immediacy and plannability.

## 1 Introduction

Imperatives are directive, i.e. they bring into existence an obligation on the part of the addressee to carry out the relevant action. By virtue of being directive, imperatives are often understood as being future-oriented. However, as observed by van der Wurff (2007), Aikhenvald (2010), Schwager (2011) among others, certain languages make a distinction between immediate and deferred imperatives. Consider (1) from Tucano, which encodes the immediate-deferred distinction in imperatives via different morphological forms.

(1) **Tucano** (West 1980: 48, 51; as cited in Aikhenvald 2010: 130, glosses adapted for uniformity)

    a. Immediate imperative
    ba'á-ya
    eat-IMP
    'Eat!'

    b. Deferred imperative[3]
    ba'á-apa
    eat-DFR.IMP
    'Eat (later)!'

In this paper, we examine three Indo-Aryan/IA languages - Hindi-Urdu/HU, Bangla and Punjabi, for which this divide has been reported (Ferguson 1966 for Bangla, Bhatia 1993 for Punjabi, Sharma 1999 for HU, a.o.). Consider the following contexts, which clearly illustrate that the immediate versus deferred divide also exists in IA.

(2) Context: A fire has occurred in the building, and you shout to the occupants...[4]
    a. Hindi-Urdu

        i.   (abhi) bhaag-o
            (now) run-2N
            'Run (now)!'    *Immediate*

        ii.  # (abhi) bhaag-naa
              (now) run-INF
          'Run (now)!'    *Deferred*

---

[1] neilb@alum.mit.edu

[2] gurmeet.kaur@phil.uni-goettingen.de

[3] We use DFR.IMP to gloss the deferred imperatives.

[4] We use N to denote the neutral level of honorificity in all three languages, and H to denote high honorificity. In Punjabi ALLOC indicates allocutive agreement, and in Bangla VC denotes vowel change in the verbal root.

b. Punjabi

 i. (hune) pàjj-o
  (now) run-2H

  'Run (now)!'  *Immediate*

 ii. # (hune) pàjj-eyaa je
   (now) run  ALLOC.H

   'Run (now)!'  *Deferred*

c. Bangla

 i. (ikkhuni) douṛɔ-o
  (now)  run-2N

  'Run (now)!'  *Immediate*

 ii. # (??ikkhuni) douṛi-o
   (now)  run.VC-2N

   'Run (now)!'  *Deferred*

(3) Context: At the start of the race tomorrow, the referee will fire a starting shot. When you hear the shot…

a. Hindi-Urdu

 i. # (tab) bhaag-o
  (then) run-2N

  '(Then) run!'  *Immediate*

 ii. (tab) bhaag-naa
   (then) run-INF

   '(Then) run!'  *Deferred*

b. Punjabi

 i. # (tã̃ã) pàjj-o
  (then) run-2H

  '(Then) run!'  *Immediate*

 ii. (tã̃ã) pàjj-eyaa je
   (then) run  ALLOC.H

   '(Then) run!'  *Deferred*

c. Bangla

 i. # (tɔkhon) douṛɔ-o
  (then)  run-2N

  '(Then) run!'  *Immediate*

 ii. (tɔkhon) douṛi-o
   (then)  run.VC-2N

   '(Then) run!'  *Deferred*

Given the existence of the immediate versus deferred divide in IA, this paper first aims to understand if deferred directives belong to the same natural class of speech act/clause-type as immediate directives. Furthermore, how is the immediate versus deferred distinction in imperatives characterised?

Employing syntactic and semantic diagnostics for imperativehood, we show that both deferred and immediate imperatives in IA are real imperatives. We also demonstrate that the results of the syntactic-semantic tests do not align with whether the form of the imperative is (not)-unique to the imperative paradigm, which clearly shows that associating morphological forms directly with semantic properties is incorrect. In order to understand the characterisation of the immediate-deferred divide, we explore the behaviour of immediate and deferred imperatives under negation. Investigating the event-structural syntax and semantics of the immediacy and delay components is left for future work.

The paper is organized as follows: section 2 examines the morphology of all immediate and deferred directive forms across IA and shows that the morphology based true-surrogate divide (à la Rivero 1994, Zanuttini 1994, 1997 etc.) does not apply in all languages even if they have restrictions on the use of negation for instance. We therefore resort to syntactic and semantic diagnostics for defining imperatives in section 3. Section 4 examines the distribution of immediate and deferred imperatives under negation and section 5 concludes the paper.

# 2 Morphology of directive forms

|  | Hindi-Urdu | | Punjabi | | Bangla | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | IMM | DFR | IMM | DFR | IMM | DFR |
| I | √-∅ | √-naa | √-∅ | √-ĩ | √-∅ | √-(i)s |
| N | √-o | | √-o | √-naa, √-eyaa je | √-o | √.VC-o |
| H | √-(j)iye | √-naa, √-(j)iye-gaa | | | √-(u)n | √-b-en |

Table 1: Verbal morphology for singular directives

As Table 1 shows, all three languages show the immediate vs. deferred split for a set of directives which further show honorificity distinctions [5]. Both HU and Bangla have three levels of honorificity: these are (I)ntimate (N)eutral, and (H)onorific. Punjabi encodes only two levels of honorificity: intimate and honorific, where the latter is also employed as the neutral form. VC indicates a vowel change in the root, used in Bangla only.

The immediate directive paradigm looks relatively uniform both within and across languages. It uses the verb stem with 2nd person endings. Moreover, the intimate and neutral forms are also the same across HU, Punjabi and Bangla. The deferred paradigm, in contrast, consists of heterogeneous forms. Except for the √-naa form used in both HU and Punjabi, all verbal forms in this paradigm are varied.

Regardless of the (non)-homogeneous composition of the paradigms, both immediate and deferred paradigms in all three languages consist of verb forms syncretic with verbs in non-imperative paradigms. These are listed below.

(4) a. Hindi-Urdu
    i. N.IMM √-o is syncretic with the subjunctive
    ii. H.DFR √-naa is used in the infinitival, but crucially requires an auxiliary when non-directive (modulo the presence of negation)
  b. Punjabi
    i. N.IMM √-o is syncretic with the subjunctive
    ii. H.DFR √-naa is used in the infinitival, but crucially requires an auxiliary when non-directive (modulo the presence of negation)
    iii. H.DFR √-(e)yaa je is homophonous with the perfective allocutive form for certain verbs
  c. Bangla
    i. I.DFR √-(i)s and N.IMM √-o are syncretic with both the subjunctive and indicative present
    ii. H.IMM √-(u)n is syncretic with the subjunctive
    iii. H.DFR √-b-en is syncretic with the indicative future and homophonous with the corresponding honorific third person

The availability of verbal forms not unique to the directive paradigm is interesting in view of the assumed correlation between the verbal morphology of a directive and its imperativehood in existing literature. We explore if morphological (non)uniqueness of the verbal form is instructive in understanding IA directives in the following subsection.

---

[5]We omit number distinctions here for easier exposition.

## 2.1 True vs. Surrogate imperatives

Existing literature on Romance, Greek, and Slavic languages has found it useful to distinguish 'true' imperatives from 'suppletive' or 'surrogate' imperatives (Rivero 1994, Zanuttini 1994, 1997, a.o.). Zanuttini (1994: 119) defines the former as "verbal forms which are unique to the paradigm of the imperative, in the sense that they are different from any other verbal form used, for the same person, in any tense of the indicative, subjunctive, etc." In contrast, surrogate imperatives are "verbal forms which are used in the imperative but are morphologically identical to a form used in another paradigm for that same person" (Zanuttini 1994: 119, see also Rivero 1994: 103).

A characteristic typically associated with 'true' imperatives pertains to their negative ineffability. In some languages which use both morphologically unique and non-unique forms as directives, it has been observed that only the syncretic directive forms can be negated. For illustration, consider Spanish, which bans negation in true imperatives. Only the subjunctive directive in Spanish can occur with negation to issue a prohibition, attesting to its surrogacy.

(5) Spanish (Zeijlstra 2006:406, glosses adapted for uniformity)

   a.  Lee!           b.  * No  lee!           c.  No  leas!
       read.2SG.IMP         Neg read.2SG.IMP       Neg read.2SG.SBJV
       'Read!'               Int: 'Don't read!'      'Don't read!'

While HU and Punjabi do not exhibit the above divide and allow negation in all directives listed in Table 1 as shown in (6) for Punjabi, Bangla seems to pattern with Spanish in exhibiting a divide in directives with regard to the use of negation - only deferred imperatives in the language can be negated. Immediate imperatives disallow negation. This is illustrated in (7).

(6) Negative commands in Punjabi

   a.  seb   naa khaa-o          b.  seb    naa khaa-naa
       apple NEG eat-2H            apple NEG eat-INF
       'Don't eat the apple!'         'Don't eat the apple!'

(7) Negative commands in Bangla

   a.  * kha-o  na            b.  khe-o     na
        eat-2N NEG               eat.VC-2N NEG
        Int: 'Don't eat (it)!'        'Don't eat (it)!'

The distribution of negation in Bangla imperatives raises the following question: are immediate imperatives in Bangla 'true' imperatives with the deferred imperatives being 'surrogate'? The answer is no. This is because none of the immediate commands permit negation, which is allowed only in (all) deferred commands. Recall from Table 1 that in the deferred paradigm in Bangla, the √.VC-o form is unique to the imperative paradigm. It allows negation notwithstanding, as shown in (7b). On the flip side, √-o in the immediate paradigm is syncretic with the habitual, but it disallows negation, as demonstrated in (7a).

This shows that even in Bangla which allows only some directives to occur with negation, the use of negation does not map onto the morphological (non)-uniqueness of the directive's verbal form. This precludes a characterisation of the immediate forms as 'true' and the deferred forms as 'surrogate'. Thus, the morphology based true-surrogate divide is not instructive in determining the status of immediate and deferred commands in Bangla (and other IA languages).

4

# 3 Syntactic-semantic diagnostics for defining imperatives

Given that morphology based tests are not relevant to determining the status of imperatives in IA languages, we turn instead to syntactic and semantic tests. Under the assumption that imperatives have distinct structure from declarative and interrogative clauses, we expect to see correlates of these differences in the syntactic and semantic behaviour of these forms. In particular, we discuss performativity and special subject properties. On the bases of these tests, which we believe better delimit all and only true imperatives, we demonstrate that both immediate and deferred commands in IA belong to the class of imperatives.

## 3.1 Test 1: Performativity

Austin (1962) first proposes a distinction between *performative* speech acts, which bring about an action in the world by their utterance, and *constative* speech acts, which report a state of affairs in the world by their utterance. As descriptions, the latter class of utterances may be characterised as true or false. However, the former cannot, since their function is not to report, but to create a state of affairs. Imperatives have been noted to be performative in this sense by many researchers (Sadock & Zwicky 1985, Han 2000, Portner 2004, 2007, Kaufmann 2012, a.o.). Consider the following two sentences.

(8)   a.  Go to the zoo.          b.  You will go to the zoo.

The sentence in (8a) is used to direct a hearer to go to the zoo, but cannot be used to assert that someone will go to the zoo. In contrast, (8b) can be used both as an assertion that the hearer will go to the zoo, and directively, with the aim of getting the hearer to go to the zoo. This difference is evident when attempting to disagree with each sentence:

(9)   Go to the zoo.
      # That's not true. (I will go to the library.)

(10)  You will go to the zoo.
      That's not true. I will go to the library.

Since the imperative lacks any assertive content, it is impossible to disagree with it. Employing this test, we find that all immediate and deferred commands, regardless of their form, manifest a lack of truth conditions. This is shown for HU immediate and infinitival deferred commands.

(11)  a.  zoo jaa-o
          zoo go-2N
          'Go to the zoo!'

      b.  # nahı̃ı̃, ye  sac   nahı̃ı̃ hai
          NEG  this truth NEG  be.PRS.3SG
          'No, this is not true.'

(12)  a.  zoo jaa-naa
          zoo go-INF
          'Go to the zoo!'

      b.  # nahı̃ı̃, ye  sac   nahı̃ı̃ hai
          NEG  this truth NEG  be.PRS.3SG
          'No, this is not true.'

Compare the above-mentioned infinitival deferred command in (12a), which cannot be disagreed with, with the infinitival construction with a dative subject and auxiliary, which can also be used directively as in (13). As Butt (2006) observes, the structure can express both *necessity* and *desire*.

(13)  tum-ko zoo jaa-naa hai
      2N-DAT zoo go-INF  be.PRS.3SG
      'You have/want to go to the zoo.'

While usable as a directive, this kind of utterance functions more like the English declarative future than the imperative. It is possible to disagree with the truth of (13) as in (14), unlike its imperative counterpart in (12a). This demonstrates that while (13) has assertive content, (12a), does not.

(14)  nahı̃ı̃, ye  sac  nahı̃ı̃ hai.      mujh-ko       kahı̃ı̃   nahı̃ı̃ jaa-naa hai
      NEG   this truth NEG  be.PRS.3SG, 1SG.OBL-DAT anywhere NEG  go-INF  be.PRS.3SG
      'No, this is not true. I don't have to go anywhere.'

Thus in addition to the syntactic distinctions between the infinitival imperative and declarative (the former has a nominative subject and lacks an auxiliary, while the latter has a dative subject and an auxiliary), we see differences in the semantics of the two constructions as well.

The lack of truth conditions being a hallmark of performativity, we take it that all immediate and deferred forms in the three IA languages discussed are performative, and thus instantiate the imperative clause type rather than the declarative clause type.

## 3.2  Test 2: Subject properties

The second property of imperatives that distinguishes them from other clause-types pertains to addressee-restriction on the subject. It is well-noted that subjects exhibit unique properties in imperatives (Bolinger 1967, Schmerling 1982, Platzack & Rosengren 1998, Potsdam 1998, Rupp 2003, Zanuttini 2008). For instance, languages such as English, which are not pro-drop, allow null subjects in imperatives. Moreover, these null subjects in imperatives can bind 2nd person pronouns and anaphors.

(15)  a. Raise your hand!                                    (Zanuttini 2008: 187)
      b. Wash yourself!                                      (Zanuttini 2008: 187)

English also allows overt subjects in imperatives. Pronominal overt subjects in imperatives are restricted to 2nd person, as shown in (16), based on Zanuttini (2008: 189).

(16)  You/*I/*he read a book!

For non-pronominals, this restriction seems relaxed in that imperatives allow 3rd person subjects such as quantifiers and also proper names, albeit only in coordinated structures. Crucially, in their imperative occurrence, said 3rd person subjects can not only bind a 3rd person anaphoric object, but also a 2nd person anaphoric object. Consider the following examples from Zanuttini (2008: 190-191). The quantifier subject of the imperative can bind a 2nd person anaphor, as in (17a). Contrast with the declarative in (17b) and the interrogative in (17c), where the 3rd person quantifier subject fails to bind a 2nd person anaphoric object. Identical facts obtain for the proper name subject, as shown in (18a) - (18c), also from Zanuttini (2008:192).

(17)  a. Everyone$_i$ raise (his$_i$/her$_i$/their$_i$)/your$_i$ hand!
      b. Everyone$_i$ should raise his$_i$/her$_i$/their$_i$/*your$_i$ hand.
      c. Should everyone$_i$ raise his$_i$/her$_i$/their$_i$/*your$_i$ hand?

(18)  a. Gabriel$_i$ comb your$_i$ hair, Dani$_j$ put on your$_j$ shoes!
      b. *Gabriel$_i$ combed your$_i$ hair, while Dani$_j$ put on your$_j$ shoes.
      c. *Did Gabriel$_i$ comb your$_i$ hair, while Dani$_j$ put on your$_j$ shoes?

These unique properties of the imperative subject have been argued to follow from unique imperative syntax (Zanuttini 2008, Zanuttini, Pak & Portner 2012, see also Jensen 2003, Bennis 2006, a.o.). Zanuttini (2008) offers the most promising syntactic analysis of the addressee relatedness found

with imperative subjects. She assumes the presence of a functional projection, the Jussive Phrase, which is a 2nd person projection found *only* in imperatives. The imperative subject enters into an agreement relation with the head of the Jussive Phrase and values the possibly unspecified person feature on the imperative subject. Since the subject inherits 2nd person features from the Jussive head, it can remain phonologically unrealized (following Rizzi's 1986 theory of *pro* drop), and can bind 2nd person anaphors. In contrast, declarative and interrogative clauses lack a Jussive head for the subject to agree with and receive 2nd person features from. As a result, these clause-types pattern differently.

In view of the discussion above, we find that all immediate and deferred commands in Table 1, regardless of their form, manifest addressee-restriction on the subject. This is different from the behaviour of declarative and interrogative subjects. We illustrate with Punjabi. Like English, Punjabi permits overt pronominal subjects in imperatives - these subjects are restricted to 2nd person, which illustrates the presence of a 2nd person feature in the verbal complex, which may or may not be realized overtly. Consider the immediate imperative in (19a) with an overt 2nd person ending, and the deferred infinitival imperative in (19b) without any 2nd person agreement morphology. Both imperatives disallow a 1st or 3rd person pronominal as the imperative subject, notwithstanding [6].

(19) a. tusii/*o otthe jaa-o
2H/3H   there go-2H
'Go there!'

   b. tusii/*o otthe jaa-naa
2H/3H   there go-INF
'Go there!'

Further support for addressee-restriction on the subject comes from its binding properties. Even when covert, the subject of both the immediate and deferred imperative can bind a 2nd person anaphoric object, but not a 1st or 3rd person anaphoric object. This is demonstrated below.

(20) a. *pro*$_i$ twaa-ḍii$_i$/onaa-dii$_{*i/j}$   caabi de-o
*pro* 2.OBL-POSS/3.OBL-POSS key   give-2H
'Give your key!'

   b. pro$_i$ twaa-ḍii$_i$/onaa-dii$_{*i/j}$   caabi de-naa
*pro* 2.OBL-POSS/3.OBL-POSS key   give-INF
'Give your key!'

Compare this with the declarative occurrence of the infinitival verb, which is compatible with a dative or ergative subject of any person specification. An example with the dative subject is given in (21). Moreover, unlike the imperative, there are no unique binding properties in infinitival declaratives. Depending on the phi-specification of the (c)overt subject, a matching anaphor, it be 1st/2nd or 3rd, can be bound in the object position.

(21) twaa-nuu/onaa-nuu   otthe jaa-naa e
2.OBL-DAT/3.OBL-DAT there go-INF   be.PRS.3SG

   i. 'You/(s)he have/has to go there.'
   ii. 'You/(s)he wants to go there.'

Apart from the restriction on the overt pronominal subject and binding properties, addressee-restriction on imperative subjects is also evidenced by agreement facts. Imperatives in Punjabi can also occur with quantifier subjects. Crucially, even when the subject is a 3rd person quantifier,

---

[6]The pronominal paradigm for 3rd person (nominative) in Punjabi only has one form *o*, which is used for various number and honorificity distinctions.

the form of the verbal complex remains invariable. This finding, which holds for both the immediate and deferred imperatives, clearly attests to the presence of an agreeing 2nd person feature in the functional spine of the imperative clause.

(22)  a.  koyii      buaa khol-o
          someone door  open-2H
          'Someone open the door!'

      b.  koyii      buaa khol-naa
          someone door  open-INF
          'Someone open the door!'

Contrast the above pattern with declaratives shown below, where a 3rd person quantifier subject must occur with corresponding 3rd person agreement, and not 2nd person agreement. This is shown for the subjunctive declarative in (23).[7]

(23)  shaayad koyii      buaa khol-e/*ẽ
      maybe   someone door  open-PRS.3I/*PRS.2I
      'Maybe someone opens the door.'

Addressee-restriction on the imperative subject, as presented above, also hold in HU for all immediate and deferred imperatives. The only seemingly exceptional case is the Bangla honorific. Across immediate and deferred imperatives, the honorific form can occur with not only 2nd person pronominal subjects, but also 3rd person.

(24)  apni/uni ciṭhi-ṭa    likh-un
      2H/3H    letter-CLF write-2H
      i.  'You write the letter!'
      ii. '(Make it such that) (s)he writes the letter!'

Bangla agreement across all paradigms does not distinguish between 2nd and 3rd person for the highest level of honorificity. Given this, it is perhaps expected that the honorific agreement form would permit 3rd person subjects. But note that even with a 3rd person pronominal subject, the interpretation of (24) is not a report, but rather a command for the addressee to see to it that the 3rd person subject carries out the action, which is in keeping with Zanuttini's (2008) treatment of 3rd person imperatives.

Thus, to the extent that imperative syntax is unique in hosting a 2nd person head which agrees with the subject to restrict it to the addressee, both immediate and deferred imperatives in IA pattern alike as imperatives, to the exclusion of declaratives. Having established the imperative-hood of both immediate and deferred imperatives, we will henceforth gloss them as IMM.IMP and DFR.IMP respectively.

# 4   What does the immediate vs. deferred distinction mean?

In the previous section, we argued that both immediate and deferred imperatives are on par in terms of their status as imperatives. In this section, we probe further into the immediate vs. deferred divide.

In section 1, we observed a non-overlapping distribution of the immediate and deferred imperatives in affirmative contexts. Across all three languages, the deferred imperative is disallowed with

---

[7]Quantifier subjects can also occur in the infinitival declarative. However, since the infinitival is a person-invariable form, the contrast between 2nd and 3rd person agreement cannot be observed. The gloss I refers to the intimate level of honorificity.

immediate uses as in (2), and the immediate imperative is disallowed with deferred uses as in (3). One can imagine three possible states of affairs that underlie this distribution.

(25)  a. The immediate is positively specified as *now*, and the deferred is temporally unspecified.
      b. The deferred is positively specified as *later*, and the immediate is temporally unspecified.
      c. Both the immediate and the deferred are positively specified.

In this section, we examine the behavior of immediate and deferred imperatives under negation to understand which of the three above-mentioned possibilities hold in each of the IA languages under study. As noted in 2.1, Bangla does not permit the immediate imperative form to be negated, using the deferred even in immediate contexts under negation.

(26)  Context: Someone is about to step into a pothole and you shout at them to not move further …

| a. | * egɔo | na | b. | egio | na |
|----|--------|----|----|------|-----|
|    | advance.IMM.IMP | NEG | | advance.DFR.IMP | NEG |
|    | Int: 'Don't step ahead!' | | | 'Don't step ahead!' | |

Given the facts in (26), let us consider the options in (25). Accounting for the ungrammaticality of (26a) is not possible with option (25b) because the immediate imperative is unspecified for temporality and hence provides no way to model the interaction between negation and immediacy. Either option (25a) or (25c) must thus be the case for Bangla. The ungrammaticality of (26a) then could be modeled to arise from the interaction between negation and the positive specification of immediacy. Understanding the nature of this interaction is left for future research.

Turning now to HU and Punjabi, we noted in section 2 that they permit negation in both immediate and deferred imperatives. Given this, one would expect a non-overlapping distribution of immediate and deferred imperatives under negation, akin to their distribution in affirmative contexts. However, we find that the deferred imperative can be used in an immediate context under negation.

(27)  Context: Someone is about to step into a pothole and you shout at them to not move further …

| a. | aage | pair | mat | rakh-o | b. | aage | pair | mat | rakh-naa |
|----|------|------|-----|--------|----|------|------|-----|----------|
|    | ahead | foot | NEG | put-IMM.IMP | | ahead | foot | NEG | put-DFR.IMP |
|    | 'Don't step ahead!' | | | | | 'Don't step ahead!' | | | |

This on its own does not rule out any of the options in (25). As long as the positive specification of temporality can become inactive under negation (by some means), any of the three possibilities could account for the availability of a negated deferred imperative in immediate contexts. Suppose that only immediacy is positively specified. In affirmative immediate contexts, both the immediate and the underspecified deferred form are then in principle available. However, under competition, the more specific/stronger presuppositional form of the immediate imperative is preferred. If this positive specification of immediacy becomes inactive under negation, then we no longer have competition where one form is more specific or has stronger presuppositions than the other, and hence we expect free variation. The same logic applies if only the deferred is positively specified, or if both are.

Given this, we examine the behaviour of negative immediate and negative deferred imperatives in HU in deferred contexts.

(28)  Context: The weather department has announced that it will rain tomorrow, and you advise your friend not to travel …

    a.    kal       himachal mat jaa-naa
            tomorrow himachal NEG go-DFR.IMP

        'Don't go to Himachal tomorrow!'

    b.    kal       himachal mat jaa-o
            tomorrow himachal NEG go-IMM.IMP

        'Don't go to Himachal tomorrow!'

In (28), we see no difference between the acceptability of a negative immediate imperative and a negative deferred imperative. Yash Sinha (p.c.) notes that whether or not the future event is planned appears to affect the availability of a negative immediate imperative in a deferred context.

(29)    Context: I've been to Himachal and had a bad experience, so I'm giving you general advice[8] …

    a.    kabhi     himachal mat jaa-naa
            sometime himachal NEG go-DFR.IMP

        'Never go to Himachal!'

    b.  * kabhi     himachal mat jaa-o
            sometime himachal NEG go-IMM.IMP

        'Never go to Himachal!'

In (29), no future event is planned, and we see that the negative immediate imperative is unavailable. One might think that unplanned predicates are generally unavailable with future-referring immediate imperatives, but we note that without negation, such imperatives are actually available. Consider the following example [9].

(30)    Context: I've been to Himachal and had a great experience, so I'm advising my friend …

    a.    kabhi     himachal jaa-naa         b.    kabhi     himachal jaa-o
            sometime himachal go-DFR.IMP              sometime himachal go-IMM.IMP

        'Visit Himachal sometime!'                  'Visit Himachal sometime!'

This demonstrates that the ungrammaticality of (29b) arises not only from the interaction of planned-ness and immediacy, but that negation also plays a crucial role. By the same reasoning as was provided for Bangla, we can conclude that option (25b) cannot be correct for HU. This is because ruling out (29b) by appealing to the joint interaction of immediacy, negation, and planned-ness is not possible if immediacy is unspecified. Options (25a) and (25c) are both still live possibilities. Punjabi patterns alike. Thus in HU and Punjabi, as in Bangla, at least immediacy must be positively specified, but it is undetermined whether delay is also specified.

In future work, we intend to investigate the interaction of planned-ness not only with negation, but also with temporal adverbials in order to better understand its role in determining the distribution of immediate and deferred imperatives in IA.

---

[8]Thanks to Yash Sinha (p.c.) for this example.

[9]We note that in this unplanned context, certain verbs such as *eat* and *give* are deviant to various degrees in the affirmative immediate as well as the negative. Nonetheless, some verbs do allow it in the affirmative, as shown in the example.

# 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have investigated immediate and deferred directives in three Indo-Aryan languages: Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi and Bangla. Considering their morphology, we noted pervasive but non-systematic syncretism between these commands and other parts of the verbal paradigms in each language. We noted that Bangla appears to be what has been termed a *surrogate* negative imperative language, since immediate imperatives cannot be negated. Given this, we explored the morphologically defined *true* vs. *surrogate* divide that has been proposed for imperatives, and demonstrated that the syntactic properties that are known to correlate with *true* vs. *surrogate* imperatives in the literature do not align with the morphological uniqueness and non-uniqueness of the forms in Bangla. The lack of alignment between morphological uniqueness of the verbal form used in a directive and the syntactic and semantic properties of that directive demonstrates the need for non-morphological diagnostics for identifying imperatives.

On this basis, we presented syntactic-semantic diagnostics based on the special properties of the subjects of imperatives and of the imperative clause type. We demonstrated that both immediate and deferred commands in all three Indo-Aryan languages pattern as real imperatives on the basis of these tests. Turning to the difference between the immediate and deferred imperatives, we noted cross-linguistic differences in their availability with negation, and interactions between negation, immediacy, and plannability. Exploring the semantics of these components is left for future work.

# Acknowledgments

# References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Austin, John. 1962. *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford University Press.

Bennis, Hans. 2006. Agreement, pro and imperatives. In P. Ackema, P. Brandt, M. Schoorlemmer, and F. Weerman, eds., *Arguments and agreement*, page 101–123. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bhatia, Tej. 1993. *Punjabi: A cognitive-descriptive grammar*. Routledge.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. The imperative in English. *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, Janua Linguarum* 1:335–362.

Butt, Miriam. 2006. The Dative-Ergative Connection. In O. Bonami and P. C. Hofherr, eds., *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics*, page 69–92.

Ferguson, Charles. 1966. The imperative system of Bengali. In A. Dil, ed., *Shahidullah Presentation Volume*, pages 19–24. Lahore: Linguistic Research Group of Pakistan.

Han, Chung-Hye. 2000. *The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in Universal Grammar*. T. Hove, Sussex: Psychology Press.

Jensen, Britta. 2003. Syntax and semantics of imperative subjects. *Nordlyd* 31(1).

Kaufmann, Magdalena. 2012. *Interpreting Imperatives*. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy. Springer Netherlands.

Platzack, Christer and Inger Rosengren. 1998. On the subject of imperatives: A minimalist account of the imperative clause. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1(3):177–224.

Portner, Paul. 2004. The semantics of imperatives within a theory of clause types. In R. B. Young, ed., *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, vol. 14, page 235–252. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.

Portner, Paul. 2007. Imperatives and modals. *Natural Language Semantics* 15(4):351–383.

Potsdam, Eric. 1998. *Syntactic issues in the English imperative*. Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Rivero, Maria Luisa. 1994. Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12(1):63–120.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. Null objects in italian and the theory of pro. *Linguistic inquiry* 17(3):501–557.

Rupp, Laura. 2003. *The syntax of imperatives in English and Germanic: Word order variation in the Minimalist framework*. Springer.

Sadock, Jerrold M. and Arnold M. Zwicky. 1985. Speech act distinctions in syntax. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* 1:155–196.

Schmerling, Susan. 1982. How imperatives are special, and how they aren't. *Papers from the Parasession on Nondeclaratives, Chicago Linguistic Society* 202:218.

Schwager, Magdalena. 2011. Imperatives and Tense. In R. Musan and M. Rathert, eds., *Tense across Languages*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Sharma, Ghanshyam. 1999. A pragmatic survey of Hindi imperatives. *Annali di Ca' Foscari, Serie orientale* 38(3):245–316.

West, Birdie. 1980. *Gramática Popular Del Tucano*. Bogotá, CO: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

van der Wurff, Wim. 2007. Imperative clauses in generative grammar: An introduction. In W. van der Wurff, ed., *Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar: Studies in Honour of Frits Beukema*, vol. 103 of *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Zanuttini, Rafaella. 1994. Speculations on negative imperatives. *Revista di linguistica* 6:119–142.

Zanuttini, Rafaella. 1997. *Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. Oxford University Press.

Zanuttini, Raffaella. 2008. Encoding the addressee in the syntax: Evidence from English imperative subjects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 26(1):185–218.

Zanuttini, Raffaella, Miok Pak, and Paul Portner. 2012. A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 30(4):1231–1274.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2006. The ban on true negative imperatives. *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics* 6:405–424.