<h1 style="text-align:center">'EVEN NOT': The appearance of –o on negation in Bangla</h1>

Ishani Guha, MIT

I. Introduction

The emphatic particle –o in Bangla is usually associated with the meanings of 'also' and 'even'. It can attach to nouns, verbs, adverbs, postpositions, predicative adjectives and operators like 'if' and 'negation'. This paper explores the occurrence of –o attaching on negation.

Main claim: I show that when negation is the associate of –o, the focus alternative of the clause is the affirmative counterpart of the clause. I also point out that there is a problem of split scope between –o and its associate negation in these cases. Both of these observations I believe extends to Hindi –bhii and relevant examples of English *even*.

II. Presuppositions of –o
IIa The Additive Presupposition of -o

Preliminary examination reveals that –o gives rise to an <u>obligatory</u> Additive Presupposition:

1. Robi boi-ṭa-o   poṛeche
   Robi book-cla-O read-pfv-pres.3
   'Robi read the book as well.'

1a. Assertion: Robi read the book.

1b. Add. P.: There is something other than the book that Robi read.

IIb. The Scalar Presuppostion of -o

Like Hindi –bhii (Lahiri 1998), –o gives rise to a Scalar Presupposition when its associate is focused.

2. Robi [boi-ṭa]$_F$-o poṛeche
   Robi BOOK-cla-Oread-pfv-pres.3
   'Robi read even the book.'

2a. Assertion: Robi read the book.

2b. Additive Presupposition: There is something other than the book that Robi read.

2c. Scalar Presupposition: The likelihood of Robi reading the book **is less** than the likelihood of Robi reading any/most of the contextual alternatives of 'the book'.

III. –o with clausemate Negation

With clausemate negation, the scalarity reverses from 'least' to 'most' likely (cf. English *even*):

3. Robi [Sɔhoj paṭh]$_F$-o poṛe-ni
   Robi Sahaj Path-cla-O read.3-neg
   'Robi did not even read [Sahaj Path]$_F$.'[1]

Accounts of this reversal fall mostly into two kinds of accounts: the movement theory of *even* (Karttunen and Peters, Wilkinson, a.o.) and the Lexical/NPI theory of *even* NPI (Rooth, Rullmann, Giannakidou a.o.). I will formulate my proposal following Karttunen and Peters 1979.

3a. Assertion: Robi did not read Sahaj Path.

3b. Add.P.: There is something other than Sahaj Path, that Robi did not read.

3c. ScalarP.: The likelihood of Robi not reading Sahaj Path is less than the likelihood of Robi not reading any/most of the contextual alternatives of 'Sahaj Path'.

IV. -o on Negation itself

There are at least two types of non-finite constructions in which –o can appear on pre-verbal negation[2]: the complement of 'may' and the concessive conditionals. Here I discuss the former.

---

[1] Sahaj Path 'Easy Lessons' is a Bengali primer.

'EVEN NOT': The appearance of –*o* on negation in Bangla
Ishani Guha, MIT

When the infinitival complement of the existential modal *par-* is negated, the preverbal negation obligatorily appears with –*o*. The modal obligatorily scopes over negation.

4. Robi   baṛi-te   **na-*(o)**   thak-te pare   [MAY > Neg]
   Robi   house-loc   neg-O   eat-inf may-pres.3
   'Robi may not be at home.'

4a. Assertion: Robi may not be at home

The alternative to the assertion in (4a) is the proposition obtained by replacing the alternative to negation, i.e., the proposition without negation. The set of alternatives C is of the form {that Robi may not be at home, that Robi may be at home}.

4b. Add.P.: Robi may be at home.

When *na* is focused we get a Scalar Presupposition on top of the Additive Presupposition.

4c. ScalarP.: The likelihood of *that Robi may <u>not</u> be at home* **is less** than the likelihood of *that Robi may be at home*.

Here, taking –*o* to be *even,* we see that -*o* scopes over *pare*, while negation scopes under *pare*.

4d. LF: [even C [may [[not]$_F$ [Robi be at home]]]]

Similar observations can be made about *na-o* in concessive conditionals. The *na-o* cases in these two constructions form examples where –*o* and its associate do not have similar scope w.r.t. another scope bearing element in the clause. This is a puzzle given the LF movement theory of *even* (Wilkinson1996).

V. The scope of negation with -*o*

The scope of the negation differs depending on whether –*o* appears on it or not. Simpson and Syed (2014) argued that the preverbal negation in Bangla, is generated below the base position of the subject. Ramchand (2014) argued against them using examples of subject NPI licensing. It seems in (5) *na-o* can take scope above the universally quantified subject but *na* in (6) cannot.

5. prottekei   mach na-**o**   khe-te   pare
   everybody fish   neg-O   eat-inf.   may-pres.3
   'Everybody may not eat fish.'

(both low and wide scope of universal w.r.t negation)   [∀>NEG, NEG>∀]

6. (?)prottekei mach-**o**   na khe-te   pare
   everybody   fish-emph   neg eat-inf.   can-pres.3
   'Everybody may not eat fish as well.'

(only wide scope of universal w.r.t. negation)   [∀>NEG, *NEG>∀]

Examples like (6) can be used to provide evidence for Simpson and Syed 2014. One can argue that the pre-verbal negation can have 'exceptional' widescope over the subject when it is an associate of –*o*, because –*o* independently has scope over (atleast) the infinitival complement clause. However, if negation raised with –*o*, it would be again a puzzle to explain the split scope cases discussed in (4).

Therefore, I seek to explore an analysis of *na-o* where the wide scope of *even* above the modal is brought about by a covert operator while –*o* remains where negation is.

---

[2] -o resists being the final element of a sentence. Since the post-verbal finite negation would occur in the final position of a construction, we never see –o on matrix negation. We are thus forced to examples like (4).