1 Different Negations

Most Indo-Aryan languages possess a variety of distinct morphemes that mark negation (cf. Masica (1991):389-394).

1.1 Simplex and Complex Negation

Consider the negative morphemes used by some Indo-Aryan languages:

Language	Simplex	Complex
Hindi	na	nahī:
Punjabi	nā	náī:
Gujarati	na	nahi/nathi$_V$
Marathi	na-	nāhī$_V$+Agr

In some Indo-Aryan languages, the Complex Negation is a negative auxiliary plausibly analyzed as Simplex Negation plus a form of the auxiliary *be* (e.g. Gujarati, Marathi).

Though the distribution of Simplex and Complex negation varies from language to language, the following description for Punjabi is illustrative.

(1) (from Bhatia (1993):117)

    a. **na** - subjunctive, imperative, conditional, neither...nor, and infinitival clauses.

    b. **náī:** - all other uses.

1.2 Prohibitives

Many Indo-Aryan languages have a form beginning in *m-* that is restricted to negative imperatives:

(2) a. Hindi

      use   rok-o   **mat/mat** rok-o
      s/he.Acc stop-Sbjv.2Pl Neg/Neg stop-Sbjv.2Pl

      'Don't stop him/her.'

    b. Gujarati (from Cardona (1965):139)

      jāo mā
      go-? Neg

      'Don't go.'

    c. Kashmiri (from Wali and Koul (1997):114)

      akhba:r   mI par
      newspaper Neg read

      'Don't read the newspaper.'

Other negative forms may also appear in negative imperatives:

(3) vahā: **naa/?nahī:** jaa-iye
     there Neg1/Neg2 go-Sbjv.Hon

     'Please don't go there.'

1.3 Constituent Negation

Constituent Negation is marked by putting the negative marker immediately after the relevant constituent.

(4) (Marathi, from Pandharipande (1997):185)

    a. Sentential Negation:

      te   kāl   bādzārāt gele   **nāhīt**
      they yesterday market-loc go-Pst.3MPl Neg-Pl

      'They did not go the market yesterday.'

    b. Constituent Negation of Subject:

      te   **nāhī/na/*nāhīt**   kāl   bādzārāt gele
      they Neg/*Neg1/*Neg-Pl yesterday market-loc go-Pst.3MPl

      'They did not go to the market yesterday (somebody else did).'

    c. Constituent Negation of Temporal Adverb:

      te   kāl   **nāhī/na/*nāhīt**   bādzārāt gele
      they yesterday Neg/*Neg1/*Neg-Pl market-loc go-Pst.3MPl

'They did not go to the market yesterday (they went some other day).'

d. Constituent Negation of Locative Adverb:

te kāl bādzārāt **nāhī**/**na**/*****nāhīt** gele
they yesterday market-loc Neg/*Neg1/*Neg-Pl go-Pst.3MPl

'They did not go to the market yesterday (they went somewhere else).'

A similar situation obtains in Hindi, except that *nahī:* does not inflect even when used as sentential negation.

(5) a. Sentential Negation:

Ram bazaar **nahī:**/??*****naa** gayaa thaa
Ram.m market Neg/Neg1 go-Pfv.MSg be.Pst.MSg

'Ram hadn't gone to the market.'

b. Constituent Negation 1:

Ram **nahī:**/??*****naa** bazaar gayaa thaa
Ram.m Neg/Neg1 market go-Pfv.MSg be.Pst.MSg

'It wasn't Ram who had gone to the market.'

c. Constituent Negation 2:

Ram **nahī:**/??*****naa** Shiraz bazaar gayaa thaa
Ram.m Neg/Neg1 Shiraz.m market go-Pfv.MSg be.Pst.MSg

'It wasn't Ram who had gone to the market, it was Shiraz.'

1.4 'Little' as Negation

Although not described as such in the descriptive literature, the adjective *thoṛaa* 'little' can also contribute a negative meaning when used adverbially.

(6) adjectival usage: agrees with the NP

a. Billu-ne [**thoṛaa**-hii khaanaa] khaa-yaa
Billu-Erg little.MSg-only food.M eat-Pfv.MSg

'Billu ate only a little food.'

b. Billu-ne [**thoṛii**-hii sharaab] pi-i
Billu-Erg little.FSg-only wine.f drink-Pfv.MSg

'Billu drank only a little wine.'

c. Billu-ne [**thoṛe**-hii paper] likh-e
Billu-Erg little.MPl-only paper.MPl write-Pfv.MPl

'Billu wrote only a few papers.'

(*thoṛaa* 'little' can be replaced by the uninflecting adjective *kam* 'little' without affecting the meaning.)

In contrast, in the adverbial usage *thoṛaa* 'little' does not agree - it always appears in the feminine form as *thoṛii*.

(7) a. Billu-ne khaanaa **thoṛii** khaa-yaa thaa
Billu-Erg food.M little eat-Pfv.MSg be.Pst.MSg

'Billu didn't eat food.'

b. Billu-ne sharaab **thoṛii** pi-i thii
Billu-Erg wine.f little drink-Pfv.FSg be.pst.F

'Billu hadn't drunk wine.'

c. Billu-ne paper **thoṛii** likh-e the
Billu-Erg paper.MPl little write-Pfv.MPl be.Pst.MPl

'Billu hadn't written papers.'

(*thoṛaa* 'little' **cannot** be replaced by the uninflecting adjective *kam* 'little'.)

(8) Constituent Negation of Subject:

Billu-ne **thoṛii** khaanaa khaa-yaa thaa
Billu-Erg little food.M eat-Pfv.mSg be.Pst.MSg

'It wasn't Billu who ate the food.'

• A constituent negation of the object reading is also available in (7).

(9) a. Ram kitaab phaaṛ-taa **thoṛii**
Ram.M book tear-Hab.MSg little

'Ram wouldn't have torn the book.' (maybe he would have done something else)

b. Ram kitaab phaaṛ-taa **thoṛii** hai
Ram.M book tear-Hab.MSg little be.Prs.Sg

'Ram doesn't tear books.'

1.5 Other Negative Elements

binaa/bagEr 'without'

(10) Ambipositions:

a. Ram [**binaa/bagEr** mujhe bataa-ye] Goa chal-aa gayaa
Ram.m without/without me.Dat tell-Pfv.Obl Goa go-Pfv.MSg GO.Pfv.MSg

'Ram went to Goa without telling me.'

b. Ram [mujhe bataa-ye **binaa/bagEr**] Goa chal-aa gayaa
Ram.m me.Dat tell-Pfv.Obl without/without Goa go-Pfv.MSg GO.Pfv.MSg

'Ram went to Goa without telling me.'

(11) a. Ram   [Sita-ke   **binaa/?bagEr**]   Goa chal-aa   gayaa
Ram.m Sita.Gen.Obl without/without Goa go-Pfv.MSg GO.Pfv.MSg
'Ram went to Goa without Sita.'

   b. ???Ram [**binaa/?bagEr**   Sita-ke] Goa chal-aa   gayaa
Ram.m without/without Sita.Obl Goa go-Pfv.MSg GO.Pfv.MSg
'Ram went to Goa without Sita.'

1.6   A Systematic Gap

No Indo-Aryan language has negative quantifiers -
no no, nothing, nobody, never, nowhere

The functional equivalent is achieved through a sentential negation and an associated NPI.

(12) a. no NP = 'any' NP + sentential negation
   b. nowhere = 'any place' + sentential negation
   c. never = 'any time' + sentential negation

2   Syntactic Location of Negation

With a few exceptions, sentential negation appears adjacent to the verb or its associated auxiliaries.

The domain of variation:

• whether negation immediately precedes or follows the main verb or the auxiliary.
• whether negation is an adverb, a head, or part of a negated auxiliary.

Three Case Studies:

• Kashmiri: negation is a suffix on the verb, except in correlatives when it may appear discontinuous from the verb.

• Bengali: negation follows the verb, except in correlatives where it precedes. However, negation preceded the verb in Old Bengali.

• Hindi: negation can precede or follow the participial verb, but must be adjacent to it modulo N+V compounds.

2.1   Kashmiri

Background: Kashmiri is a V2 language that like Yiddish and Icelandic has V2 in embedded clauses also.

Negation in Kashmiri appears as a suffix on the finite verb.

(13) (Kashmiri, from Wali and Koul (1997))
   a. me   chu-**nI** ba:sa:n ki   su yiyi   az.
I-dat is-not believe that he come-fut today
'I don't believe that he will come today.'

   b. me   chu ba:sa:n ki   su yiyi-**nI**   az.
I-dat is   believe that he come-fut-Neg today
'I believe that he won't come today.'

Bhatt (1999)'s analysis of V2 in Kashmiri:

(14) ...[$_{CP}$ ki   [$_{MP}$ Ramesh$_i$ [$_{M'}$ os$_j$ [$_{TP}$t$_i$ [$_{VP}$t$_i$ phal khEwaan] t$_j$]]]]
that   Ramesh   be.Pst.3MSg   fruit eat-Impfv
'..that Ramesh was eating fruit.'

CP and MP are head-initial. TP and VP are head-final.

2.1.1   The Distribution of Negation in V2 Environments

Neg forms a syntactic unit with the finite verb in matrix clause and together with the finite verb occupies the second position of the MP.

(15) a. samir **chu nI** tsuuNth khEwaan
Samir is   not apple   eat-Impfv
'Samir does not eats/is not eating the apple.'

   b.   *samir **nI   chu** tsuuth khEwaan
Samir not is   apple eat-Impfv

   c. *samir **chu** tsuuth khEwaan **nI**
Samir is   apple eat-Impfv not

No syntactic material can occur in between the finite verb and Negation in verb second constructions.

(16) a. samir **chu nI** dohay   tsuuNth' khEwaan
Samir is   not everyday apple   eat-Impfv
'Samir does not eat apples everyday.'

5

6

b. dohay   **chu nI**   samir tsuuNth' khEwaan
everyday is   Neg Samir apple   eat-Impfv

'Samir does not eat apples everyday.'

c. *samir **chu** dohay   **nI**   tsuuth' khEwaan
Samir   is   everyday not apple   eat-Impfv

2.1.2   The structural location of Negation

• Q-morpheme vs. Negation

Y/N Questions are indicated by a question morpheme that appears on the finite verb.

(17) a. samir **chaa** dohay tsuuth' khEwaan
samir is-Q always apple   eat-Impfv

'Does Samir eat apples everyday?'

b. dohay **chaa** samir tsuuth' khEwaan
always is-Q Samir apple   eat-Impfv

'Does Samir eat apples everyday?'

c. *****chaa** samir dohay tsuuth' khEwaan
is-Q   Samir always apple   eat-Impfv

'Does Samir eat apples everyday?'

Q-morpheme follows Negation.

(18) a. samir **chu-naa** dohay tsuuNth' khEwaan
samir is-Neg-Q always apple   eat-Impfv

'Doesn't Samir eat apples everyday?'

b. dohay **chu-naa** samir tsuuNth' khEwaan
always is-Neg-Q Samir apple   eat-Impfv

'Doesn't Samir eat apples everyday?'

c. *samir **chu** dohay **naa**   tsuuNth' khEwaan
Samir   is   always Neg-Q apple   eat-Impfv

Assumption: Q morpheme resides in the Mood head.

• Tense/Agreement vs. Negation
Tense and Agreement markers appear before Negation.

(19) (pg. 113 from Wali and Koul (1997))

a. bI **chu-s-nI**   azkal   garI gatsha:n
I   be-1sgps-Neg nowadays home going

'I don't go home nowadays.'

b. su **pari-nI**   kita:b
he read-Fut-Neg book

'He will not read the book.'

• Q > Neg > T

(20) ...$[_{CP}$ C^0 $[_{MP}$...M^0 $[_{NegP}[_{TP}[_{VP}$....V$^0]$ T$^0]$ Neg$^0]]]$

In finite matrix clauses and finite embedded complement clauses, there is obligatory V-to-T-to-Neg-to-M movement.

2.1.3   Non-V2 Environments in Kashmiri

No V2 effects in correlative clauses and conditionals (cf. Bhatt (1999), pgs. 121-126).

(21) Conditionals

a. [agar samir-an ravi-as   yi   kitaab ditsmIts **aasihe**] [tEli....]
if   Samir-erg Ravi-dat. this book given   be.Pst.f then....

'If Samir had given this book to Ravi, then...'

b. [agar samir-an ravi-as   yi   kitaab **aasihe** ditsmIts][tEli....]
if   Samir-erg Ravi-dat. this book be.Pst.f given   then....

'If Samir had given this book to Ravi, then...'

c. [agar samir-an ravi-as   **aasihe** yi kitaab ditsmIts][tEli....]
if   Samir-erg Ravi-dat. be.Pst.f this book given   then....

'If Samir had given this book to Ravi, then...'

d. [agar samir-an **aasihe** ravi-as   yi   kitaab ditsmIts][tEli....]
if   Samir-erg be.Pst.f Ravi-dat. this book given   then....

'If Samir had given this book to Ravi, then...'

e. ?? [agar **aasihe**   samir-an ravi-as yi   kitaab ditsmIts [tEli....]
if be.Pst.f Samir-erg Ravi-dat. this   book given then....

'If Samir had given this book to Ravi, then...'

f. ???[**aasihe** agar samir-an ravi-as   yi kitaab ditsmI ts   ][tEli....]
be.Pst.f   if   Samir-erg Ravi-dat. this book given then....

'If Samir had given this book to Ravi, then...'

(22) Correlatives

    a. [yosI kitaab samir-an ravi-as **dits**][so kitaab......]
       which book   Samir-erg Ravi-dat. gave that book.....

       'The book Samir gave to Ravi....'

    b. [yosI kitaab samir-an **dits** ravi-as]][so kitaab......]
       which book   Samir-erg gave Ravi-dat. that book.....

       'The book Samir gave to Ravi....'

    c. ???/*[yosI kitaab **dits** samir-an ravi-as]][so kitaab......]
       which   book gave Samir-erg Ravi-dat. that book.....

       'The book Samir gave to Ravi....'

● This is also the case in Germanic (cf. Vikner (1995)).

2.2   Negation in Conditionals

Negation can appear discontinuous from the finite verb in non-V2 environments (cf. pgs. 113-114 in Wali and Koul (1997)).

(23) agar **nI** tsI samir-as yi kath **vanakh**, tEli gatshi nI su tor
    if   Neg you Samir-dat. this story tell,   then go-Fut Neg. he there

    'If you don't tell this story to Samir, then he won't go there.'

(24) tsI **nay**   samir-as yi kath **vanakh**, tEli gatshi nI su tor
    you Neg-cond Samir-dat. this story tell,   then go-Fut Neg. he there

    'If you don't tell this story to Samir, then he won't go there.'

The finite verb in a conditional does not have to be clause-final (cf. 25c). Further the negation **can** be post-verbal (cf. 25b, c).

(25) (from Bhatt and Munshi (2002))

    a. agar **nI** tsI gomut **aasahakh**, tEli....
       if   Neg you gone are   then.....

       'If you had not gone , then....'

    b. agar tsI gomut **aasahakh nI**, tEli....
       if   you gone are   Neg then

       'If you had not gone , then....'

    c. agar tsI **aasahakh nI**   gomut, tEli....
       if   you are   Neg gone   then

       'If you had not gone , then....'

    d. *agar tsI **nI**   **aasahakh** gomut, tEli....
       if   you Neg are   gone   then

       'If you had not gone , then....'

If not immediately following the finite verb, Negation must be in the CP domain immediately following *agar* 'if':

(26) a. agar **nI** samir-an ravi-as yi kitaab ditsmIts **aasihe**, tEli....
       if   Neg Samir-erg Ravi-dat. this book given is   then....

       'If Samir had not given this book to Ravi, then...'

    b. *agar samir-an **nI** ravi-as yi kitaab ditsmIts **aasihe**, tEli....
       if   Samir-erg Neg Ravi-dat. this book given is   then....

    c. *agar samir-an ravi-as **nI** yi kitaab ditsmIts **aasihe**, tEli....
       if   Samir-erg Ravi-dat. Neg this book given is   then....

    d. *agar samir-an ravi-as yi kitaab nI ditsmIts **aasihe**, tEli....
       if   Samir-erg Ravi-dat. this book Neg given is   then....

    e. *agar samir-an ravi-as yi kitaab ditsmIts **nI** **aasihe**, tEli....
       if   Samir-erg Ravi-dat. this book given Neg is   then....

When the negation is postverbal, it forms a unit with the verb. It moves around with the verb and syntactic material cannot intervene between the verb and the postverbal negation.

(27) a. agar samir-an ravi-as yi kitaab ditsmIts **aasihe nI**, tEli....
       if   Samir-erg Ravi-dat this book given is   Neg then

       'If Samir had not given this book to Ravi, then...'

    b. agar samir-an ravi-as yi kitaab **aasihe nI**   ditsmIts, tEli....
       if   Samir-erg Ravi-dat this book is   Neg given   then

       'If Samir had not given this book to Ravi, then...'

    c. agar samir-an ravi-as **aasihe nI** yi kitaab ditsmIts, tEli....
       if   Samir-erg Ravi-dat is   Neg this book given   then

       'If Samir had not given this book to Ravi, then...'

    d. agar samir-an **aasihe nI** ravi-as yi kitaab ditsmIts, tEli....
       if   Samir-erg is   Neg Ravi-dat this book given   then

       'If Samir had not given this book to Ravi, then...'

2.2.1 Negation in Correlatives

Correlatives behave substantially the same as conditionals with respect to V2 and Negation.

(28) No V2

   a. [[yosI kitaab] samir-an ravi-as **dits**] [so kitaab......]
      which book Samir-erg Ravi-dat. gave that book.....

      'The book that Samir gave to Ravi, that book...'

   b. [yosI kitaab samir-an **dits** ravi-as] [so kitaab......]
      which book Samir-erg gave Ravi-dat. that book.....

      'The book that Samir gave to Ravi, that book...'

   c. ???/*[yosI kitaab **dits** samir-an ravi-as] [so kitaab......]
      which book gave Samir-erg Ravi-dat. that book.....

      'The book that Samir gave to Ravi, that book...'

The most unmarked order is where Neg appears in the C position. However, it can also form a unit with the finite verb.

(29) a. [[yosI kitaab] **nI** samir-an ravi-as **dits**] [so kitaab......]
      which book Neg Samir-erg Ravi-dat. gave that book.....

      'The book that Samir did not give to Ravi, that book...'

   b. [[yosI kitaab] samir-an ravi-as **dits nI**] [so kitaab......]
      which book Samir-erg Ravi-dat. gave Neg that book.....

      'The book that Samir did not give to Ravi, that book...'

Negation can also appear 'sandwiched' inside the Relative Phrase (cf. 30c).

(30) a. Postverbal Negation:

      [[yosI kitaab] samir-an **pAr nI**], so kitaab....
      which book Samir read Neg that book....

      'The book that Samir didn't read, that book.....'

   b. Preverbal, Post-Rel-XP Negation:

      [[yosI kitaab] **nI** samir-an **pAr**], so kitaab....
      which book Neg Samir read that book....

      'The book that Samir didn't read, that book.....'

   c. 'Sandwiched' Negation:

      [yosI **nI** kitaab samir-an **pAr**], so kitaab....
      which Neg book Samir read that book....

      'The book that Samir didn't read, that book.....'

2.2.2 An Analysis

• In V2 environments, there is obligatory V to T to Neg to M movement. As a result, negation is always a suffix on the finite verb.

•What makes an environment non-V2?
Not clear. Let us assume that there is a feature in M that blocks movement of V to M in these environments (= relative clauses, conditionals).

1. Neg-to-(M-to)-C movement takes place, V-to-T movement takes place. Neg and the finite verb do not form a unit.

(31) $[_{CP}$ [yosI kitaab]$_i$ **nI**$_j$ $[_{NegP}[_{TP}$ samir-an ravi-as t$_i$ **dits**] t$_j$]]
      which book Neg Samir-erg Ravi-dat. gave

      'The book that Samir did not give to Ravi,...'

2. Neg-to-(M-to)-C movement does not take place. V-to-T-to-Neg movement takes place. Neg and the finite verb form a unit.

(32) $[_{CP}$ [yosI kitaab]$_i$ $[_{NegP}[_{TP}$ samir-an ravi-as t$_i$ t$_j$] **dits**$_j$+**nI**]]...
      which book Samir-erg Ravi-dat. gave+Neg...

      'The book that Samir did not give to Ravi,..'

V-to-T-to-Neg movement blocks further movement of Neg-to-M-to-C because in non-V2 environments, the finite verb cannot move to M.

• Neg-to-(M-to)-C Movement is clause bounded:

(33) a. Embedded Negation:

      [[yosI kitaab]$_i$ ram-an sita-i **won** [zi ravi-as **che** **nI** t$_i$ pasand]]
      which book Ram-Erg Sita-Acc said that Ravi-Dat be.FSg Neg pleasing

      'The book that Ram told Sita that Ravi does not like...'

   b. Matrix Negation 1 (Postverbal):

      [[yosI kitaab]$_i$ ram-an sita-i **won nI** [zi ravi-as **che** t$_i$ pasand]]
      which book Ram-Erg Sita-Acc said Neg that Ravi-Dat be.FSg pleasing

      'The book that Ram didn't tell Sita that Ravi likes...'

   c. Matrix Negation 2 (Preverbal):

      [[yosI kitaab]$_i$ **nI** ram-an sita-i **won** [zi ravi-as **che** t$_i$ pasand]]
      which book Neg Ram-Erg Sita-Acc said that Ravi-Dat be.FSg pleasing

      'The book that Ram didn't tell Sita that Ravi likes...'

• Negation 'sandwiched' inside a relative phrase that originates in an embedded clause negates the clause where it appears and not the embedded clause where the relative phrase appears.

(34) [yosI **nI** kitaab ram-an sita-i **won** [zi ravi-as **che** t_i pasand]]
which Neg book Ram-Erg Sita-Acc said that Ravi-Dat be.FSg pleasing

'The book that Ram didn't tell Sita that Ravi likes...'

Not Available: 'The book that Ram told Sita that Ravi does not like...'

2.3 Bengali

Negation in Bengali follows the finite verb (cf. Singh (1976), Wen (1979), van der Wurff (1989), del Prado and Gair (1994), van der Auwera (2001) a.o.).

(35) (from del Prado and Gair (1994))

a. Se bhat khae na
he rice eat-3 Neg

'He does not eat rice.'

b. *Se bhat na khae
he rice Neg eat-3

(*khae* = simple present of 'eat')

Existential and copular sentences are negated through negative auxiliaries.

(36) Copular Sentences (from del Prado and Gair (1994))

a. sOhore gOrom (hOe)
city-Loc hot (is)

'It is hot in the city.'

b. sOhore gOrom **nOe**
city-Loc hot Neg-is

'It is not hot in the city.'

(37) Existential Sentences (from del Prado and Gair (1994))

a. bagane gach ache
garden-Loc plant is

'There are trees in the garden.'

b. bagane gach nei
garden-Loc plant Neg-is

'There are no trees in the garden.'

Negation must also be postverbal in embedded clauses.

(38) (from del Prado and Gair (1994))

a. V Neg
ami Sunechi [je Ram aste parbe **na**]
I heard that Ram to-come will-be-able Neg

'I heard that Ram will not be able to come.'

b. V Neg
*ami Sunechi [je Ram aste **na** parbe]
I heard that Ram to-come Neg will-be-able

2.3.1 The Domain of Preverbal Negation

• Infinitival Clauses

(39) Infinitival Complement (from del Prado and Gair (1994))

a. Neg V:
pro kar SONge dEkha **na** korte cay?
who-Gen with meeting Neg do-Inf want

'Who would you rather not meet?'

b. *V Neg:
pro kar SONge dEkha korte **na** cay?
who-Gen with meeting do-Inf Neg want

(40) Infinitival Subject (from del Prado and Gair (1994))

a. Neg V:
[Bangla na Sekha] OSombhob hObe
Bengali not learn-Ger problem be.Fut.3P

'Not learning Bengali will be a problem.'

b. *V Neg:
*[Bangla Sekha na] OSombhob hObe
Bengali learn-Ger not problem be.Fut.3P

- Conditionals

(41) Participial Conditional clause: (from del Prado and Gair (1994))

    a. Neg V

      [tumi Sekhane **na** gele], [ami jabo na]
      you there Neg go-if I will-go Neg

      'If you do not go there, I will not go.'

    b. *Neg V

      *[tumi Sekhane gele **na**], [ami jabo na]
      you there go-if Neg I will-go Neg

(42) Correlative Conditional clause: (from del Prado and Gair (1994))

    a. Neg V

      [tumi jodi Sekhane **na** jao], [(ta-hole) ami jabo na]
      you if there Neg go then I will-go Neg

      'If you do not go there, I will not go.'

    b. *Neg V

      *[tumi jodi Sekhane gele **na**], [(ta-hole) ami jabo na]
      you if there go Neg then I will-go Neg

- Correlatives allow for both orders.

(43) (from del Prado and Gair (1994))

    a. V Neg

      ami [je boiguli bujhi **na**] Seguli toma-ke debo
      I Rel books understand Neg those to-you will-give

      'I will give you the books that I do not understand.'

    b. Neg V

      ami [je boiguli **na** bujhi] Seguli toma-ke debo
      I Rel books Neg understand those to-you will-give

      'I will give you the books that I do not understand.'

- Rahman (2002) notes that while syntactic material may not intervene between V and a postverbal negation, syntactic material **may** intervene between V and a preverbal negation.

(44) (from Dasgupta (1987):70)

    a. N Neg V-inf

      tumi kaj śeṣ **nā** kor-te par-le,...
      you job end Neg do-Inf can-Pst.2

      'If you cannot finish the job,...'

    b. Neg N V-inf

      tumi kaj **nā** śeṣ kor-te par-le,...
      you job Neg end do-Inf can-Pst.2

      'If you cannot finish the job,...'

→ Postverbal Negation and the V form a complex head, while preverbal negation and the V do not.

2.3.2 Preverbal Negation in Old Bengali

Sen (1958) noted that a major difference between Old Bengali (up until the 18th century) and Modern Bengali is that negation of finite verbs was preverbal in Old Bengali.

(45) a. (from Sen (1958))

      na jani [ki hOeno raja judhiStir]
      Neg know what happened King Yudhishthir

      'I don't know what happened to Kind Yudhishthir.'

    b. (from Halhed (1778))

      ke bole [OnOngo Ongo dekha **na** jae]
      who says formless form see-Ger Neg Pass

      'Who says that the figure of love is not to be seen?'

2.3.3 Ramchand's Puzzle: Negated Perfects

del Prado and Gair (1994), Ramchand (2001), Ramchand (2003) a.o. note that the negation of perfects has certain special properties in Bengali.

(46) (from Ramchand (2003))

    a. Present Progressive

      ami am-ṭa khacchi (**na**)
      I mango-CL eat.Prog.Prs.1st Neg

      'I am (not) eating the mango.'

b. Simple Past

ami am-ṭa   khelam   (**na**)
I   mango-CL eat.Pst.1st Neg

'I did not eat the mango.'

(47) a. Present Perfect

ami am-ṭa   kheyechi   (***na**)
I   mango-CL eat.PERF.Prs.1st Neg

'I have eaten the mango/*I have not eaten the mango.'

b. Past Perfect

ami am-ṭa   kheyechilam   (***na**)
I   mango-CL eat.PERF.Pst.1st Neg

'I had eaten the mango/*I had not eaten the mango.'

c. Negated Perfect

ami am-ṭa   khai **ni**
I   mango-CL eat.1st Neg

'I have/had not eaten the mango/did not eat the mango.'

• The stem of the negated perfect changes to a simple aspectually unspecified form (cf. Masica (1991):393).

• A special negation (**ni** vs. **na**) is used.

2.3.4 Ramchand's Proposal

ni is specified for Tense and Aspect (cf. Ramchand (2001)).
(This would block combination of tensed forms with *ni*.)

(48) a. **na** : negative quantifier over events
     b. **ni** : negative quantifier over times

(49) a. (46b) = there is a contextually specified interval of time in the past during which there was no event of the relevant sort.
     b. (47b) = there is no interval of time in the contextually specified domain during which an event of the relevant sort took place.

• According to Ramchand (2003), negating a perfect with *na* involves negating the result state of the perfect while leaving the event quantification untouched. This leads to a contradiction.

Some contrasts:

Quantification over times blocks temporal anaphora:

(50) a. Negated Past:
        When Mary didn't eat the mango, John became very angry.
     b. Negated Perfect:
        *When Mary hasn't/hadn't eaten the mango, John became very angry.

Interaction with durative adverbials:

(51) On which day did your car not start?
     a. Negated Perfect:
        kalke   gaṛi start hoy   ni
        yesterday car   start become-3 Pst.Neg

        'Yesterday the car didn't start at all.'
     b. Negated Past:
        kalke   gaṛi start holo   na
        yesterday car   start become-Pst.3 Neg

        'Yesterday the car didn't start. (but then the neighbour came and fixed it).'

2.4 Hindi

The complex negation *nahī:* seems to have become the default form in that it is possible in most environments.

The simplex negation *naa* is preferred in infinitival and subjunctive environments and not allowed in finite environments.

(52) a. Finite Clause
        Miriam-ne Buffy-par paper   **nahī:/??/*naa** likh-aa
        Miriam-Erg Buffy-on paper.m Neg/Neg   write-Pfv.MSg

        'Miriam did not write a paper on Buffy.'
     b. Subjunctive Clause
        mÊ chaah-taa   hũ: [ki Miriam Buffy-par paper **naa/??nahī:**
        I   want-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg that Miriam Buffy-on   paper Neg/Neg
        likh-e]
        write-Sbjv.3Sg

        'I want that Miriam not write a paper on Buffy.'
     c. Infinitival Subject
        [Buffy-par paper naa/nahī: likh-naa] burii baat   hai
        Buffy-on   paper Neg/Neg write-Ger bad.f thing.f be.Prs.Sg

        'To not write a paper on Buffy is a bad thing.'

2.4.1 Auxiliary Deletion

Habitual and Progressive sentences in Hindi require a tense bearing auxiliary (cf. Bhatia (1978), Bhatia (1979)).

(53) a. Progressive

   Vina   kitaab paṛh rahii   *(hai/thii)
   Vina.f book   read Prog.f be.Prs.Sg/be.Pst.F

   'Vina is/was reading a book.'

   b. Habitual

   Vina   ghazal gaa-tii   *(hai/thii)
   Vina.f ghazal sing-Hab.f be.Prs.Sg/be.Pst.F

   'Vina sings/used to sing ghazals.'

The presence of negation allows for the present tense auxiliary to be absent.

(54) a. Progressive

   Vina   kitaab **nahĩ:** paṛh rahii   (hai)
   Vina.f book   read Neg Prog.f be.Prs.Sg

   'Vina is not reading a book.'

   b. Habitual

   Vina   ghazal **nahĩ:**   gaa-tii   (hai)
   Vina.f ghazal sing-Hab.f be.Prs.Sg/be.Pst.F

   'Vina doesn't sing ghazals.'

→ Putative evidence for the tensed auxiliary source of *nahĩ:*

→ But *nahĩ:* is also compatible with overt past tense auxiliaries.

Agreement Float

(55) a. No Plural Marking on Participle:

   pariyā: mã:s (**nahĩ:**) **khaa-tii   hẼ**
   fairies.f meat Neg   eat-Hab.F be.Prs.Pl

   'Fairies (don't) eat meat.'

   b. Auxiliary absent, Plural Marking on Participle:

   pariyā: mã:s **nahĩ: khaa-tī:**
   fairies.f meat Neg   eat-Hab.FPl

   'Fairies don't eat meat.'

2.4.2 The Question of Ordering

If negation is not adjacent to the verb and associated auxiliaries, it is interpreted as a constituent negation on the immediately preceding XP.

In all environments, the 'Neg V' order is natural.

Within infinitival subjects, the V-Neg order seems to be ungrammatical.

(56) *V Neg

   *[Buffy-par paper likh-naa   **naa/nahĩ:**] burii baat   hai
   Buffy-on   paper write-Ger Neg/Neg bad.f thing.f be.Prs.Sg

'V Neg' is possible with finite clauses, but is emphatic.

(57) V Neg

   Miriam-ne Buffy-par paper   likh-aa   **nahĩ:**
   Miriam-Erg Buffy-on paper.m Neg/Neg write-Pfv.MSg

   'Miriam did not write a paper on Buffy.' (even though she had said that she would.)

Negation must either immediately precede or immediately follow the main verb. Other orders are degraded.

(58) Progressive: V Prog be-Tense
   a. Neg V Prog be-Tense
   b. V Neg Prog be-Tense
   c. ???/* V Prog Neg be-Tense
   d. ??? V Prog be-Tense Neg

(59) Perfect Passive: V-Pfv Pass-Pfv be-Tense
   a. Neg V-Pfv Pass-Pfv be-Tense
   b. V-Pfv Neg Pass-Pfv be-Tense
   c. ???V-Pfv Pass-Pfv Neg be-Tense
   d. ???V-Pfv Pass-Pfv be-Tense Neg

Kumar (2003) attempts to derive the ordering restrictions of negation from an optional movement of the verb.

'Neg V' - V moves to a head above Neg, and picks up Neg on the way.

'V Neg' - V stays put.

For Kumar (2003), 'Neg V' involves a complex head, but not 'V Neg'.

(60) a. Preverbal Negation: Adjacency required for sentential negation reading

      b. Postverbal Negation: Adjacency not required for sentential negation reading

• We have seen that (60a) is borne out.

(61) N-V Compounds: a putative counterexample

      a. N Neg V

      Billu-ne abhii-tak kaam   shuruu **nahĩ:** ki-yaa
      Billu-Erg now-till work.m start   Neg do-Pfv.MSg

      'Billu hasn't started working until now.'

      b. N Neg V

      Billu-ne abhii-tak kaam   **nahĩ:** shuruu ki-yaa
      Billu-Erg now-till work.m Neg start   do-Pfv.MSg

      'Billu hasn't started working until now.'

Presumably N+V compounds form a head that can move together.

• Separability of postverbal sentential negation and the main verb.

(62) a. V-Topicalization:

      khaa-yaa-to$_i$ Billu-ne phal   t$_i$ **nahĩ:** thaa
      eat-Pfv-Top Billu-Erg fruit.m   Neg be.Pst.MSg

      'It is not the case that Billu ATE the fruit.'

      b. Rightward Scrambling:

      tum   kuchh   khaa **kyõ nahĩ:** le-te?
      you.Pl something eat   why Neg TAKE-Hab.MPl

      'Why don't you eat something?'

3 Negative Polarity Items and the Issue of Scope

Unlike English, sentential negation can license subject NPI's in Hindi (cf. Mahajan (1990), Lahiri (1998)).

(63) kisii-ne-bhii   jOn-ko **nahĩ:** dekh-aa
      someone-Erg-'even' John-Acc Neg   see-Pfv

      'Nobody saw John.' (Lit. *Anybody didn't see John.)

Negation can also take scope over subject quantifiers.

(64) [koii aadmii] nahĩ: aa-yaa
      some man   Neg come-Pfv.MSg

      ¬ > ∃ : No man came. (**easy to get**)

      ∃ > ¬: There was a man who did not come. (**hard to get**)

Negation in restructuring infinitival complement clauses is able to take scope over the matrix predicate.

(65) **Ram**   [Dilli **nahĩ:** jaa-naa] chaah-taa   (hai)
      Ram.M Delhi Neg go-Inf   want-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg

      'Ram doesn't want to go to Delhi.'
      (Possibly: Ram wants to not go to Delhi)

(66) Matrix NPI-licensing and Auxiliary deletion:

      a. Tense Auxiliary is obligatory with non-negated habituals:

      Ram   [Dilli jaa-naa] chaah-taa   ***(hai)**
      Ram.M Delhi go-Inf   want-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg

      'Ram wants to go to Delhi.'

      b. NPI-licensing:

      ek-bhii   laṛkaa   [Dilli **nahĩ:** jaa-naa] chaah-taa
      one-'even' boy.MSg Delhi Neg go-Inf   want-Hab.MSg

      'Not even one boy wants to go to Delhi.'

3.1 Mahajan (1990)'s Proposal

Negation in Hindi moves at LF and can take scope over the matrix IP, conditions on covert movement permitting.

• A negation in a non-restructuring infinitival complement, subject infinitival, or finite clausal complement is unable to license an NPI in an embedding clause.

(67) *kah* 'tall': a non-restructuring predicate

    a. Ram Sita-se   [Dilli nahī: jaa-ne]-ko   kah-taa   *(hai)
       Ram Sita-Instr Delhi Neg   go-Inf.Obl-Dat say-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg

       'Ram tells Sita to not go to Delhi.'

    b. Ram Sita-se   [Dilli jaa-ne]-ko   nahī: kah-taa   (hai)
       Ram Sita-Instr Delhi go-Inf.Obl-Dat Neg   say-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg

       'Ram does not tell Sita to go to Delhi.'

(68)   a. ***ek-bhii laṛkaa** Sita-se   [Dilli nahī: jaa-ne]-ko   kah-taa   *(hai)
       one-even boy   Sita-Instr Delhi Neg   go-Inf.Obl-Dat say-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg

       '*Even a single boy told Sita to not go to Delhi.'

    b. **ek-bhii laṛkaa** Sita-se   [Dilli jaa-ne]-ko   nahī: kah-taa   (hai)
       one-even boy   Sita-Instr Delhi go-Inf.Obl-Dat Neg   say-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg

       'Not even a single boy told Sita to not go to Delhi.'

• Rightward scrambling, which blocks wide scope for in-situ *wh*-XP's also block wide scope for negation.

(69) *ek-bhii laṛkaa   chaah-taa [Dilli **nahī:** jaa-naa]
     one-'even' boy.MSg Delhi   Neg go-Inf want-Hab.MSg

     '*Even one boy wants to not go to Delhi.'

3.2 The Form and Meaning of Hindi NPIs

NPI's in Hindi are licensed in the usual downward entailing environments and also in generic environments where they receive a Free Choice reading (see also Vasishth (1998)).

Lahiri (1998) argues that the distributional properties of most Hindi NPI's can be derived from their structure.

(70) Structure of some Hindi NPIs (from Lahiri (1998):58)

    a. *ek bhii* = 'any, even one' = *ek* 'one' + *bhii* 'also, even'

    b. *koii bhii* = 'anyone, any (count)' = *koii* 'some (count)' + *bhii* 'also, even'

    c. *kuch bhii* = 'anything, any (mass)' = *koii* 'some (count)' + *bhii* 'also, even'

    d. *zaraa bhii* = 'even a little' = *zaraa* 'little' + *bhii* 'also, even'

    e. *kabhii bhii* = 'anytime, ever' = *kabhii* 'sometime' + *bhii* 'also, even'

    f. *kahī: bhii* = 'anywhere' = *kabhii* 'somewhere' + *bhii* 'also, even'

3.2.1 Lahiri (1998)'s Basic Proposal

• *bhii* by itself has a meaning like 'also'.

(71) Yunus bhii aa-yaa   thaa
     Yunus 'also' come-Pfv.MSg be.Pst.MSg

     'Yunus also came.'
     Implicature: Someone else came.

• If the associate of *bhii* is focused, we get an *even* reading.

(72) [$_F$ Yunus] bhii aa-yaa   thaa
     Yunus   'also' come-Pfv.MSg be.Pst.MSg

     'Even Yunus came.'
     Implicature: The likelihood of Yunus's coming was less than the likelihood of everyone else who came.

• NPI's are inherently focused.

• The NP to which *bhii* attaches in an NPI is a 'weak' predicate - it is entailed by all its contextual alternatives.

• At LF, *even* moves to the edge of a clause. If more than one option is available, this leads to ambiguity.

(73)   a. It is hard for me to believe that Bill understands [even Syntactic Structures].
      LF: It is hard for me to believe that [[even Syntactic Structures]$_i$ [Bill understands t$_i$]]

b. It is hard for me to believe that Bill understands [even Mother Goose].
LF: [[even Mother Goose]$_i$ [It is hard for me to believe that [Bill understands t$_i$]]]

• If there is no downward entailing operator/genericity, the implicatures of the weak predicate + *bhii* are systematically violated.

• The presence of a downward entailing operator/genericity, rectifies this problem.

(74) a. Surface Order: [[one even] man] Neg came
      b. LF: [one even]$_i$ [Neg [[t$_i$ man] came]]

NPI Licensing requires:

(75) a. Negation takes scope over trace of NPI.
      b. The 'even' part of the NPI takes scope over Negation.

→ Locality effects on NPI-licensing - negation must take scope over NPI, but NPI must not be too deeply embedded.

• Since NPI licensing is allowed across some finite clauses in the (Neg...[$_{CP}$...NPI) configuration, we have to countenance covert movement of *even* out of finite clauses (as in English).

3.2.2 Some Additional Issues

Not all NPI's require a *bhii*.

(76) *tas-se mas* 'budge an inch'
      a. vo ṭas-se mas   **nahī:** hu-aa
         he budge-an-inch Neg   be-Pfv.MSg
         'He did not budge an inch.'
      b. vo ṭas-se mas   tak/bhii **nahī:** hu-aa
         he budge-an-inch till/even Neg   be-Pfv.MSg
         'He did not so much as/even budge an inch.'

Most phrasal NPI's can optionally take *bhii* 'even' or *tak* 'till'.

Non NPI usage of *tak*:

(77) Mona Dilli-**tak** train-se   jaa-egii
      Mona Delhi-till train-Inst go-Fut.3FSg
      'Mona will go up until Delhi by train.'

tak does not combine with determiners, but combines with NP's.

(78) a. *[ek tak freshman] nahī: aa-yaa
         one till freshman Neg come-Pfv.MSg

      b. [ek freshman] tak nahī: aa-yaa
         one freshman till Neg come-Pfv.MSg

         'Not even a freshman came.'
         (the focus is on the predicate 'freshman', not on the number.)

A puzzle: Vasishth (1998) notes that there are some NPI's like *sir pair* lit. 'head legs', 'head or tail', which display the following pattern:

(79) a. Downward Entailing, but not pure negation:
         sir pair, **sir pair + bhii*, **sir pair + tak*
      b. Antimoprhic (i.e. basically negation):
         ???sir pair, *sir pair + bhii*, *sir pair + tak*

He suggests that strongly negative environments prefer NPI's with overt *bhii/tak*.

Would a scopal approach extend to the inabilitative passive?

(80) Inabilitative Passive
      a. ???Saira-se peṛ   ukhaaṛ-e   jaa-te hẼ
         Saira-Instr tree.m uproot.Pfv.MPl Neg   Pass-Hab.MPl be.Prs.Pl
         '?Trees are uprooted with Saira.'
      b. Saira-se   peṛ   ukhaaṛ-e   nahī: jaa-te
         Saira-Instr tree.m uproot.Pfv.MPl Neg   Pass-Hab.MPl
         'Saira is unable (to bring herself) to uproot trees.'

Where would the covert 'even' be here?
Maybe it doesn't need to. The NPI nature of the inabilitative could be like the NPI nature of modals in many languages, a fact that needs to be stipulated.

References

Auwera, J. van der (2001) "Negating Dynamic and Deontic Modality in Hindi-Urdu and Bengali," in A. Abbi, R. S. Gupta, and A. Kidwai, eds., *Linguistic Structure and Language Dynamics in South Asia: Papers from the Proceedings of the SALA XVIII Roundtable*, MLBD Series in Linguistics 15, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 327–347.

Bhatia, T. K. (1978) *A syntactic and semantic description of negation in south asian languages*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois-Urbana, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.

Bhatia, T. K. (1979) "Negation in South Asian Languages," in B. Kachru, H. H. Hock, and Y. Kachru, eds., *South Asian Languages Analysis Vol. 1*, Dept. of Linguistics, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 1–12.

Bhatia, T. K. (1993) *Punjabi: a cognitive-descriptive grammar*, Descriptive Grammars, Routledge, London.

Bhatt, R., and S. Munshi (2002) "Neg Movement and Optional Verb Second in Kashmiri," handout of talk given at SALA 22 at the University of Iowa.

Bhatt, R. M. (1999) *Verb Movement and the Syntax of Kashmiri*, Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 46, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Cardona, G. (1965) *A Gujarati Reference Grammar*, The University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Dasgupta, P. (1987) "Sentence Particles in Bangla," in E. Bashir, M. M. Deshpande, and P. E. Hook, eds., *Selected Papers from SALA 7*, Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington, 49–75.

Halhed, N. B. (1778) *A Grammar of the Bengali Language*, Hoogly, Bengal.

Kumar, R. (2003) *The Syntax of Negation in Hindi*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois-Urbana, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois. Forthcoming.

Lahiri, U. (1998) "Focus and Negative Polarity in Hindi," *Natural Language Semantics* 6:1, 57–123.

Mahajan, A. K. (1990) "LF Conditions on Negative Polarity Licensing," *Lingua* 80:4, 333–348.

Masica, C. (1991) *The Indo-Aryan Languages*, Cambridge Language Surveys, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.

Pandharipande, R. V. (1997) *Marathi: a descriptive grammar*, Descriptive Grammars, Routledge, London.

Prado, Z. N. del, and J. Gair (1994) "The position of negation in Bengali: An account of synchronic and diachronic variation," in A. Davison and F. M. Smith, eds., *Papers from the Fifteenth SALA Roundtable Conference 1993*, South Asian Studies Program, University of Iowa, Iowa City, 234–250.

Rahman, S. (2002) "Verb Movement and Negation in Bengali," handout of talk given at SALA 22 at the University of Iowa.

Ramchand, G. C. (2001) "Tense and Negation in Bengali," in A. Abbi, R. S. Gupta, and A. Kidwai, eds., *Linguistic Structure and Language Dynamics in South Asia: Papers from the Proceedings of the SALA XVIII Roundtable*, MLBD Series in Linguistics 15, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 308–326.

Ramchand, G. C. (2003) "Two Types of Negation in Bengali," in V. Dayal and A. Mahajan, eds., *Clause Structure in South Asian Languages*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Sen, S. (1958) "The position of the negative particle in Bengali," *Indian Linguistics* 19, 100–102.

Singh, U. N. (1976) "Negation in Bengali and the order of constituents," *Indian Linguistics* 37, 295–303.

Vasishth, S. (1998) "Negative Contexts and Negative Polarity in Hindi," in R. Singh, ed., *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages 1998*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks/London/New Delhi, 135–158.

Vikner, S. (1995) *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*, Oxford studies in comparative syntax, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Wali, K., and O. N. Koul (1997) *Kashmiri: a cognitive-descriptive grammar*, Descriptive Grammars, Routledge, London.

Wen, T. (1979) "The syntax of the negative particle in Bengali," *Indian Linguistics* 40, 246–251.

Wurff, W. van der (1989) "Scope and Movement in Bengali Negation," in H. Bennis and A. van Kemenade, eds., *Linguistics in the Netherlands: 1989*, Linguistic Models, Foris, Dordrecht, 185–194.