Proceedings of CLS 58 (2022), 139-153

Polarity, homogeneity, and authority

Julie Goncharov and Gurmeet Kaur
University of Göttingen

1 Introduction

This paper discusses Completive Compound Verbs (CCVs) in Hindi-Urdu (HU), which have been argued to have a distribution similar to Positive Polarity Items (PPIs).[1] In particular, CCVs have been shown to be unacceptable under negation in simple declarative sentences, such as in (1), where the completive compound complex *paRh lii* is used (e.g., Hook 1973; Singh 1998; Homer & Bhatt 2019).

(1) mira-ne kitaab (*nahiiN) paRh lii
Mira-ERG book.F.SG NEG read take.PFV.F.SG
'Mira did (not) read the book.'

However, the empirical picture is more complex than it has been previously assumed. We demonstrate that there are (at least) two important aspects in which the ban on negated CCVs is dissimilar from the polarity phenomena. First, CCVs are disallowed under negation in some speech acts (declaratives and immediate imperatives), but not in others (deferred imperative), as shown by the contrast between (1)/(2a) and (2b) (also see Hook 1973).

(2) a. ye kitaab (*mat) paRh l-o
this book NEG read take-IMM
'(Don't) read this book!'
b. ye kitaab (mat) paRh le-naa
this book NEG read take-DFR
'(Don't) read this book!'

Second, the ban on CCVs under negation can be lifted in declaratives and immediate imperatives in certain configurations, which only partly overlap with the configurations that affect the polarity phenomena. For instance, (1) improves with the presence of the quantifier *saare/saarii* 'all' in the object DP, but not with the presence of the quantifier *har* 'every' in the same position, as shown in (3a) and (3b). By contrast, the presence of either quantifier can affect polarity sensitive phenomena in the language.

[1]We would like to thank Muskaan, Neha Kulshreshtha, Parvinder Kaur, Usha Udaar and Yash Sinha for discussion of the Hindi-Urdu data. This research has been supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) grants: ZE 1040/13-1 to Julie Goncharov and ZE 1040/11-1 to Gurmeet Kaur.

(3) a. mira-ne saarii kitaabeiN nahiiN paRh liiN
Mira-ERG all.F.PL book.F.PL NEG read take.PFV.F.PL
'Mira didn't read all the books.'

b. * mira-ne har kitaab nahiiN paRh lii
Mira-ERG every book.F.SG NEG read take.PFV.F.SG
Intended: 'Mira didn't read every book.'

These observations have received little to no attention in the literature, despite the fact that they undermine not only the polarity-based account of CCVs (e.g., Homer & Bhatt 2019), but also competing accounts in terms of completion (e.g., Singh 1998), as we will show.

For the analysis, we focus on the first observation, that is, the interaction between negated CCVs and speech acts. We propose that CCVs have what we call a homogeneity requirement on the completion of an action expressed by the main verb. According to this requirement, either in all speaker's doxastic possibilities the action is completed within a contextually set time span or in all speaker's doxastic possibilities the action is not completed within that time span. We show that this requirement interacts with different speech acts in a different way which explains the grammaticality of negated CCVs in deferred imperatives, but not in declaratives or immediate imperatives. We put the investigation of the ameliorating contexts (our second cluster of observations) outside of the scope of this paper. Here, we use them primarily to argue against the existing accounts of CCVs in HU and to set the desiderata for any account of CCVs.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 2, we present the distribution of negated CCVs across declarative and imperative sentences. Section 3 provides our main proposal explaining this distribution. Section 4 presents ameliorating contexts for the occurrence of negated CCVs in declaratives and immediate imperatives. In Section 5, we argue that the two existing accounts of CCVs that we are aware of cannot accommodate the facts from HU presented in this paper. Section 6 offers some concluding remarks.

2 CCVs across speech acts

There are two ways to express the perfective in Hindi-Urdu (henceforth HU). The first way is by addition of perfective (PFV) morphology on a simple verb, see (4a). The second way is via a completive compound verb (CCV). CCVs are verbal structures that consist of the stem form of the main verb and an inflecting light verb such as *de* 'give', *le* 'take', *Daal* 'put', *maar* 'hit' (Hook 1973; Butt 1995; Singh 1998; Butt 2003; Homer & Bhatt 2019). An illustration is given in (4b).

(4) a. mira-ne kitaab paRhii
Mira-ERG book.F.SG read.PFV.F.SG
'Mira read the book.'

b. mira-ne kitaab paRh lii
Mira-ERG book.F.SG read take.PFV.F.SG
'Mira read the book.'

It is well-known in literature (Hook 1973; Butt 1995; Singh 1998; Homer & Bhatt 2019, among others) that negation of CCVs is disallowed in declaratives, as shown in (5a). The simple perfective, by contrast, can be negated; see (5b).

(5) a. * mira-ne kitaab nahiiN paRh lii
Mira-ERG book.F.SG NEG read take.PFV.F.SG
'Mira did not read the book.'

b. mira-ne kitaab nahiiN paRhii
Mira-ERG book.F.SG NEG read.PFV.F.SG
'Mira did not read the book.'

What is less discussed is that the above restriction also extends to (a subset of) imperatives in the language. HU makes a morphological distinction between imperatives that require the addressee to act immediately after the imperative is issued (immediate imperatives/IMM) and imperatives that require the addressee to act later (deferred imperatives/DFR) (Sharma 1999, Banerjee & Kaur 2022). See (6a) for an example of the IMM imperative and (6b) for an example of the DFR imperative.

(6) a. kitaab paRh-o
book read-IMM
'Read this book.'

b. kitaab paRh-naa
book read-DFR
'Read this book (later).'

Like in declaratives, CCVs cannot be negated in IMM imperatives, (7a). The DFR imperative, in contrast, shows no such restriction, (7b) (Hook 1973).

(7) a. ye kitaab (*mat) paRh l-o
this book NEG read take-IMM
'(Don't) read this book.'

b. ye kitaab (mat) paRh le-naa
this book NEG read take-DFR
'(Don't) read this book.'

The simple perfective does not obtain in imperatives, regardless of negation. This is an independent restriction in the language, which we do not discuss in this paper, but see Kaur & Goncharov (2022).

(8) a. kitaab paRh-(*aa)-o
book read-PFV-IMM
'Read the book!'

b. kitaab paRh-(*aa)-naa
book read-PFV-DFR
'Read the book!'

The above observations, as summarized in Table (1), lead to the following puzzle: why are CCVs disallowed under negation in declaratives and IMM imperatives but not in DFR imperatives?

	DECL	IMM	DFR
Negated CCV	N	N	Y
Negated PFV	Y	NA	NA

Table 1: Distribution of PFV under negation across speech acts

3 Accounting for CCVs across different speech acts

3.1 The meaning of PFV and CCVs in HU

In order to capture the polarity sensitivity of CCVs, we first need to understand the semantic contribution of CCVs. We begin with the established observation that sentences with PFV in HU have a weak meaning, which requires the event to be discontinued, but does not require the event to reach its natural end-point (e.g., Singh 1998; Arunachalam & Kothari 2011; Altshuler 2013). This is illustrated in (9).

(9) a. mira-ne kitaab paRhii #aur use ab-tak paRh rahii hai
Mira-ERG book read.PFV and it.ACC still read PROG be.PRS
lit: 'Mira read a book and is still reading it.'

b. mira-ne kitaab paRhii lekin khatam nahiiN kii
Mira-ERG book read.PFV but finish NEG do.PFV
'Mira read a book but did not finish it.'

For this reason, we assign the weak truth-conditions for a sentence with PFV that the event is discontinued at an arbitrary end-point, which we represent as the state FIN_{some}, see (10). In (10), $\Box^K$ is the declarative speech act operator (Meyer 2013; Krifka 2015), t_δ is a pronominal time set by tense (ignored here), I_c is some non-zero, non-infinite contextually set time interval (which is a parameter for $\Box^K$), and FIN_{some} is an abbreviation for the event in question being in a non-ongoing state with an arbitrary end-point (Ramchand & Svenonius 2014; Altshuler 2016).

(10) Truth-conditions for (9a):
$\Box^K$ [FIN_{some}(book-reading(m)) at t_δ] $\quad t_\delta \in I_c$

Throughout the presentation of our proposal, we assume event semantics and a system similar to Ramchand & Svenonius, in which verbs denote an event description and the aspect embeds this event description into a situation of a particular kind. For example, the truth-conditional meaning of PFV in HU will be as in (11), where FIN_{some} is a situation where the event is discontinued at some arbitrary point. The semantic meaning of a sentence with PFV, such as in (9a), will be roughly a set of situations where book-reading events whose agent is Mira are discontinued at an arbitrary end-point, see (12). However, as our main point concerns the interaction with the speech act rather than event semantics, for the rest of the paper, we will use abbreviations like in (10).

(11) PFV $\rightsquigarrow \lambda P \lambda s. \exists e[P(e) \wedge FIN_{some}(s, e)]$

(12) $\lambda s. \exists e[book - reading(e) \wedge Ag(e) = m \wedge FIN_{some}(s, e)]$

In addition to the truth-conditional meaning, PFV has a non-truth conditional component, which ensures that the speaker holds it possible that the event can reach its natural end-point, see (13). This non-truth-conditional component of PFV is formulated in (14) where FIN$_{all}$ = finish at a natural end-point state. The meaning of a sentence with PFV can be pragmatically strengthened either to mean that the event has reached its natural end-point, as in (13), via the inference in (14) or to mean that the event didn't reach its natural end-point, as in (9b), via a mechanism similar to *some but not all* strengthening.

(13) mira-ne kitaab paRhii aur puurii paRhii
Mira-ERG book read.PFV and full.F.SG read.PFV
'Mira read a book completely.'

(14) Non-truth-conditional contribution of PFV:
if $\Box^K$ [$\exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{some}$(book-reading(m)) at t], then $\Diamond^K$ [$\exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{all}$(book-reading(m)) at t]

The sentences with CCVs are different from sentences with simple PFV-verbs in that in the former, the inference that the event has reached its natural end-point (FIN$_{all}$) is obligatory, see (15).

(15) a. mira-ne kitaab paRh lii #aur use ab-tak paRh rahii
Mira-ERG book read take.PFV and it.ACC still read PROG
hai
be.PRS
lit: 'Mira read a book and is still reading it.'

b. mira-ne kitaab paRh lii #lekin khatam nahiiN kii
Mira-ERG book read take.PFV but finish NEG do.PFV
lit: 'Mira read a book but did not finish it.'

Thus, we propose that a CCV makes a non-truth-conditional contribution, which, in positive sentences, strengthens speaker's certainty about completion of the event. In particular, we propose that a CCV contributes what we call a homogeneity requirement on completion of the event, which we capture as an excluded middle inference here.[2] According to this requirement, a CCV is felicitous only if either in all of speaker's K-worlds the action is completed within I_c or in all her K-worlds the action is not completed within I_c, see (16).

(16) Non-truth-conditional contribution of CCV:
$\Box^K$ [$\exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{all}$(book-reading(m)) at t] $\vee$ $\Box^K$ [$\neg$ $\exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{all}$(book-reading(m)) at t]

[2]The interaction between polarity and homogeneity has interested linguists since at least Fodor's (1970) observation about definite plurals, whose recent accounts make a straightforward connection to the derivation of polarity sensitive items (e.g., Bar-Lev 2018). Our use of homogeneity is different from the technical point of view, but the same in spirit.

Taking stock, a sentence like in (15a) has the weak truth-conditions in (17a) where the speaker commits herself to the statement that the event has discontinued at some arbitrary end-point (FIN$_{some}$). PFV adds the requirement that the speaker holds it possible that the event will be completed, see (17b). Finally, the addition of a CCV strengthens the inference brought in by PFV to the inference that in all speaker's K-worlds the event has reached its natural end-point (FIN$_{all}$), see (17c).

(17) a. Truth-conditions for 15a:
$\Box^K$ [FIN$_{some}$(book-reading(m)) at t_δ] $t_\delta \in I_c$

b. Contribution of PFV:
$\Diamond^K$ [$\exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{all}$(book-reading(m)) at t]

c. Contribution of a CCV (strengthening):
$\Box^K$ [$\exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{all}$(book-reading(m)) at t]

3.2 Under negation

Let us now turn to what happens when negation is present, as in (18). As we show shortly, in negative sentences, the homogeneity requirement of CCVs in (16) cannot be satisfied.

(18) mira-ne kitaab (*nahiiN) paRh lii
Mira-ERG book.F.SG NEG read take.PFV
'Mira did (not) read the book.'

This is because there are only two ways to fulfil the requirement in (16) and both of them require the speaker to be omniscient about how the event in question develops throughout I_c. As we assume that the speaker is not omniscient, (16) is unsatisfiable and thus, CCVs are out in negative sentences. To make things concrete, let us look at the representation of (18) in (19). The truth-conditions in (19a) say that the event is not in the finish-at-some-arbitrary-point state. Given that the negated PFV expresses a non-ongoing event, see (20), (19a) is true only in case the event has not begun by t_δ.

(19) a. Truth-conditions for 18:
$\Box^K$ [$\neg$ FIN$_{some}$(book-reading(m)) at t_δ] $t_\delta \in I_c$

b. Non-truth-conditional contribution of PFV:
if $\Box^K$ [$\exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{some}$(book-reading(m)) at t], then $\Diamond^K$ [$\exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{all}$(book-reading(m)) at t] (vacuous)

c. Non-truth-conditional contribution of CCV:
$\Box^K$ [$\exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{all}$(book-reading(m)) at t] $\vee$ $\Box^K$ [$\neg$ $\exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{all}$(book-reading(m)) at t] (unsatisfiable)

(20) mira-ne kitaab nahiiN paRhii #aur use ab-tak paRh rahii hai
Mira-ERG book NEG read.PFV and it.ACC still read PROG be.PRS
'Mira did not read a book (#and is still reading it).'

To satisfy (19c), the speaker must be omniscient and either (i) know that the event will begin at some later time $t \in I_c$ and then reach its natural end-point within

I_c (satisfying the first disjunct), or (ii) know that the event remains non-started throughout I_c (satisfying the second disjunct). As we said above, we standardly assume that the speaker is not omniscient. Therefore, the condition in (19c) is unsatisfiable in negative sentences which leads to CCVs being unacceptable under sentential negation.

3.3 CCVs in imperatives

Let us recall that in imperatives the situation is more complex: IMM-imperatives pattern with declaratives in that CCVs cannot be negated there, (21a), whereas in DFR-imperatives, CCVs are fully acceptable under negation, (21b).

(21) a. ye kitaab (*mat) paRh l-o
this book NEG read take-IMM
'(Don't) read this book!'
b. ye kitaab (mat) paRh le-naa
this book NEG read take-DFR
'(Don't) read this book!'

To explain (21), we build on the idea that in contrast to declaratives, in imperatives the speaker has Authority, i.e., perfect knowledge about the necessity of ordered propositions, see (22) (Kaufmann 2012).

(22) When 'p!' is uttered, $\Box^K\Box^R p \leftrightarrow \Box^R p$ (where R is some prioritizing modality)

In a nutshell, our proposal for imperatives is that Authority ensures that non-started events remain non-started throughout I_c (which, in a sense, implements the second omniscient strategy above). In this case, the homogeneity requirement on CCVs is satisfied since if in all speaker's K-worlds it is necessary that the event is non-started, it is entailed that in all speaker's K-worlds the event is not completed.

The difference between IMM-imperatives, which do not allow CCVs under negation, and DFR-imperatives, which do, is in how long the Authority lasts. It has been noted that Authority in DFR-imperatives spans a longer period of time, whereas Authority in IMM-imperatives is limited to a short time interval overlapping with the utterance time. This difference is illustrated in (23).

(23) a. issii waqt baazaar jaa-o
this.foc time market go-IMM
'Go to the market right this moment!'
b. * issii waqt baazaar jaa-naa
this.foc time market go-DFR
Intended: 'Go to the market right this moment!'

In our system we can capture this difference by specifying Authority duration relative to I_c. In IMM-imperatives, Authority spans a time interval that is properly included in I_c, (24a), whereas in DFR-imperatives, Authority is longer than I_c, (24b).

(24) a. When 'p!-IMM' is uttered, $\Box^K [\, \forall t \in J \, : \, \Box^R p_t \,] \leftrightarrow \Box^R p \qquad J \subset I_c$
b. When 'p!-DFR' is uttered, $\Box^K [\, \forall t \in J \, : \, \Box^R p_t \,] \leftrightarrow \Box^R p \qquad I_c \subseteq J$

Let us look at the meaning of a negated imperative with a CCV, assuming for simplicity the modal view on imperatives (Kaufmann 2012).

(25) a. Truth-conditions for 21:
$\Box^R [\, \neg$ BEG(book-reading(you))]
b. Contribution of the Authority condition:
$\Box^K [\, \forall t \in J \, : \, \Box^R \neg$ BEG(book-reading(you)) at $t \,] \leftrightarrow \Box^R \neg$ BEG(book-reading(you))
c. Contribution of CCV:
$\Box^K$ [$\exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{all}$(book-reading(you)) at t] $\vee \Box^K$ [$\neg \exists t \in I_c$: FIN$_{all}$(book-reading(you)) at t]

Now, if $J \subset I_c$, as is the case with IMM-imperatives, there will still be speaker's K-worlds within I_c, in which it is uncertain whether your reading the book begins or not. Therefore, none of the disjuncts of (25c) can be satisfied. If, on the other hand, $I_c \subseteq J$, as is the case with DFR-imperatives, in all speaker's K-worlds within I_c, your reading of the book remains non-started (which entails that the event does not reach its natural end-point within I_c). Thus, the second disjunct of the homogeneity condition in (25c) is satisfied, which explains why negated CCVs are acceptable in DFR-imperatives.

In summary, we have proposed that a homogeneity requirement is at the heart of the ban on CCVs under negation. This homogeneity requirement interacts with speech act operators in declarative sentences and imperatives, which explains different distribution of CCVs in these environments.

4 Ameliorating contexts for negated CCVs

It has been noted in the literature that the ban on CCVs under negation can be lifted in declaratives in certain configurations (Homer & Bhatt 2019, Hook 1973). This section provides a more comprehensive list of ameliorating contexts for negated CCVs in HU by presenting three additional contexts that improve the occurrence of CCVs under negation in declaratives and immediate imperatives.[3]

Based on Hook (1973), Homer & Bhatt (2019) show that although CCVs are ungrammatical in the immediate scope of negation in simplex declaratives, they can occur under negation in at least three contexts. In particular, negated CCVs can occur in the antecedent of a counterfactual conditional, as shown in (26a), in subjunctive relative clauses, as shown in (26b), and in *jab tak* 'as long as'-clauses shown in (26c).

[3]The speakers we consulted agree that the following contexts improve the occurrence of negated CCVs in declaratives and immediate imperatives - however, there is inter-speaker variation in the degree of acceptability.

(26) a. agar maiN-ne ram-ko laDDuu **nahiiN khilaa diye**
if I-ERG Ram-DAT laddu.M.PL NEG feed give.PFV.M.PL
hote, to vo zarur behosh ho gayaa hotaa
be.HAB.M.PL then he definitely unconscious be go.PFV be.HAB.M.SG
'If I hadn't fed Ram laddus, he would have definitely lost consciousness.'

b. yahaaN aisaa koi bhii nahiiN [jis-ne Sita-ke liye ye kaam
here such some ever NEG REL-ERG Sita-GEN for this work
naa kar diyaa ho]
NEG do give.PFV.M.SG be.SBJV
'There is no one here who hasn't done this work for Sita.'

c. [jab tak mira-ne kitaab **nahiiN paRh lii**] [tab tak
when till Mira-ERG book NEG read take.PFV.F.SG then till
karan intezaar kartaa rahaa]
Karan wait do.HAB.M.SG stay.PFV.M.SG
'Karan kept waiting until Mira finished reading the book.'

We provide three additional contexts that significantly improve the occurrence of CCVs under negation both in declaratives and immediate imperatives. The first ameliorating context is provided by the quantifier 'all'. Consider the following example - when the internal argument is a quantified phrase containing 'all', it becomes possible to negate the CCV. This is shown for the declarative in (27a), and for the immediate imperative in (27b) - these examples are more natural with stress on 'all'.

(27) a. mira-ne saarii kitaabeiN nahiiN paRh liiN
Mira-ERG all.F.PL book.F.PL NEG read take.PFV.F.PL
'Mira did not read all the books.'

b. saarii kitaabeiN mat paRh l-o
all.F.PL book.F.PL NEG read take-IMM
'Don't read all the books.'

Crucially, the universal quantifier 'every' and numerals, even with stress placed on them, do not cause this amelioration. This is shown in (28) with declaratives. Immediate imperatives pattern alike.

(28) a. * mira-ne har kitaab nahiiN paRh lii
Mira-ERG every book.F.SG NEG read take.PFV.F.SG
Intended: 'Mira did not read every book.'

b. * mira-ne do kitaabeiN nahiiN paRh liiN
Mira-ERG two book.F.PL NEG read take.PFV.F.PL
Intended: 'Mira did not read the two books.'

The second ameliorating context for negated CCVs in declaratives and immediate imperatives is provided by *in*-adverbials, which are known to occur with telic but not atelic predicates.

(29) a. John built the house in a year.
b. #John loved Beth in a year.

CCVs in HU are telic predicates which allow in-adverbials, as shown in (30).

(30) mira-ne ye kitaab ek raat meiN/(#tak) paRh lii
Mira-ERG this book one night in/for read take.PFV.F.SG
'Mira read this book in a night.'

The *in*-adverbial has no bearing on the grammaticality of a positive CCV. However, consider the declarative and the immediate imperative in (31) - a phonologically stressed *in*-phrase adverbial significantly improves the presence of a CCV under negation in these sentences.

(31) a. mira-ne kitaab ek (hii) raat meiN nahiiN paRh lii
Mira-ERG book one FOC night in NEG read take.PFV.F.SG
'Mira did not read the book in a night.'
b. ek (hii) raat meiN kitaab mat paRh lo
one FOC night in book NEG read take.IMM
'Don't read the book within one night.'

The third ameliorating context comes from contrastively focused main verb. In HU, the occurrence of negation before the verb is its default position. This is illustrated in (32). However, negation can also occur between the verb and the auxiliary, in which case, a contrastive reading of the verb becomes easily available. This is shown in (33) from Homer & Bhatt (2020:3).

(32) ram-ne seb nahiiN khaayaa thaa
Ram-ERG apple NEG eat.PFV.M.SG be.PST.M.SG
'Ram had not eaten the apple.'

(33) ram-ne seb khaayaa nahiiN thaa (sirf suNghaa
Ram-ERG apple eat.PFV.M.SG NEG be.PST.M.SG only smell.PFV.M.SG
thaa)
be.PST.M.SG
'Ram hadn't eaten the apple (he merely smelled it).'

As seen already, placement of negation in its default position in a CCV leads to ungrammaticality in perfective declaratives and immediate imperatives. However, these structures are significantly improved when negation occurs between the main and the light verb. Consider the examples in (34) - the position of negation after the main verb causes this verb to be contrastively focused, and ameliorates the presence of the CCV under negation.

(34) a. mira-ne phuul toR nahiiN diyaa thaa (sirf
mira-ERG flower break NEG give.PFV.M.SG be.PST.M.SG only
suuNghaa thaa)
smell.PFV.M.SG be.PST.M.SG
'Mira did not pluck the flower, she only smelled it.'

b. phuul toR mat do (sirf suuNgho)
flower break NEG give.IMM only smell.IMM
'Don't pluck the flower, only smell it!'

We now have a more comprehensive list of contexts that ameliorate negated CCVs. These are: (i) antecedent of a counterfactual conditional, (ii) a subjunctive relative clause, (iii) a *jab tak*-clause, (iv) a quantified object DP containing 'all', (v) an *in*-adverbial, and (vi) contrastive focus on the main verb.

5 Existing accounts

On the empirical front, this paper has presented two findings: first, apart from positive declaratives, CCVs in HU are also licensed in negated DFR imperatives. Secondly, there are at least six contexts that improve the occurrence of CCVs under negation in declaratives and IMM imperatives. In view of these findings, this section evaluates two existing approaches to negated CCVs in HU. We demonstrate that both accounts lack empirical coverage - neither of them can explain the licensing of CCVs in negated DFR imperatives. Furthermore, under both approaches, only a subset of ameliorating contexts can be accounted for.

There are two approaches to explaining the ban on negated CCVs in declaratives in HU. These are (i) the PPI-based approach (Homer & Bhatt 2019), and (ii) the completion-based approach (Singh 1998). According to the PPI-based approach, CCVs (but not simple perfective verbs) are positive polarity items, akin to English *would rather*, which restricts them from occurring in the scope of negation.

(35) a. John would rather read the book.
b. * John wouldn't rather read the book.

According to the completion approach (Singh 1998), use of negation is pragmatically infelicitous with a CCV, which is a marker of completion. For illustration, let us revisit the example in (1), repeated here as (36). Singh claims that 'not read a book' expressed with a CCV, as in said example, can have either of the following two meanings: (i) the agent did not start reading the book, or (ii) she started reading the book but did not complete it. Since neither of the meanings suggest completion of the event, the CCV is blocked and the simple perfective suffices.

(36) mira-ne kitaab (*nahiiN) paRh lii
Mira-ERG book.F.SG NEG read take.PFV.F.SG
'Mira did (not) read the book.'

We evaluate these approaches against the empirical findings of the paper in the rest of this section:

CCVs across speech acts: Let us start with the distribution of CCVs across speech acts. Recall that CCVs are disallowed under negation in some speech acts (declaratives and immediate imperatives), but not in others (deferred imperative). The PPI-based approach does not make any prediction about the interaction between negated CCVs and the type of speech act they occur in. In particular, if CCVs are

regular PPIs, then their grammatical status under negation in deferred imperatives but not in immediate imperatives or declaratives, remains unexplained. Like the PPI-based approach, the completion based approach also fails to explain the grammatical occurrence of CCVs in deferred imperatives.

As for ameliorating contexts, each of the approaches can explain some of the contexts but not all.

Ameliorating contexts (i)-(iii): The PPI-based approach can account for the first three ameliorating contexts, listed as follows: (i) antecedent of a counterfactual conditional, (ii) a subjunctive relative clause, (iii) a *jab tak*-clause. In particular, the three contexts can be treated as *rescuing* environments, where rescuing is understood as the effect of making an otherwise ungrammatical occurrence of a PPI grammatical by placing it in the scope of a second Downward entailing expression. For example, the negation of *would rather*, which is typically ungrammatical, becomes grammatical in the antecedent of a conditional, and under the DE quantifier *few*, see (37).

(37) a. If you wouldn't rather be here, you are lying.
b. Very few people wouldn't rather sit somewhere else.

Thus, one might conclude that CCVs are regular PPIs with some caveats that have to do with their lexical category and possibly language-specific properties of HU. However, the old and new data we have presented in this paper raises important challenges for the PPI-based treatment of CCVs in HU. As stated already, the PPI-based approach does not make any prediction about the interaction between negated CCVs and the type of speech act they occur in. Furthermore, this approach cannot explain all ameliorating contexts.

Ameliorating context (iv): According to this context, a negated CCV can occur in the presence of a quantified object containing 'all' but not 'every'. Prima facie, the PPI-based account seems capable of explaining amelioration context (iv) as an instance of 'shielding', defined as follows: a PPI becomes acceptable in the scope of a clausemate negation if a universal item intervenes at logical form (Nicolae 2017, Kroch 1974). For instance, *some* can be licensed in the scope of a clausemate negation if a strong scalar term such as *always* intervenes (38).

(38) Mary doesn't always understand something. (neg $>$ always $>$ some)

Similarly, under the PPI-based approach to CCVs, their amelioration under negation in the presence of the universal quantifier 'all' can be treated as an instance of shielding. However, the PPI based approach cannot explain as to why this 'shielding' effect does not extend to other universal items such as 'every'.

Upon further development, the completion based approach may fare better for context (iv). Under the completion based account, the difference between 'all' and 'every' can be obtained by capitalizing on the collective versus distributive distinction in meaning between the two quantifiers - *har* 'every' and *saaraa* 'all' in HU behave differently when they occur in the subject position of an obligatorily collective predicate like 'gather'. In such cases, only collective *saaraa* is grammatical; *har* that has (predominantly) a distributive reading is not possible with 'gather'.

(39) a. saare laRke kamre meiN ikaTThaa ho gaye
all boys room in gather be go.PFV.PL
'All boys gathered in the room.'

b. * har laRkaa kamre meiN ikaTThaa ho gayaa
every boy room in gather be go.PFV.SG
lit: 'Every boy gathered in the room.'

Ameliorating context (v): Since the completion based account is based on the event semantics of the CCVs, it may be possible to develop the account to explain the amelioration of negated CCVs with *in*-adverbials, which apply to quantized (telic or event) predicates (context v). It is not clear how to apply the PPI-based approach to this context.
Ameliorating context (vi): An application of either of these approaches to explain ameliorating context (vi) with contrastive focus on the main verb, is unclear.

The above discussion clearly demonstrates that existing approaches to negated CCVs in HU have limited empirical coverage. A novel account to explain the old and new data discussed in this paper is therefore highly desired.

6 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we revisited the ban on negated CCVs by expanding the empirical domain to include imperatives - negated CCVs are grammatical in deferred imperatives but not in immediate imperatives and declaratives. We argued that a homogeneity requirement about the completion of an event is at the heart of this distribution. This homogeneity requirement has an epistemic component that spans a contextually set time interval. This component interacts with the speech act operator in declaratives and imperatives. Under negation, this interaction results in imposing an impossible requirement on the speaker's epistemic state in declaratives and immediate imperatives (requiring her to be omniscient about the development of the event). In deferred-imperatives, this omniscience requirement is fulfilled by Authority (speaker's perfect knowledge about the command) that spans longer than the contextually set interval for CCVs.

We also provided ameliorating contexts that improve the occurrence of negated CCVs in declaratives and immediate imperatives. These amelioration facts and the interaction of negated CCVs with speech acts demonstrates that existing accounts of CCVs under negation do not suffice, and a distinct analysis is needed. Our future work will focus on providing a unified account of all ameliorating contexts for negated CCVs, including deferred imperatives where negated CCVs occur freely.

References

Altshuler, D. 2013. There is no neutral aspect. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 23*, 40–62.

Altshuler, D. 2016. *Events, States and Times. An essay on narrative discourse in English*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
Arunachalam, S., & A. Kothari. 2011. An experimental study of Hindi and English perfective interpretation. *Journal of South Asian Linguistics* 4. 27–42.
Banerjee, N., & G. Kaur. 2022. Deferred imperatives across Indo-Aryan. In *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to South Asian Languages (F)ASAL-10*.
Bar-Lev, M. 2018. *Free choice, homogeneity, and innocent inclusion*. Hebrew University of Jerusalem dissertation.
Butt, M. 1995. *The structure of complex predicates in Urdu*. Center for the Study of Language (CSLI).
Butt, M. 2003. The light verb jungle. In *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics 9*, 1–49.
Fodor, J. 1970. *The linguistic description of opaque contexts*. Hebrew University of Jerusalem dissertation.
Homer, V., & R. Bhatt. 2019. Licensing of PPI indefinites: Movement or pseudoscope? *Natural Language Semantics* 27. 279–321.
Homer, V., & R. Bhatt. 2020. Restructuring and the scope of negation in Hindi-Urdu. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 5.
Hook, P. 1973. *The compound verb in Hindi*. University of Pennsylvania dissertation.
Kaufmann, M. 2012. *Interpreting Imperatives*. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy. Springer Netherlands.
Kaur, G., & J. Goncharov. 2022. Aspect in Hindi-Urdu and transition between syntactic domains. In *Proceedings of The 13th Generative Linguistics in the Old World in Asia conference*, 133–148.
Krifka, M. 2015. Bias in commitment space semantics: Declarative questions, negated questions, and question tags. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 25*, 328–345.
Kroch, A. S. 1974. *The semantics of scope in English*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
Meyer, M.-C. 2013. *Ignorance and Grammar*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
Nicolae, A. C. 2017. A new perspective on the shielding property of positive polarity. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 27*, 266–281.
Ramchand, G., & P. Svenonius. 2014. Deriving the functional hierarchy. *Language Sciences* 46. 152–174.
Sharma, G. 1999. A pragmatic survey of Hindi imperatives. *Annali di Ca' Foscari, Serie orientale* 38(3). 245–316.
Singh, M. 1998. On the semantics of the perfective aspect. *Natural Language Semantics* 6. 171–199.