A pragmatic account of directive strategies in Hindi
Ghanshyam Sharma

*Abstract*: The paper presents a pragmatic account of different directive strategies a speaker adopts when issuing commands in Hindi. It takes a pragmatic approach to analyze not only the canonical form of the Hindi imperative but also other sentence types which are employed to express directive illocutions. Furthermore, in analyzing the data to establish links between a linguistic unit and the illocution thereby conveyed, the paper takes a 'form-to-illocution' viewpoint rather than adopting the opposite entrenched 'illocution-to-form' approach. It does this by investigating various Hindi sentence types which are employed in diverse directive strategies to convey deontic modal meaning. The paper presents a modal account of various directive strategies in Hindi.

Keywords: Hindi imperative, directive strategies, obligation, deontic

## *1. Preliminaries*

Although the imperative has been a topic of grammatical investigation for millennia, some recent trends in linguistics and philosophy have given it further dimensions, thus making it a part of an all-inclusive term—namely, the directive. Such a term is meant to cover a wide variety of commands issued by the speaker (hereafter S, wherever possible) to make the hearer or the addressee (hereafter H, wherever possible) carry out a desired action (hereafter X, wherever possible). The paper analyzes not only the canonical form of the imperative in Hindi but also some other sentence types which are typically employed by S to issue different types of commands and to make requests, pleas and suggestions.

Before analyzing various Hindi sentence types and making an attempt at uncovering their modal meaning according to their role in diverse directive strategies, it would be appropriate, however, to limit our scope and define some of the terms employed in the present study. Put more succinctly, by canonical imperative we mean a sentence in what we are accustomed to call the imperative mood (Palmer 2001: 80-2), loaded with S's command

directed to a second person H (Aikhenvald 2010: 18; Birjulin & Xrakovskij 2001: 5). In this study, all other Hindi sentence types lacking the imperative mood by the S to issue commands are classified as 'non-canonical imperatives', even if they are directed to a second person addressee and carry to varying degree elements of deontic necessity or deontic possibility. Hence, a Hindi command containing an infinitive falls under the 'non-canonical imperative' class, even though—similar to a canonical imperative—it carries the deontic necessity element, albeit with a deferred time reference. Likewise, other commands containing either a subjunctive or imperfective verb form are classified as 'non-canonical imperative' since they lack imperative mood marking. In addition, some other sentence types through which S reminds H of her/his obligations are also analyzed for their role in directive strategies.

Given that the aim of this study is to describe modal meaning of selected Hindi sentence types for their standard use in diverse directive strategies, no attempt thus will be made to describe either third person-oriented commands (i.e. jussives) or first person-oriented commands (i.e. hortatives). In addition, the paper does not aim to present an exhaustive list of all Hindi sentence types which can be employed to issue directives nor does it intend to uncover different types of directives such as willful and non-willful directives, commissive directives, expressive directives, etc. as investigated in Van Olmen (2011: 41-50).

Furthermore, for a modal analysis of Hindi directive strategies, the paper intends to adopt a 'form-to-illocution' approach rather than the opposite 'illocution-to-form' approach developed by a number of scholars.[1] In other words, rather than conducting an empirical survey of the frequency of their uses, the paper instead intends to investigate major Hindi sentence types which typically express directive illocution, theorizing certain elements of an ideal conversational setting in which they are supposed to be employed. The term 'modal meaning' is treated here as that part of utterance meaning which S—either overtly or covertly—necessarily attaches to its inherent proposition in any normal conversational setting. Thus, in making an assertion such as "John lives in Paris", S attaches to its propositional content

[1] De Clerck (2006) and Van Olmen (2011) meticulously put forward a theory which can roughly be termed as 'illocution-to-form theory' which requires serious consideration in any typological research on imperatives. However, for various reasons, a slightly different approach is attempted in this study. Firstly, there is a shortage of a wide all-representative Hindi corpus to test any scientific hypothesis with. Secondly, there are some inconsistencies in the speech act terminology which does not help dredge up essential semantic elements of utterance meaning: for example, 'I'm hungry' (an assertion), I will never forget your help (commissive), May God bless you! (expressive), etc. may all be employed by S to issue the same directive illocution. Thirdly, it is believed that by strictly adopting illocution-to-form approach, one must consider not only the imperatives, but all sentences types which can be employed by S to convey a directive illocution: assertive (i.e. I'm hungry!), interrogatives (i.e., Could you open the door?), expressive (Oh, it is too hot in here!), etc.

the following meaning: "for all I know I communicate to you that it is necessarily true" that "John lives in Paris", or to put it symbolically, $K_s \Box P$[2] (P = John lives in Paris). Similarly, in issuing a command through a canonical imperative such as "Read it!", S attaches to its propositional content a directive modal meaning such as the following: "for all I want I tell you/ demand" that "You necessarily do X": $W_s \Box !X$ (i.e. You necessarily accomplish X). Hence, to some extent, modal meaning is comparable to the concept of illocution—as conceived in the speech act theory—but at the same time quite different from it: illocution is an overlay which may contain numerous sentences whereas modal meaning is S's meaning assigned to each and every sentences. Finally, although a number of interesting studies have developed a parallel line research in illocutionary logic[3] as well as in formal semantics,[4] the paper seeks to develop a different formal-functional line of research focusing mainly on the linguistic forms employed in different directive strategies by Hindi speakers.

## *2. Elements of directive strategies in Hindi*

### *2.1. Pronominal reference*

Most Hindi grammar texts provide a sketchy discussion of the distribution of the second person pronoun in the imperative (Kellogg 1875: 229; Sharma 1958: 82; McGregor 1972: 43; Montaut 2004: 114; Kachru 2006: 78; Koul 2008: 116) as they do not make any distinction between one addressee and more than one addressee. For the purpose of the present paper, it can be stated that depending on the type of relationship S has with H, s/he can choose from three pronominal forms of reference to H to express commands through a canonical imperative, namely: *tū* [tuː] ('you', intimate) which is a second-person singular), *tum* [tʊm] ('you', familiar or friendly) which is a second-person plural, and *āp* [ɑːp] ('you', polite, respectful or formal) which is a second-person plural and has its own distinct plural imperative form. However, if H is treated equally as a single person or more, the

[2] Symbols used: $K_s$ = 'speaker knows'; $K_h$ = hearer knows; $B_s$ = 'speaker believes'; $B_h$ = 'hearer believes'; $\Box$ = 'necessarily', 'it is necessary that'; $\Diamond$ = 'possibly', 'it is possible that';, !X = 'do X'; $\neg\Box$= negation; $\therefore$ therefore; W = want.

[3] Unlike Searle & Vanderveken (1985) who have developed illocutionary logic to study speech acts, it is believed here that illocutions do not tantamount to a sentence, nor even to an utterance of it.

[4] The present author considers Huntley's (1984) truth-conditional account of imperative incongruous since the scope of veracity in formal semantic analysis is rather fuzzy: Is it the veracity (i.e. truth-conditions) of the utterance one is making or that of the action yet to be carried out by the addressee?

following six possibilities—i.e. (i) through (vi)—of the second person Hindi pronoun can be envisaged in natural communication:

| (1) | H (one person) | | H (more than one person) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intimate | (i) | *tū* 'you' | (iv) | *tum (log)* 'you all' |
| Familiar or friendly | (ii) | *tum* 'you' | (v) | *tum (log)* 'you all' |
| Polite or formal | (iii) | *āp* 'you' | (vi) | *āp (log)* 'you all' |

The canonical Hindi imperative marks person and number and consequently the addressee can have all the above mentioned six second person pronominal references, but, as can be seen in the following example, at the level of verbal inflection Hindi exhibits three canonical imperative forms only. For example, in (2), the verb *jānā* [ʤɑːnɑː] 'go' shows three forms in the imperative mood, namely, *jā* [ʤɑː] 'go!' (with second person singular *tū*), *jāo* [ʤɑːo] 'go!' (with second person plural and friendly *tum*) and *jāie* [ʤɑːɪe] 'go!' (with second person plural, formal or polite *app*).

(2) a. ~~तू~~ बाजार जा।

(i) ~~(tū)~~ bāzār ʤā
you.2SG.INTI bazār go.IMP.2SG[5]
'Go to the bazār [right away]!'

b. ~~तुम~~ बाजार जाओ।

(ii) ~~(tum)~~/ (iv), (v) ~~(tum log)~~ bāzār ʤāo
you.2PL.FAM bazār go.IMP.2PL.FAM
'Go to the bazār [right away]!'

c. ~~आप~~ बाज़ार जाइए।

(iii) ~~(āp)~~/ (vi)~~(āp log)~~ bāzār ʤāie
you.2PL.POL bazār go.IMP.2PL.POL
'Please go to the bazār [right away]!'

*2.2. Degree of strength of deontic modality*

In almost all directive illocutions through which S expresses her/his desire or wishes for the referred agent to perform X, deontic modality is employed. As stated above, the person(s) by whom such a desired action is to be carried out can be any of the following: second person(s)—the imperative; third person(s)—the jussive; or, in monologues, even first person(s)—the

[5] Abbreviations: ACC= accusative; DAT= dative; DIFF= differential; FAM= familiar; FUT= future; IMP= imperative; IPFV= imperfective; INF= infinitive; INTI= intimate; OBL= oblique; PFV= perfective; PL= plural; POL= polite; SBJV= subjunctive; SG= singular; 2PL= second person plural; 2SG= second person singular; 3PL= third person plural.

hortative. The following taxonomy will show the degree of strength of the deontic modality involved in the various cases:

(3) Conversational settings

| | Speaker | Addressee(s) or hearer | Referred agent | Strength of the directive |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Situation 1: | I (we) | you [SG/PL] | you [SG/PL] | (strongest) |
| Situation 2: | I (we) | you [SG/PL] | s/he/they | ↑ |
| Situation 3: | I (we) | you [SG/PL] | I/we | \| |
| Situation 4: | I (we) | I | I/we | \| |
| Situation 5: | I (we) | I | s/he/they | \| |
| Situation 6: | I (we) | you [SG/PL] | [None] | ↓ |
| Situation 7: | I (we) | I | [None] | (weakest) |

As discussed elsewhere (Sharma 2000), in situation 1, S wants the addressee(s) to perform X because the addressee in this case is also the intended agent of X. In situation 2, it is the third person(s) who should carry out X, while in situations 3 and 4 the first person(s) should accomplish it. Situations 4, 5 and 7 are monologues (in which S is also the addressee) while their respective referred agents differ in having in 4 a self-reference (possibly including others), in 5 a third-person referred agent and in 7 no referred agent at all. Situation 6 has an addressee other than S, but also has no referred agent. For example, a speaker may mutter to her/himself (or enunciate someone else) a sentence such as 'It must rain tomorrow' or 'It should be a hot day tomorrow', without a referred agent existing to carry out any supposed action.

Thus, whether an imperative sentence is an order, request, plea, exhortation or permission depends not only on the pronominal form of reference used to refer to H but also on the conversational setting. Although the pronominal forms of reference are indicators of the kind of relationship between S and H, they are believed to indicate the illocutionary flexibility of the utterance as well; i.e. the selection itself of one of the pronominal forms of reference can render an imperative sentence to exist as an order, request, demand or permission.

### *3. The first directive strategy: The canonical imperative*

The most frequent way of issuing commands in Hindi is to use the canonical imperative, termed also as present imperatives (Sharma 1958: 83), immediate or direct imperatives in the literature. By employing a canonical Hindi imperative, S asks H to accomplish or begin accomplishing a particular act X at the moment of utterance $t_n$. As explained in (2), this form

of Hindi imperative exhibits three distinct verb forms corresponding to the six pronominal forms of reference in the second person described in (1).

*3.1. Preparing illocutionary grounds for making a command through the canonical imperative*

S issues a command through the canonical imperative—otherwise known as direct or immediate imperative in the literature—at time $t_n$ under any of the following conditions:

(4) a. S wants H to carry out X.
b. S thinks that H is able to produce X.
c. At the moment of utterance, S believes that it is necessary for H to produce X, i.e.
$B_s \Box!X$, and
either $B_s \neg K_h \Box!X$ or $\neg B_s K_h \Box!X$ (i.e. $\Diamond K_h \Box!X$; $\Diamond \neg K_h \Box!X$).
d. S imagines that H's action in carrying out X will either be in H's, or in S's interest, or in the interest of a third party (hereafter TP).
e. At the moment of utterance, $t_n$, S either knows or believes that either
e'. H has not started action X, and thus S asks H to carry out X at $t_n$, or
e''. H has already initiated action X at a time $t_{n-1}$, but the task is still incomplete and so the aim of S's order is to ensure H completes the task at $t_{n+1}$.
f. At the time of utterance S either knows or believes either that
f'. At the time $t_n$ H is engaged in carrying out action Y that would prevent him from fulfilling X at $t_{n+1}$, or
f''. At the time in question, H is not engaged in some other activity that would prevent him from immediately undertaking X.
g. If f' is the case, then S asks H to abandon Y and to start carrying out X. Thus, S does not allow H to carry out any action other than X before it is completed.
h. It is necessary for S to carry out the action X:
$\Box!X$ (= H necessarily does X)
$\therefore \neg\Diamond\neg!X$
i.e., it is obligatory that H performs X, and, therefore, it is not possible that H chooses not to undertake X.
i. The possible time lag between $t_{n-1}$ and $t_n$ and $t_{n+1}$ is arbitrary and will depend on some mutual knowledge between S and H; it might be an instant or even a period lasting longer than a year. The accomplishment of the desired action may vary according to the type of verb used. Some verbs (e.g. jump etc.)

will of course require only a few seconds for the action to be completed, whereas other verbs (e.g. learn etc.) may last as long as the agent's lifetime.

j. When S issues a command using a direct imperative, S wants H to know that S has a set of beliefs about the addressee and that s/he is interested in seeing the outcome and completion of the desired action.

This is the most common and frequent imperative type in Hindi which, as mentioned above, is employed by S to convey to H commands relating to an action X to be carried out immediately, without any other action Y being allowed before X. In (5a) through (5c), the same directive illocution is evoked to H according to three pronominal references to H.

(5) a. (तू ) इसे पढ़।

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ~~(tū)~~ | ise | paṛh |
| you.2SG.INTI | it | read.IMP.2SG |

'Read it [right away]!'

b. (~~तुम~~) (~~तुम~~ लोग) इसे पढ़ो।

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ~~(tum)~~/ ~~(tum log)~~ | ise | paṛho |
| you.2PL.FAM | it | read.IMP.2PL.FAM |

'Read it [right away]!'

c. (~~आप~~) (~~आप~~ लोग) इसे पढ़िए।

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ~~(āp)~~/ ~~(āp log)~~ | ise | paṛhie |
| you.2PL.POL | it | read.IMP.2PL.POL |

'Please read it [right away]!'

*3.2. The question of a special form of ĀP-class imperative*

In addition to the three forms mentioned in (5a)-(5c), the canonical Hindi imperative exhibits yet another imperative form, as in (5d), which is used exclusively with the second person plural—formal, polite or respectful—form of pronoun *app*.

(5) d. (~~आप~~) इसे पढ़िएगा।

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ~~(āp)~~ | ise | paṛhiegā |
| you.2PL.POL | it | read.IMP.2PL.POL |

'Please read it [right away], will/won't you?!'

This differential form of imperative (Shapiro 1989 : 89; Shapiro 2003; 268) is in frequent use—more particularly in the eastern variety of Hindi—and is considered as the most polite form of imperative as it indicates an even greater degree of politeness. Some scholars have classified it either as a

future imperative (Sharma 1958: 84) or as an imperative which require H to accomplish X at a future point in time (Shapiro 1989: 89; Kachru 1980: 119)—keeping in mind its *-ga:* suffix which morphologically marks future tense in the Hindi verb formation. In the present analysis, however, this form of imperative belongs to the class of immediate or direct command—albeit to the class of most polite imperatives—but not necessarily to the class of deferred commands to which we will get in 4. As the acceptability of (5e) and the anomaly in (5f) show, by using this form of imperative S may ask H to accomplish the task immediately rather than at a future point in time:

(5) e. (~~आप~~) यहाँ बैठिएगा।

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| (~~āp~~) | yahā | baithiegā |
| you.2PL.POL | here | sit.IMP.2PL.POL |

'Please sit down here [now], will/won't you?!'

(5) f.?? (~~आप~~) यहाँ कल बैठिएगा।

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| (~~āp~~) | yahā | kal | baithiegā |
| you.2PL.POL | here | tomorrow | sit.IMP.2PL.POL |

'Please sit down here tomorrow, will/won't you?!'

It is worth pointing out that, although by issuing a command through canonical or direct imperatives S is demanding H to perform the task immediately, the accomplishment of it as required by S depends on the type of verb in imperative since the duration of action may vary with respect to the lexical aspect (i.e. Aktionsarten) of the verb employed.

### *4. The second directive strategy: Deferred imperatives*

By issuing a command through deferred imperative, termed by some authors as future imperative (Sharma 1958: 84), S asks H to perform X not immediately, but at a future point in time, $t_{n+1}$. For McGregor (1972: 45), it implies less of an immediate specific request and more to impending events not directly visualized, generalized situations, and precepts, etc. In the present analysis, however, S issues such deferred commands bearing in mind that the location and the point in time at which X has to be carried or both might be different from the location or the point in time of the utterance. Thus, the action required by this imperative is in general performed subsequent to some other actions, whether these actions are a part of the entire process concluding with the required action X, or to any other unrelated actions Y which appear to be independent of action X. However, in some circumstances S may ask H to carry out X at the same place and time. In such cases S will require H to suspend any other actions or tasks (Y, Z), so as to be entirely free to carry out X.

*4.1. Preparing illocutionary grounds for making a command through the deferred imperative*

While issuing such commands, S will be in one of the following discourse situations:

(6) a. S believes that H can carry out X, and either knows or believes that at the time of utterance is engaged in carrying out some other action Y:

a'. H is involved in completing Y, and therefore S believes that it would not be possible for H to bring about X before having accomplished Y. S thus asks H to perform the task immediately after the completion of Y.

a". H is involved in carrying out Y, and S wants H to interrupt this task and undertake X even before s/he has accomplished Y. S will in such circumstances add certain terms to show politeness, or to express concern that H is already occupied. S may either ask H to try to make an extra effort, or do something special as a favor for S, i.e. using a particle such as *zarā* (just: would you mind ...), etc.

b. S either knows or believes that H is not busy doing anything which may prevent H from carrying out X, but,

c. Whether or not H is involved in any task other than X, S wants H to carry out X at some future moment in time:

c'. Though H is not carrying out an act deemed by S as preventing the completion of X by H, X will still occur either at a different location from the place of utterance or at a distant point in time in the future. H will therefore only be able to carry out X at a future time, and S will not force him to perform it immediately following the issue of the order.

c". The action will be performed at a different location and S will not be present to check if the task has been fulfilled or not. Thus, H will not be required by S to be responsive, or to report back on the completion of the activity. Any actions will be permissible for H from the time that the command was issued to the moment of the accomplishment of the task.

d. By issuing a command through the 'indirect imperative' S intends for H to know one of the following: (1) that S is not interested in seeing the outcome of the action and leaves it to H to decide whether to accomplish the action or not; (2) in cases where S wants H to abandon the action Y to carry out X, s/he may want to communicate that s/he is interested in seeing the outcome and completion of the desired action.

Thus, the main distinguishing characteristic between the first strategy (i.e. an immediate command through canonical imperative) and the second strategy (i.e. a deferred command expressed through an infinitival verb form) results in the type of world in which H is required to perform X. In fact, in the case of the former S asks H to carry out the action immediately (i.e. in the world in which S has issued a command) whereas in the latter S issues a command to be fulfilled in a deferred world, and this deferred world might be in a different action place or a different point in time. The required action X may even be undertaken at the place of utterance, but in such cases X is going to be subsequent to some other action, say Y. In all the cases of deferred imperative, the action is deferred to a point in time beyond the time of utterance.

(7) a. (तुम) इसे पढ़ो।

(tum) ise paṛho
you.2PL.FAM it read.IMP.2PL.FAM
'Read it (right away)!'

b. (तुम) इसे पढ़ना।

(tum) ise paṛhnā
you.2PL.FAM it read.INF
'You read it (as and when the moment occurs)!'

c. (तुम) ज़रा इसे पढ़ना।

(tum) zarā ise paṛhnā
you.2PL.FAM just it read.INF
'Would you read it (just now)?!'

Whereas in (7a)—an example of an immediate command—the action desired by S has to be carried out by H at the same place and point in time, in (7b)—which is an example of a deferred command—the actions requested by S must be carried out either at a future time or at a different spot from that where the command is issued. As mentioned above, by selecting this kind of imperative S communicates to H that s/he recognizes that either the task has to be done at a different place or at a later moment (and hence deferred) or is subsequent to some other action Y, which is necessary before X can be undertaken. The concept of different worlds therefore seems to be useful here because in all the cases of deferred imperative the required action has to be carried out in a world which, for various reasons, is different from the world in which the command has been issued. Furthermore, S seems to suggest that since the world in which s/he is present is different from the world in which the action will take place, it will not be possible for her/him to see the outcome of the action. Therefore, it is up to H to complete the undertaking or not.

There are, however, cases where this imperative may be employed by S to ask H to carry out the task in the same world as that in which both S and

H find themselves. In (7c), for instance, S invites H to abandon action Y (signaled by the Hindi particle *zarā*) in order to accomplish the task X at the time of utterance. In such cases, the meaning of the imperative derives from S's recognition of H's being busy in some other task. S is well aware of the fact that H is engaged in performing and therefore asks H to interrupt Y and begin X by using the deferred command. The deferment of the action by H in this case is not evident from any situational element and can be understood only in terms of the interruption in the action in which H is engaged.

*4.2. Revisiting the difference between the first strategy (immediate command) and the second strategy (deferred command)*

As explained above, in addition to differences in preparatory grounds of the two types of imperatives in question, the main distinguishing feature between them is that while in the first type of command S wants to see the outcome of H's undertaking the required task in the case of the second type of command S leaves it to H to carry out the task in a world which may or may not be different from the world in which the command has been issued. Some examples will follow to illustrate the above:

(8) a. (~~तुम~~) अब मेरे साथ बाजार चलो।

| (~~tum~~) | ab | mere sāth | bāzār | calo |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| you.2PL.FAM | now | with me | bazār | come.IMP.2PL.FAM |

'Come to the bazār with me [right now]!

b. (~~तुम~~) *अब/ कल मेरे साथ बाजार चलना।

| (~~tum~~) | *ab/kal | mere sāth | bāzār | calnā |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| you.2PL.FAM | just | with me | bazār | come.INF |

'Come to the bazār *now/tomorrow with me!'

c. (~~तुम~~) अब/ *कल यहाँ बैठो।

| (~~tum~~) | ab/*kal | yahɑ̃ | baitho |
|---|---|---|---|
| you.2PL.FAM | now/tomorrow | here | sit.IMP.2PL.FAM |

As can be seen, the presence of a Hindi adverbial *ab* 'now' and *kal* 'tomorrow' makes the deferred commands in (8b) and (8c) anomalous. Both (8b) and (8c) are pragmatically unacceptable in the presence of adverbials *ab* 'now' and *kal* 'tomorrow' since in (8b) the required task has to be completed at a deferred point in time rather than immediately whereas in (8c) it has to carried out immediately.

## *5. The third directive strategy: Commands through the subjunctive*

A very polite way of issuing commands or making pleas in Hindi is to employ a non-canonical imperative which is obtained through the use of the subjunctive or optative (Kachru 2004: 78, 178). With the absence of any imperative mood in it, some authors prefer to call it an 'indirect' command (Sharma 1953: 107). However, such commands are limited to two (out of three) forms of the second person pronoun only—*tum* ('you' familiar or friendly) and *āp* ('you', polite, respectful or formal)—as only the person referred to with one of these two forms is given the possibility of refusing to comply with the command. The person referred to with the singular second person pronoun form—namely *tū* ('you', intimate or subordinate)—is not allowed the right of non-compliance and thus there is no form of command through subjunctive which may refer to this person. The overall picture of the distribution of subjunctive forms can be presented as follows:

(9)

| | PRONOUN | IMP | SUBJ | COMMAND IN SUBJ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| i | tū 2.SG | paṛh | paṛhe | ---- |
| ii | tum 2.PL | paṛho | paṛho | paṛho |
| iii | āp 2.PL | paṛhıe | paṛhẽ | paṛhẽ |

It is evident from (9) that as the third strategy to issue commands, H uses a sentence which has a subjunctive verb form and the person referred to with the pronominal form *tū* (intimate or subordinate) is given the possibility of non-compliance of the command. Furthermore, it is apparent that this type of imperatives is always elliptical since either a clause containing speaker's wish, an *if*-clause or even a *then*-clause is missing from it. Such a form can be joined to another clause through a conjunction that, 'I want that ...' as in (10) where to obtain its full meaning the subjunctive form of the clause requires another clause (in brackets) which expresses S's desire that the action referred be carried out by the agent:

(10) (मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप) यहाँ आएँ।

(mɛ̃ cāhtā hũ: ki āp) yahɑ̃: āɛ̃

I want aux that you.2PL.POL here come.SBJV.2PL.POL

'(I want that (you)) come here, will/won't you?!'

Other kinds of bracketed elements may comprise those expressing possibility, desirability etc. in a conditional sentence form. In general, the bracketed elements are in the form of an if-clause which is not pronounced, but inferred, though they can also be in a 'then-clause' form. The imperative-in-subjunctive in (11a), for example, can take any of the supplementary elements from (11b)—'If you wish..', (11c)—'If it is possible ...' or (11d)—'It would be nice...'.

(11) a. यहाँ आएँ।

yahɑ̃: āẽ
here come.SBJV.2PL.POL
'Please come here!'
'If you wish, please come here!'
'If it is possible, please come here.'
'Please come here!'
'It would be nice if you came.'

b. अगर चाहते हैं तो ...

agar cāhte hɛ̃ to
if want.IPFV.M.PL aux.PL then
'If you want/wish ...'

c. अगर हो सके तो ...

agar ho sake to
if become possible.SBJV.SG then
'If it is possible ...'

d. तो अच्छा हो/ होगा

...(to acchā ho/hogā)
...then good be.SBJV.SG/be.FUT.M.SG
'It would be nice...'

When S issues commands through the subjunctive, s/he asks H to perform X in the same way as direct commands. Both types share the same preparatory grounds, although in the case of command-through-subjunctive—after providing good reasons for the execution of the action—S still eventually gives H the possible choice whether to perform the action or not. This kind of verbal encoding with the option for H to refuse to undertake act X derives from the understood element (either 'then-clause' or 'if-clause') of the conditional imperative. This attached element is the sole factor that adds an air of politeness to such commands, transforming them from orders into requests. S seems to suggest that it is not obligatory for H to undertake X; nonetheless, it would be nice if H decides to do it:

(12) a. □!X ('obligatorily do X' or 'it is obligatory for you (H) to do X')

b. ¬□!X ('not obligatorily do X' or 'it is not obligatory for you (H) to do X'), i.e.

b1. ◊X → ◊!X, (if it is possible for you (H) to accomplish X, then possibly bring about X), or

b2. $\neg\Diamond X \rightarrow \Diamond\neg !X$ (if it is not possible for you (H) to accomplish X, then it is possible for you not to do X) [6]

While the immediate commands (discussed in 3) and deferred commands (discussed in 4) are of type (12a), the imperative-through-subjunctive is of type (12b). Thus through a conditional imperative made up of a subjunctive form of the verb, S communicates both (12b1) and (12b2) at the same time. It is this underlying pragmatic string that makes this command special. The pragmatic strings are of two types: one contains an element expressing S's desires that can be joined though the conjunction *ki* (that) to the imperative, as in (13a), and the second is similar to a pure conditional utterance as seen in (13b):

(13) a. I want that if P, then Q(!X) at time $t_{n+1}$.
= 'I want that if it is possible for you to do/ if you like it etc., then do X.'
b. If P, then Q(!X) at time $t_{n+1}$.
= 'If it is possible/ If you like/ etc., then do X.'

To sum up then, the imperative-through-subjunctive in Hindi can have either the if-clause or the then-clause of a conditional sentence.

### *6. The fourth directive strategy: S's reproach*

To express commands through another kind of non-canonical imperative, Hindi employs the imperfective participle of the verb or labeled by some authors as contingent (Kachru 1980: 119). This is a very special way of issuing commands in Hindi in that, similar to the imperative with the subjunctive, it appears to be a residue if-clause of a complete conditional sentence in which the consequent '... *to accha: hoga: ...*' ('... then it would be/would have been nice.') is dropped and the antecedent if-clause '*agar khiṛkı: band kar dete ...*' ('if you could/could have closed the window ...') is retained. The full meaning of such counterfactual commands presupposes that H should have already undertaken a required action prior to the utterance, but so far he has not fulfilled the task. S therefore believes that H will deduce from the utterance that he is still under the obligation to accomplish the task and will possibly carry it out. The pragmatic constraints on this kind of imperative can be summarized in the following way:

(14) a. S believes that H was under the obligation to carry out an action X at a time $t_{n-1}$ (i.e. prior to the time of utterance $t_n$).

[6] Note, however, that only (b1) is deontic. (b2) is permission rather than a command and is essential for (b1)'s realization.

b. S either knows or believes that, by the time of utterance, H has not carried out X.
c. S knows or believes that H either knows or believes that S knows that H has not carried out X, i.e., $B_s$/$K_s$ $B_h$/$K_h$ $K_s$ P (where P stands for the proposition 'H has not yet carried out X').
d. S believes that from her/his utterance H will be able to deduce that s/he is still possibly required to carry out X at time $t_{n+1}$, $t_{n+2}$ or $t_{nn}$.
e. S believes that by uttering the imperative with an imperfective participle s/he can still persuade H to execute the task.

The imperative with a subjunctive verb form can also be used in conditional senses, though it does not entail the information regarding H's unfulfilled obligation, as is the case of the imperative with imperfective participle or contingent. In fact, in the commands with the subjunctive, S does not intend to inform the addressee that he has not accomplished action X. An imperative of this form follows:

(15) ~~आप~~ खिड़की तो बंद कर देते।

| (~~āp~~) | khiṛkī | to | band | kar |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| you.2PL.POL | window.SG.F | at least | closed | do.root |

dete
give.IPFV.M.PL
'If only you had closed the window, at least!'
['you haven't done that'; 'you were and still are obliged to do it'; possibly do it; at time $t_{n+1}$; in $w_1$]

This variant of command is dependent upon different types of shared knowledge between S and H, and the actual form expressed will have a different meaning for the person involved. For example, it may be expressed by S as irritation, disappointment, or a rebuke; though at the end of the dialogue S may have modified her/his initial mood towards her/his addressee by conceding something more desired by H.

(16) a. (कम से कम ~~तुम~~) चाय तो पी लेते।

| (~~kam-se-kam tum~~) | cāy | to | pī | lete |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| at least | you | tea | at least drink.root | take.IPFV.PL |

'If only you had drunk some tea at least!'
'If only you {would /were to} drink some tea!'
['you haven't carried out X yet'; 'it was required of you'; 'you are still obliged to do it'; 'I want you to do it at time $t_{n+1}$ in $w_1$]

b. (अच्छा होता ~~तुम~~) चाय पी लेते।

(~~acchā hotā tum~~) cāy pī
good be.IPFV.M.SG you.2PL.FAM tea drink.root
lete
take.IPFV.M.PL
'It would have been nice if you had drunk some tea!'
'If only you had drunk some tea!'
'If only you {would /were to} drink some tea.'
['you haven't accomplished X yet', 'it was required of you', 'I want you to do it'; possibly do it; at time $t_{n+1}$; in $w_1$]

Similar to the imperative with subjunctive form of the verb, the imperative with imperfective participle can also have a reading which can express S's desire for H's action.

## *7. Other verbal strategies*

### *7.1. Directive strategy: Referred agent's obligations*

As has been mentioned elsewhere (Sharma 2000: 185-202), in addition to the above mentioned canonical and non-canonical types of imperatives and other constructions employed by S to issue commands, Hindi also allows S to employ three other constructions to express obligations of the agent referred to (AGREF), namely, *CĀHIE* [cɑ:hɪe] constructions, *PARNĀ* [paṛnɑ:] constructions and *HONĀ* [honɑ:] constructions. At the surface-structure level the three constructions under discussion are syntactically parallels, inasmuch as all of them demand an agent NP in a dative construction signaled by the postposition *ko* and a VP which includes a verb in the infinitive plus one of the three verbal markers. However, differences can be found with respect to the verbal agreement as each construction shows with the object of the verb.

#### *7.2.1. CĀHIE constructions: S's advice to H*

Through this construction, S after assessing X's utility gives advice to H to accomplish the task X. Its preparatory conditions should be the following ones:

(17) a. S wants H to carry out X at time $t_n$).
b. To this end, S utters a sentence containing CĀHIE
c. S does so because s/he believes that for all s/he knows that AGREF 's doing X would be useful/ helpful/ beneficial/ advantageous or even necessary for AGREF or would be in the interest of either addressee, speaker or a TP, or

d. On the basis of all what S knows, s/he believes that AGREF 's carrying out X would be an appropriate deed based on the moral obligations required of AGREF.

*7.2.2. PARNĀ constructions: contra agent's desire*

Through this construction S, on the other hand, tells H to accomplish X even though s/he recognizes H's unwillingness to carry out the task. Its preparatory conditions can be summarized in the following manner:

(18) a. S desires that H carries out X at time $t_n$ ).
b. To this end, S utters a sentence involving PARNĀ.
c. There may or may not be an addressee, and the reference to AGREF may be either the addressee, a TP, or S itself.
d. S performs under one of the following conditions:
i S/he believes that AGREF will not willingly carry out X.
ii S/he believes that AGREF will have difficulties in or will feel uneasy about performing X.

*7.2.3. HONĀ constructions: neutral obligations*

Through the use of this modal verb, the speaker intends to remind AGREF about her/his intention (or a normal obligation he is under) to carry out action X:

(19) a. S desires H to carry out X at time $t_n$).
b. S does so under any of the following conditions:
i S is not quite sure whether AGREF still remembers his duty to carry out the action X or s/he is under the impression that AGREF may possibly have forgotten an action already planned by her/himself or required by some internal or external authority.
ii On the basis of all S knows, s/he believes that AGREF 's accomplishing X would be a correct act under moral or other kind of obligations on AGREF.

Examples in (20) illustrate the above mentioned constructions. In (20a), for example, S considers it beneficial for H to carry out X, in (20b) S recognizes H's unwillingness. (20c) carries neutral obligation in that it contains neither S's advice to H for accomplishing X nor S's recognition of H's unwillingness to carry out X.

(20) a. तुम्हें तीन केले खाने चाहिए।

| tumhẽ | tīn | kele | khāne | cāhie |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| you.DAT | three | banana.M.PL | eat.INF.M.PL | is advisable |

'You should eat three bananas.'

b. तुम्हें तीन केले खाने पड़ेंगे।

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| tumhẽ | tīn | kele | khāne |
| you.DAT | three | banana.M.PL | eat.INF.M.PL |

paṛẽge
fall.M.PL.FUT
'You will have to eat three bananas.'

c. तुम्हें तीन केले खाने हैं/ होंगे।

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| tumhẽ | tīn | kele | khāne |
| you.DAT | three | banana.M.PL | eat.INF.M.PL |

hɛ̃/hõge
be.PL.PRES/M.PL.FUT
'You got/are/supposed to eat three bananas.'

### *8. The LET-construction in Hindi*

In his detailed analysis of imperative and other directive strategies in English and Dutch, Van Olmen (2011: 23) establishes nine distinguishing criteria—the LET-criterion the first, which he considers fundamental for separating canonical imperatives from non-canonical ones. However, the Hindi construction which is equivalent to the English LET-construction seems to pose a problem for Van Olmen's generalization in that both the canonical and non-canonical Hindi imperative forms equally exhibit the equivalent of the English LET-construction. In Hindi, when S asks H to let her/him or a third party (i.e. TP) undertake X, say 'read', S does not issue a command asking H to carry out X, but on the contrary S asks H not to put obstacles to S's or a TP's in accomplishing it. One ought to notice here that the imperative mood is not on the verb 'read', but on the verb 'let'. In other words, S asks H to permit or allow (i.e. X) S or TP to carry out Y. The LET-construction is unique since through an imperative construction S asks H to carry out X whereas through an imperative form of let S asks H to allow her/him or a TP to carry out Y. In this kind of deontic modality, the imperative mood is placed on the Hindi verb *denā* [denɑ:] 'give' which collocates with preceding oblique case infinitives expressing the granting of permission, and containing pronouns or nouns in oblique case with a dative case marker *ko* (McGregor 1972: 146), preceded by an oblique infinitive which indicates the action the speaker or a TP (and not H,) wishes to perform. An imperative which is directed at H can be represented by an imperative sign placed before the content of the utterance, i.e. !X, whereas the imperative with let verb requires another element placed before the content of an imperative as in (21b):

(21) a !X (i.e. (You) carry out X)
i.e., (You) Read it.

b !LET/X/ (You) let S or a TP carry out X.
i.e., (You) let S or a TP read it.

As the example in (21b) demonstrates, the S's command in the let-construction is directed at the let verb rather than at the real action mentioned by X, 'read'. The let-construction in Hindi thus exhibits all types of imperatives discussed in the previous sections, both canonical and non-canonical. The following sections provide a detailed analysis of the Hindi let-construction.

*8.1. The Hindi LET-construction through an immediate imperative*

In this kind of imperative S tells H to obligatorily let a TP carry out the task mentioned by the verb without delay. Since the action mentioned by the verb in such an imperative is to be carried out either by S or a TP rather than by H, H's role in this imperative, therefore, is simply to allow or permit the accomplishment of X.

(22) उसे इसे पढ़ने दो।

| use | ise | paṛhne | do |
|---|---|---|---|
| s/he.DAT | it | read.INF.OBL | give.IMP.2PL |

'Let her/him read it, [right away]!'

*8.2. The Hindi LET-construction through a deferred imperative*

In this kind of imperative S tells H to obligatorily let a TP carry out the action mentioned by the verb at a future point in time. Both S and H share knowledge of or beliefs regarding the TP's intention of carrying out the action. S leaves it to H to fulfill the obligation by not obstructing TP, and in doing so, it implies that s/he is not going to check whether H will indeed fulfill the obligation.

(23) उसे इसे पढ़ने देना।

| use | ise | paṛhne | denā |
|---|---|---|---|
| s/he.DAT | it | read.INF.OBL | give.INF |

'Let her/him read it [as and when the moment occurs]!'

*8.3. The Hindi LET-construction through a subjunctive imperative*

By uttering this imperative sentence S invites H to possibly fulfill the obligation by not obstructing a TP in carrying out an action mentioned by the verb at a point in time subsequent to the utterance. As is common with all the cases of the imperative with a subjunctive verb form, this type also gives

H the choice or possibility not to fulfill the task. This means that H is free to obstruct TP in carrying out the task if H desires or has reason to.

(24) (~~आप~~) उसे इसे पढ़ने दें।

| (~~āp~~) | use | ise | paṛhne | dẽ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| you.2PL.POL | s/he.DAT | it | read.INF.OBL | give.SBJV.PL |

'If possible, please let her/him read it [right away]!'

*8.4. The Hindi LET-construction through an imperfective imperative*

In this circumstance, S simply reminds H of the unfulfilled obligation to let a TP take up a task at a time prior to the time of utterance. S believes that H should have allowed or let a TP carry out the task mentioned by the verb. The utterance of this imperative, therefore, should be treated as a reproach rather than an example of deontic modality. However, in some cases this utterance might mean that it is still possible for H to fulfill the obligation by allowing a TP to carry out the task. It is only in this last sense that the imperative becomes deontic.

(25) उसे इसे पढ़ने देते।

| use | ise | paṛhne | dete |
|---|---|---|---|
| s/he.DAT | it | read.INF.OBL | give.IPFV.M.PL |

'If only you would let her/him read it!'

*8.5. The Hindi LET US-constructions*

When S has to request H to perform a joint action, S makes use of the imperative which exhibits the subjunctive verb form. Such commands are issued as an invitation to H to join with or work together with S in accomplishing X. It is to be noted, however, that the Hindi verb *ānā* 'come' exhibits three imperative verb forms according to three forms of second person pronoun, whereas the Hindi verb *piinā* 'drink' is in the first person plural subjunctive form. Such forms are polite requests or proposals rather than orders.

(26) a. (~~तू~~) उसे इसे पढ़ने दो।

| (~~tū~~) | ā | cāy | piyẽ |
|---|---|---|---|
| you.SG.INTI | come.IMP.2SG | tea | drink.SBJV.PL |

'Come on, let us have some tea!'

b. (~~तुम~~) आओ, चाय पिएँ।

| (~~tum~~) | āo | cāy | piyẽ |
|---|---|---|---|
| you.PL.FAM | come.IMP.2PL | tea | drink.SBJV.PL |

'Come on, let us have some tea!'

c. (~~आप~~) आइए, चाय पिएँ।

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| (~~āp~~) | āie | cāy | piyẽ |
| you.2PL.POL | come.IMP.2PL.POL | tea | drink.SBJV.PL |

'Please come on, let us have some tea!'

### *9. Negative commands through imperatives – prohibitives*

In Hindi all the above mentioned imperative types are negated exactly in the same way as non-imperative sentences. However, the distribution of three negative markers (or negative particles) shows some constraints. Hindi is one of those languages which utilize different negative particles to express different types of modality (van der Auwera 2001). In fact, Hindi possesses three negative markers to express epistemic and deontic modalities: *nahiin* [nahĩː], *mat* [mat], and *na* [na]. Although exceptions to the rules are attested in the spoken variety of Hindi, the distribution of negative markers in the modern standard Hindi sentences is not an arbitrary one, but is governed both by the type of sentence they are employed in and by some pragmatic constraints. As discussed elsewhere (Sharma 2001), the distribution of negative markers can be summarized in the following way:

(27) Negative Modalities in Hindi

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. Modal necessity | | |
| a1. epistemic necessity | □¬ P | *nahiin* (necessarily not P) |
| a2. deontic necessity | □¬!X | *mat* (necessarily don't do !X) |
| b. Modal possibility | | |
| b1. epistemic possibility | ◊¬ P | *na* (possibly not P) |
| b2. deontic possibility | ◊¬!X | *na* (if it is possible, don't do !X) |

Since imperative utterances are concerned with deontic necessity and possibility, only two negative markers can be found in Hindi imperatives: *mat* and *na*.[7]

[7] Some languages do not possess negative markers to show the distinction between epistemic negation and deontic negation. In English, for example, both 'It is not good' showing the epistemic negation and 'Do not eat it!' showing the deontic negation have the same negative marker 'not'. It does not make any distinction even between negative necessity and negative possibility: both 'It is not necessarily good' (i.e. epistemic negative necessity) and 'It is possibly not good' (i.e. epistemic negative possibility) carry the negative marker 'not'. Likewise, both 'Necessarily don't eat it!' (i.e. deontic negative necessity) and 'Possibly don't eat it!' (i.e. deontic negative possibility) carry the same negative marker 'not'. Hindi shows differences in all the negation types. The role of Hindi negative markers in expressing modality, however, is supplementary and determined primarily by the modality of the main verb or the auxiliary.

*9.1. Immediate negative imperative (or prohibitive)*

By attaching a negative marker to a direct imperative S prohibits H from taking up a task that H is set to carry out. S thus imposes a command on H with regard to H's planned action.

(28) (तुम) इसे मत पढ़ो।

(~~tum~~) ise mat paṛho
you.2PL.FAM it don't read.IMP.2PL
'Don't read it!'

The example in (28) requires an immediate response by H. This involves forbidding action already in process or about to be commenced. They all presuppose that S has some knowledge or beliefs that H is already involved in an task which in future will be forbidden. They all stress the suspension of that action already begun or is about to begin, and they all presuppose that S believes or knows that H is already carrying out the action which is forbidden. It is also possible that H is about to undertake such action immediately following the order, and thus S feels it necessary to tell H not to carry it out.

*9.2. Deferred negative imperative*

To ask H not to carry out a task through indirect imperative is to forbid her/him to take it up at a future point in time. On the basis of existing knowledge and beliefs, S foresees that H will take up the task and wants to inform H that taking up the task would not be acceptable in S's opinion. Since in the indirect imperatives S will not be in a position to check H's fulfilling the command, it is up to H to decide whether to obey or ignore it.

(29) (तुम) इसे मत पढ़ना।

(~~tum~~) ise mat paṛhnā
you.2PL.FAM it don't read.INF
'Don't read it (as and when you happen to do)!'

There seems to be no difference in meaning between the three action types used in this kind of imperative as none of the actions presupposes its beginning at the time of utterance. The prohibition of H's activities is based on S's assessment of the likelihood of H's taking up the tasks habitually at a place and time different from that of the utterance. S may or may not know or believe that H has indeed been involved in carrying out the tasks regularly prior to the time of utterance.

*9.3. Negative command through subjunctive*

In issuing a negative command through an imperative with the subjunctive form of the verb, S does not oblige H to refrain from carrying out the action. S intends to communicate that it is up to H to take up the task or not, although S would prefer her/him to perform and complete it rather than ignoring it. The negative marker in this kind of imperative is *na*, rather than *mat*, as *na* carries a deontic possibility whereas *mat* expresses deontic necessity.

(30) a. (~~आप~~) नदी में न कूदें।

(~~āp~~) nadī mẽ na kūdẽ
you.2PL.POL river in not jump.SBJV.2PL.POL
'Would you please not jump into the river (now)!'

In (30), the pronominal form of reference is *āp* only and hence the deontic possibility only is expressed.

*9.4. Negative command through imperfective participle*

While issuing a command consisting of an imperative sentence with an imperfective participle, S implies that H has not, at the time of S's utterance, carried out or taken up the task. In issuing negative commands comprising the imperfective participle of the verb S implies that H has already carried out and concluded the task or is in the process of taking it up. Thus, this is a statement denoting a fact rather than a command carrying deontic modality. S is aware that there is nothing H can do about it. It is therefore a sort of complaint.

(31) (~~आप~~) इसे न पढ़ते।

(~~āp~~) ise na paṛhte
you.2PL.POL it not read.IPFV.M.PL
'If only you didn't read it (now), (will you/won't you?)!'
[Although I see that you are planning to.]

*9.5. Negative commands with 'let-a-TP-not-do-X'*

Whereas the negative markers in imperative sentences are directed at H's carrying out an action X and, therefore, both the negation and deontic modalities (deontic necessity and deontic possibility) have as their scope exclusively H's action; in the case of an imperative with a 'let-a-TP-do-X' construction, instead, they show different applications. The negative markers in a 'let-a-TP-do-X' imperative cover both the let verb (demanding

H's action or inaction) as well as the real action which is to be carried out by a TP. Likewise, although both the deontic necessity and the deontic possibility are directed at H (it is H on which deontic modalities are imposed), they seem to be related to TP as well (since it is the TP's action which will show if H has fulfilled his task according to the type of modality s/he was under). The negative marker in Hindi shows differences according to the kind of deontic modality it is to carry: *mat* ('don't') carries deontic necessity and *na* ('don't') in contrast carries deontic possibility.

### *10. Imperatives and verbal aspect*

It is generally believed that as compared to other sentence types imperatives are not rich enough in marking aspectual distinctions (Aikhenvald 2010: 125). In contrast to the widely held belief, however, the Hindi data show that all types of Hindi imperatives discussed in the previous sections (i.e. immediate, deferred, polite and reproachful, etc.) can morphologically mark almost all the types of verbs (simple, causative, conjunct and compound, etc.) with different verbal aspects. Without presenting a detailed analysis of the phenomenon, however, the following discussion of immediate imperative with different verbal aspect marker will suffice to substantiate our claim.

Hindi morphologically marks at least three verbal aspects in the verbal conjugation of an imperative sentence: the iterative habitual, the iterative continuous (or iterative progressive), and the perfective. (32a) is a case of an imperative without any aspect linked to the verb, whereas (32b, 32c and 32d) are examples of the imperative with aspectual element linked to the verb. While habitual and progressive aspects are evidenced in a word or grammatical item, as seen in (32b) and (32c) respectively, the perfective aspect is observed through a compound verb construction in an imperative mood, as in (32d). In the latter case S's command aims to make H bring the action to completion, reaching the final desired outcome X.

(32) a. (तुम) अख़बार पढ़ो।

(~~tum~~) akhbār paṛho
you.2PL.FAM newspaper read.IMP.2PL
'Read the newspaper [now]!'

b. (तुम) अख़बार पढ़ा करो।

(~~tum~~) akhbār paṛhā karo
you.2PL.FAM newspaper(s) read.PFV do.IMP.2PL
'Read newspapers every day [from now on]!'
'Make it a habit to read newspapers every day!'
[obligatorily and habitually do x] or

c. (तुम) अख़बार पढ़ते रहो।

(~~tum~~) akhbār paṛhte raho
you.2PL.FAM newspaper(s) read.IPFV.MPL stay.IMP.2PL
'Continue reading/to read the newspaper!'
'Continue reading/ to read newspapers!'

d. (~~तुम~~) इस अख़बार को पढ़ डालो।
(~~tum~~) is akhbār ko paṛh ḍālo
you.2PL.FAM this.OBL newspaper dat read.ROOT put.IMP.2PL
'Read this paper through [now]!'

### *11. Summary*

The discussions in previous sections demonstrate that S has a number of directive strategies to choose from to convey commands in Hindi. First and foremost, it is the canonical form of the Hindi imperative through which S issues a command carrying an immediate deontic necessity, viz. □!P *at time t*. Additionally, in view of H's engagement with some other action Y or just being aware of the fact that X is scheduled to take place after Y, S can also issue a command asking H to obligatorily carry out action X at a later point in time, viz. □!P *at time t+1*. This type of command is issued through the Hindi infinitive. Furthermore, S has at his/her disposal other types of sentences to ask H to possibly carry out action X at will, viz. ◊!P *at time t*. However, this type of polite command can be issued only to the agent referred to by the honorific pronominal form *tum* and *āp*, and using their respective subjunctive forms. This is one of the types of non-canonical imperatives in Hindi. Likewise, S can also have recourse to sentences in the imperfective to express his/her reproach, asking H to carry out action X. In other words, you should have carried out the action X — yet you have not — there is still time for you to accomplish it. Both forms of non-canonical imperative are generally of conditional types, but they may also be phrases dependent on a principle clause containing S's wish or desire. Besides, in its directive strategy reserve, Hindi has three more constructions to express an agent's obligations carrying S's different attitudes towards the action X.

### *References*


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

Birjulin, L. A. & Xrakovskij, V. S. 2001. Imperative sentences: theoretical problems. In *Typology of Imperative Constructions* [LINCOM Studies

in Theoretical Linguistics 09], Victor S. Xrakovskij, 3-50, Muenchen: Lincom Europa.
De Clerck, Bernard. 2006. The imperative in English: A corpus-based, pragmatic analysis. PhD dissertation, University of Ghent.
Guru, Kamta Prasad. 1919. *Hindi Vyakaran* (21st edition 2000). Varanasi: Nagri Pracharini Sabha.
Huntley, Martin. 1984. The semantics of English imperatives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 7: 103-133.
Jary, Mark & Kissine, Mikhail. 2014. *Imperatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kachru, Yamuna. 1980. *Aspects of Hindi Grammar*. New Delhi: Manohar Publications.
Kachru, Yamuna. 2006. *Hindi* [London Oriental and African Language Library]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Kellogg, S. H. 1875. *A Grammar of the Hindí Language* (3rd edition 1938, reprinted 1965). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Koul, O. N. 2008. *Modern Hindi Grammar*. Springfield: Dunwoody Press.
McGregor, Ronald S. 1972. *Outline of Hindi Grammar* (3rd revised and enlarged edition 1995). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Montaut, Annie. 2004. *A Grammar of Hindi* [LINCOM Studies in Indo-European Linguistics]. Munich: Lincom Europa.
Palmer, Ralph. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Searle, John & Vanderveken, Daniel. 1985. *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Searle, John. 1979. A taxonomy of illocutionary acts. In *Expression and Meaning*, John R. Searle (ed), 1-29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Shapiro, Michael C. 1989. *A Primer of Modern Standard Hindi*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
Shapiro, Michael C. 2003. Hindi. In *The Indo-Aryan Languages* [Routledge Language Family Series], George Cardona & Dhanesh Jain (eds), 250-285. London: Routledge.
Sharma, Aryendra. 1958. *A Basic Grammar of Modern Hindi* (4th edition 1983). New Delhi: Central Hindi Directorate, Ministry of Education and Culture.
Sharma, Ghanshyam. 2000. Pragmatic explanations for expressing obligations of the agent referred to in Hindi. In *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, Rajendra Singh (ed), 185-202. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
Sharma, Ghanshyam. 2001. The negative modality in Hindi. *Annali di Ca' Foscari, XL*: 131-149.
van der Auwera, Johan, Dobrushina, N. & Goussev, V. 2005. Imperative-hortative systems. In *The World Atlas of Language Structures*,

Haspelmath, Martin, Dryer, Matthew S., Gil, David & Comrie, Bernard (eds), 296-299. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van der Auwera, Johan. 2006. Imperatives. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistic*, Keith Brown (ed), 565-567. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

van der Auwera. Johan. 2001. Negating dynamic and deontic modality in Hindi-Urdu and Bangla. In *Linguistic Structure and Language Dynamics in South Asia*. [Papers from the proceedings of SALA XVIIII Roundtable] A. Abbi, R. S. Gupta & A. Kidwai (eds), 327-347. Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass.

Van Olmen, Daniël. 2011. The Imperative in English and Dutch: A Functional Analysis in Comparable and Parallel Corpora. PhD dissertation, University of Antwerp.