Deferred imperatives across Indo-Aryan

As observed by Aikhenvald (2014), languages often make a distinction between immediate and deferred imperatives. In this paper, we explore these deferred commands in three Indo-Aryan/IA languages, namely Punjabi, Hindi-Urdu/HU, and Bangla. Deferred commands in all three languages employ verbal forms that are not restricted to the imperative paradigm, akin to surrogate imperatives in Italian (Zanuttini 1994). We claim that despite this, deferred commands in IA pattern with true imperatives for syntactic and semantic diagnostics. Hence, imperatives should not be diagnosed through morphology, but rather syntactic and semantic properties. Second, we demonstrate that the delay component of deferred imperatives interacts with aspectual temporal adverbials, indicating that it is encoded morphosyntactically in the event structure. Data are from the authors' native speaker judgements and from one HU consultant.

Deferred commands are imperatives: We first present the morphological paradigms for immediate and deferred commands. For immediate commands, all three languages use the bare verb stem with 2nd person/2P agreement. The imperative agreement forms may differ from 2P agreement forms in the declarative (e.g. ∅, -iye,-un only obtain in imperatives). For deferred commands, disparate verbal forms are employed, albeit with some overlap. HU and Punjabi both use the infinitival V-naa, while Bangla and HU both use the future. Of the remaining forms, the -is form in Bangla is borrowed from the declarative 2P familiar paradigm, while the other three forms occur uniquely in the deferred imperative paradigm.

(1)

	HU	**Punjabi**	**Bangla**
Immediate	V-∅/-o/-iye	V-∅/-o	V-∅/-o/-un
Deferred	V-naa	V-naa	-
	V-AGR-FUT	-	V-FUT-AGR
		V-ĩĩ V-(e)yaa ALLOC	V-is V_{ABLAUT}-o

Unlike surrogate (infinitive) imperatives in German and Hebrew (von Fintel & Iatridou 2017, pp. 295), all IA deferred commands (including infinitives) pattern with true imperatives, as shown below from HU.

SYNTACTIC DIAGNOSTIC: ADDRESSEE-RESTRICTION

(2) a. tum/*maĩ **jaa-o/ jaa-naa**
2SG.FAM/1SG.FAM go-2.FAM/ go-INF
'Go!'

b. aap/*ham **jaa-yiye-gaa**
2SG.HON/1SG.HON go-2.HON-FUT
'Go!'

SEMANTIC DIAGNOSTIC: LACK OF TRUTH-CONDITIONS

(3) a. **jaa-o/ jaa-naa/ jaa-yiye-gaa**
go-2.FAM/ go-INF/ go-2.HON-FUT
'Go!'

b. #ye sac nahii hai
this truth neg is
'This is not true.'

SEMANTIC DIAGNOSTIC: WEAK READINGS (E.G. ACQUIESCENCE)

(4) a. kya *maĩ (khaa-ne ke baad) ram-ke ghar calaa jaa-ũ
POLQ 1SG (eat-INF.OBL GEN after) Ram-GEN home walk go-1SG
'Can I go to Ram's place (after eating)?'

b. haan kyũ nahii cale **jaa-o/ jaa-naa/ jaa-yiye-gaa**
yes why NEG walk.OBL go-2.FAM/ go-INF/ go-2.HON-FUT
'Yes, why not. Go!'

Other purported diagnostics (lack of subjects, permitting 2P reflexives, etc. as in Keshet & Medeiros 2018) are unusable in IA for independent reasons (*pro* drop, non-agreeing reflexives). Hence, on the bases of the diagnostics above, we conclude that both deferred and immediate imperatives in Punjabi, HU, and Bangla are true imperatives. A crucial consequence of our findings is that both morphology and command uses prove to be unreliable diagnostics for defining imperatives, which should instead be defined in terms of their syntax and semantics. Given this, we will henceforth gloss immediate imperatives as IMP and deferred imperatives as DEFIMP.

Delay is encoded morphosyntactically: Deferred imperatives require the prejacent to not be carried out immediately, and hence are infelicitous in contexts which require immediate action. Crucially, the

delay is not a cancelable inference, as evidenced by its infelicity in immediate action contexts even with the addition of a TP-level temporal adverbial, as shown with HU in (5).

(5) *Context: A building has caught fire. I shout at the occupants to run.*
(abhii) bhaag-o/ *bhaag-iye-gaa/ *bhaag-naa!
(now) run-IMP/ *run-DEFIMP/ *run-DEFIMP
'Run (now)!'

Examining the nature of the delay further, we find that it interacts with aspect-level temporal adverbs. In addition to the reading where the adverb modifies the runtime of the event, the deferred imperative also yields a reading where the adverb modifies the duration of the delay. We use the V_{ABLAUT}-o form from Bangla to illustrate, but the described interaction with adverbs holds of all deferred imperatives listed in (1), modulo (a)telicity from light verbs in HU and Punjabi.

(6) *Context: A certain medication comes in two parts that have to be mixed. Once mixed, they must be consumed within a half hour or it will become ineffective.*
a. *The doctor mixes the preparation and tells the patient:*
aadh ghôṇṭa-e osud-ṭa khao
half hour-LOC medicine-CL eat.IMP
'Take the medicine within a half hour.'
b. *The doctor gives the unmixed parts to the patient to take home and says:*
(melano-r) aadh ghôṇṭa-e osud-ṭa kheo
(mixing-GEN) half hour-LOC medicine-CL eat.DEFIMP
'Take the medicine within a half hour (of mixing).'

(7) *Context: A certain medication cannot be taken within two hours of eating a meal. A patient is prescribed this medication, but has just eaten, so the doctor tells the patient:*
du ghôṇṭa-e osud-ṭa kheo/ #khao
2 hour-LOC medicine-CL eat.DEFIMP/ #eat.IMP
'Take the medicine after two hours.'

We adopt the intuitive view that in-adverbials assert that the runtime of the event they modify is contained within the specified time span (Dowty 1979, Rothstein 2004). In (6), we see that the temporal adverbial is able to modify the runtime of the event that is the prejacent of the imperative for both immediate and deferred imperatives. In (7) however, we see that the temporal adverbial can also modify the duration of the delay in the deferred imperative. This option has no counterpart for the immediate imperative, hence its infelicity in (7). The delay must be morphosyntactically represented as a distinct event in the event structure so that the in-adverbial is able to specify just the runtime of the delay. The ambiguity observed with the deferred imperative is also attested with the future marked verb in declaratives, (8). This shows that the delay component is not exclusive to imperatives. Instead, it seems to be encoded in the (expanded) event structure of future-referring verbs generally.

(8) Sam will clean the room in two hours.
i. It will take two hours (because Sam is slow).
ii. The cleaning will start in two hours (because Sam is out right now).

To conclude, we have shown that diagnostics for imperatives must make reference to both their syntax and their semantics - morphological form or conversational function are insufficient. True imperatives in IA have the same morphology as non-imperatives, making morphology an unreliable diagnostic. Surrogate imperatives with the same conversational function as true imperatives have differing semantic properties, also making command uses an unreliable test. Rather, we propose that syntactic addressee restriction, a lack of truth conditions, and the availability of weak readings are diagnostics for imperatives. Applying these diagnostics, we find that IA languages have two imperatives: an underspecified one, and a deferred one. Furthermore, on the basis of interactions with temporal adverbials, we show that the delay component of deferred imperatives must be morphosyntactically encoded since temporal adverbials can modify just the duration of the delay.

REFERENCES:**Aikhenvald, A.**. 2014. On future in commands. **Dowty, D. R.**. 1979. Word Meaning and Montague Grammar.**von Fintel, Kai & S. Iatridou**. 2017. A modest proposal for the meaning of imperatives. **Keshet, E. & D. Medeiros**. 2018. Imperatives under coordination. **Rothstein, S.**. 2004. Structuring Events. **Zanuttini, R.**. 1994. Speculations on negative imperatives.