1 Different Negations


1.1 Simplex and Complex Negation

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Simplex</th>
<th>Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>nahı:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>nā</td>
<td>nāː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>nahi/nathi/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>nahık +Agr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. nāː - 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)
   akhbaːr mI par newspaper Neg read
   ‘Don’t read the newspaper.’

Other negative forms may also appear in negative imperatives:

(3) vahāː naa/?nahıː jaa-īye
    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 bāḍzaːrāt gele nāhıt
      they yesterday market-loc go-Pst.3MPI Neg-Pl
      ‘They did not go the market yesterday.’

b. Constituent Negation of Subject:
   te nāhıt/nāː nāhıt kāl bāḍzaːrāt gele
   they Neg/*/Neg-Pl yesterday market-loc go-Pst.3MPI
   ‘They did not go to the market yesterday (somebody else did).’

c. Constituent Negation of Temporal Adverb:
   te kāl nāhıt/nāː nāhıt bāḍzaːrāt gele
   they yesterday Neg/*/Neg-Pl market-loc go-Pst.3MPI
‘They did not go to the market yesterday (they went some other day).’

d. Constituent Negation of Locative Adverb:

\[
\text{te k\={a}l b\acute{a}dz\={a}r\={a}t n\={a}h\acute{\text{i}}/n\={a}h\acute{\text{i}} ge\text{le}}
\]

they yesterday market-loc Neg/*NegI/*Neg-Pl go-Pst.3MPI

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

A similar situation obtains in Hindi, except that \( n\acute{a}h\acute{\text{i}}: \) does not inflect even when used as sentential negation.

(5) a. Sentential Negation:

\[
\text{Ram bazaar n\={a}h\acute{\text{i}}:/??\text{naa gayaa thaa}}
\]

Ram.m market Neg/NegI market go-Pfv.MSg be.Pst.MSg

‘Ram hadn’t gone to the market.’

b. Constituent Negation 1:

\[
\text{Ram n\={a}h\acute{\text{i}}:/??\text{naa Shiraz bazaar gayaa thaa}}
\]

Ram.m Neg/NegI Shiraz.m market go-Pfv.MSg be.Pst.MSg

‘It wasn’t Ram who had gone to the market.’

c. Constituent Negation 2:

\[
\text{Billu-ne [thor.aa hii] khaanaa eat-Pfv.MSg thaa}
\]

Billu-Erg little.MSg-only food.M eat-Pfv.MSg be.Pst.MSg

‘Billu ate only a little food.’

(6) adjectival usage: agrees with the NP

a. Billu-ne \[\text{thor.aa hii khaaanaa] khaa-yaa thaa}
Billu-Erg little.MSg-only food.M eat-Pfv.MSg

‘Billu ate only a little food.’

b. Billu-ne \[\text{thorii hii sharaab} pi-i]
Billu-Erg little.FSg-only wine.f drink-Pfv.MSg

‘Billu drank only a little wine.’

c. Billu-ne \[\text{thorii hii paper} likh-e]
Billu-Erg little.MPl-only paper.MPl write-Pfv.MPl

‘Billu wrote only a few papers.’

(\text{thoraa ‘little’} can be replaced by the uninflecting adjective \text{kam ‘little’} without affecting the meaning.)

1.4 ‘Little’ as Negation

Although not described as such in the descriptive literature, the adjective \text{thoraa ‘little’} can also contribute a negative meaning when used adverbially.

(7) a. \[\text{Billu-ne khaaanaa thorii khaa-yaa thaa}
Billu-Erg food.M little eat-Pfv.MSg be.Pst.MSg

‘Billu didn’t eat food.’

b. \[\text{Billu-ne sharaab thorii pi-i thii}
Billu-Erg wine.f little drink-Pfv.FSg be.pst.F

‘Billu hadn’t drunk wine.’

c. \[\text{Billu-ne paper thorii likh-e the}
Billu-Erg paper.MPl little write-Pfv.MPl be.Pst.MPl

‘Billu hadn’t written papers.’

\( \text{thoraa ‘little’ cannot be replaced by the uninflecting adjective} \text{kam ‘little’}. \)

(8) Constituent Negation of Subject:

\[
\text{Billu-ne thorii khaaanaa thorii hai thaa}
\]

Billu-Erg little.MSg 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. \[\text{Ram kitaab phaar-taa thorii}
Ram.M book tear-Hab.MSg little

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

b. \[\text{Ram kitaab phaar-taa thorii hai}
Ram.M book tear-Hab.MSg little be.Prs.Sg

‘Ram doesn’t tear books.’

1.5 Other Negative Elements

\text{binaa/bagEr ‘without’}
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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 basa:n ki su yi yi az.
      I-dat is-not believe that he come-fut today
      'I don’t believe that he will come today.'
   b. me chu basa:n ki su yi yi-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) ...
   a. samir chu-nI tsuuNth khEwaan
      Samir is-not apple eat-Impfv
      'Samir does not eat apples.'
   b. *samir 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.

(15) a. samir chu nI tsuuNth khEwaan
    Samir is not apple eat-Impfv
    'Samir does not eat apples.'
   b. *samir chu tsuuth khEwaan
    Samir not is apple eat-Impfv
   c. *samir chu tsuuth khEwaan nI
    Samir is apple eat-Impfv not

(16) a. samir chu nI dohay tsuuNth’ khEwaan
    Samir is not everyday apple eat-Impfv
    'Samir does not eat apples everyday.'
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 tsuuNth’ khEwaan samir is-Q always apple eat-Impfv
   ‘Does Samir eat apples everyday?’

b. dohay chuu samir tsuuNth’ khEwaan always is-Q Samir apple eat-Impfv
   ‘Does Samir eat apples everyday?’

c. *chaa samir dohay tsuuNth’ khEwaan is-Q Samir always apple eat-Impfv
   ‘Does Samir eat apples everyday?’

Q-morpheme follows Negation.

(18) a. samir chuu-naa dohay tsuuNth’ khEwaan
   samir is-Neg-Q always apple eat-Impfv
   ‘Doesn’t Samir eat apples everyday?’

b. dohay chuu-naa samir tsuuNth’ khEwaan always is-Neg-Q Samir apple eat-Impfv
   ‘Doesn’t Samir eat apples everyday?’

c. *samir chuu 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 chuu-s-nI azkal garl gatsha:n
   I be-Isgrp-Neg nowadays home going
   ‘I don’t go home nowadays.’

b. su pari-na kita:b
   he read-Fut-Neg book
   ‘He will not read the book.’

- Q > Neg > T

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


(21) Conditionals

a. [agar samir-an ravi-as yi kitaab ditsmlts 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 ditsmlts]t[ElIi...]
   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 ditsmlts]t[ElIi...]
   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 ditsmlts]t[ElIi...]
   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 ditsmlts]t[ElIi...]
   if be.Pst.f Samir-erg Ravi-dat. this book given then....
   ‘If Samir had given this book to Ravi, then...’

f. ??[aasiheagar samir-an ravi-as yi kitaab ditsmlts]t[ElIi...]
   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 pitsI so kitaab......] which book Samir-erg Ravi-dat. gave that book......
   'The book Samir gave to Ravi......'

b. [yosI kitaab samir-an pits ravi-as[ so kitaab......] which book Samir-erg gave Ravi-dat. that book.....
   'The book Samir gave to Ravi......'

c. ???/*[yosI pits samir-an ravi-as] [ so kitaab......] which book Samir-erg Ravi-dat.
   '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 gomut aasahakh, tEli....
    if you gone are Neg then
    'If you had not gone then.....'

(24) tsI nay 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.'

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 nl tsI gomut aasahakh, tEli....
   if Neg you gone are Neg then
   'If you had not gone then.....'

b. agar tsI gomut aasahakh nl, tEli....
   if you gone are Neg then
   'If you had not gone then.....'

c. agar tsI aasahakh nl gomut, tEli....
   if you are Neg 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 nl samir-an ravi-as yi kitaab ditsmlts aasih, 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 nl ravi-as yi kitaab ditsmlts aasih, tEli....
   if Samir-erg Neg Ravi-dat. this book given is then....

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

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

e. *agar samir-an ravi-as yi kitaab ditsmlts nl aasih, 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 ditsmlts aasih nl, 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 aasih nl ditsmlts, 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 aasih nl yi kitaab ditsmlts, 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 aasih nl ravi-as yi kitaab ditsmlts, 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 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) [yosi kitaab] nI [yosi kitaab samir-an ravi-as t dits] tj
    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) [yosi kitaab] nI [yosi kitaab samir-an ravi-as t dits,+nI]]
    which book Neg 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], ram-an sita-i won [zi ravi-as che nI t, pasand]]
    which book Ram-Erg Sita-Acc said that Ravi-Dat be.FSg Neg pleasing
    ‘The book that Ram told Sita that Ravi doesn’t like...’
   b. Matrix Negation 1 (Postverbal):
    [yosi kitaab], ram-an sita-i won nI [zi ravi-as che t, 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], nI ram-an sita-i won [zi ravi-as che t, 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 which kitaab won [zi ravi-as che t 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


(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 (bOe)
   city-Loc hot (is)
   ‘It is hot in the city.’
b. sOhore gOrom mOe
   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
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(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 ses na 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 na ses 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) (from Sen (1958))
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 ja] 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-ta khacchi (na)
   I mango-CL eat.Prog.Prs.1st Neg
   ‘I am (not) eating the mango.’
b. Simple Past
ami am-ta khelam (na)
I mango-CL eat.Pst.1st Neg
‘I did not eat the mango.’

(47)  a. Present Perfect
ami am-ta 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-ta 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-ta khai ni
I mango-CL eat.1st Neg
‘I have/had not eaten the mango/did not eat the mango.’

- A special negation (ni vs. na) is used.

2.3.4 Ramchand’s Proposal

ni is specified for Tense and Aspect (cf. Ramchand (2001)).

(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 garî start hoy ni
yesterday car start become-3 Pst.Neg
    ‘Yesterday the car didn’t start at all.’
  b. Negated Past:
    kalke garî 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 nahı: 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 nahı/??/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
    mE chaah-taa hû: [ki Miriam Buffy-par paper naa/??nahı:
    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/nahı: 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 nahi: paṛh rahii (hai)
   Vina.f book  read Neg Prog.f be.Prs.Sg
   ‘Vina is not reading a book.’

   b. Habitual
   Vina ghazal nahi: 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 nahi:

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

Agreement Float

(55) a. No Plural Marking on Participle:
   pariya: māis (nahi) khaa-tii hē
   fairies.f meat Neg  eat-Hab.f be.Prs.Pl
   ‘Fairies (don’t) eat meat.’

   b. Auxiliary absent, Plural Marking on Participle:
   pariya: māis nahi: khaa-ti:
   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 nahi: 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 nahi:
   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 nahi: 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 nahi: 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 Billu-ne phal t, nahi: 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 kiyaa nahi: 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 nahi: dekh-aa
   someone-Erg-eve’ 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] nahi: 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 nahi: 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 lar.kaa [Dilli nahi: 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 nahi: jaa-ne]-ko kah-taa *(hai)
   Ram Sita-Instr Delhi Neg go-Inf.Obl-Dat say-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg
   'Ram tells Sita not to go to Delhi.'

b. Ram Sita-se [Dilli jaa-ne]-ko nahi: 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 laarkaa Sita-se [Dilli nahi: 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 not to go to Delhi.'

b. ek-bhii laarkaa Sita-se [Dilli jaa-ne]-ko nahi: 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 laarkaa chaah-taa [Dilli nahi: jaa-naa]
    one-'even' boy:M.Sg 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. koi bhii = 'anyone, any (count)' = koi 'some (count)' + bhii 'also, even'
   c. kuch bhii = 'anything, any (mass)' = koi '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. kabhii 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) [\*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] [Bill understands \]]
b. It is hard for me to believe that Bill understands [even Mother Goose].

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

- 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). Neg [t 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...L...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 *tas-se mas nahē hu-aa
   he budge-an-inch Neg be-Pfv.MSg
   ‘He did not budge an inch.’

b. vo *tas-se mas tak/bhii nahē 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] nahē: aa-yaag
    one till freshman Neg come-Pfv.MSg

b. [ek freshman] tak nahē: aa-yaag
    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. Antimorphic (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 per ukhaar-e jaa-te hē?
   Saira-Instr tree.m uproot.Pfv.MPl Neg Pass-Hab.MPl be.Prs.PI
   ‘Trees are uprooted with Saira.’

b. Saira-se per ukhaar-e nahē: 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.
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