

Such contexts then necessitate additional, contextually-determined rankings. For example, in a context where $B >_S A$ — drinking beer is stronger (e.g. less likely, more noteworthy) than drinking water — *ma* under negation yields the presupposition $\neg B$ (5), yielding the ‘even’-like reading.

(5) *ma* in (4) with $>_S$ reflecting a contextual scale: presupposition (2): $\neg(A \wedge B) \wedge \neg B$

The introduction of the presupposition $\neg B$ in (5) makes the use of *ma* here meaningful and thus grammatical. This explains how *ma* under local negation is necessarily interpreted as scalar.

The vacuity problem in (4) however does not occur if other operators take scope between *ma* and negation at LF. This is observed in cases of *ma* in embedded clauses, with non-local negation, where the scalar (‘even’-like) reading is blocked, resulting in a negated cleft reading. (Data at talk.)

Finally, for the formation of NPIs as in (1c), we follow Lahiri (1998) in taking the *ma* to associate with the *wh* as an existential quantifier, which results in a contradiction unless it crosses a downward-entailing operator such as negation (1c).

To summarize, our uniform semantics for *ma* derives its ‘even’-like use in contexts with local negation and its exhaustive cleft-like use in contexts otherwise, and its use in NPI-formation.

Sentence-final *-dar*: The ‘even’ example in (1a) and ‘only’ example in (1b) not only differ in the presence of negation in (1a) but not in (1b): they also differ in their sentence-final mood morphemes. (1b) must end with the regular realis ending *-de*, whereas (1a) must end with the ending *-dar*. The regular realis ending for negative clauses is *-bu*, as seen in (1c). The ending *-dar* as in (1a) is instead used in headless relativization/nominalization, as in (6):

(6) [aya? po ce-dar]-ga John p^hyi?-de.
 height more tall-DAR-NOM John COPULA-REALIS
 ‘{The taller one / the one that is taller} is John.’

We propose that the choice of the *-dar* ending reflects an information-structural requirement on relativization, in (7), formulated in terms of the Roberts’ (2012) theory of discourse.

(7) Relativized clauses cannot resolve the immediate Question Under Discussion. Grammaticalization of the requirement in (7) and its extension to main clause edges explains its distribution in (1) and elsewhere in Burmese. Suppose the immediate QUD is “What did Aung drink?” We note that (1a) is relevant and informative, by reducing the space of possible answers, but it does not directly answer and resolve this question, requiring the use of *-dar*. In contrast, (1b) does answer this immediate QUD, making the use of *-dar* infelicitous.

The particle *ma* with sentential negation can also cooccur with a realis ending: see (8), which differs minimally from (1a) above in not using *-dar*. (8) is interpreted as a cleft scoping over negation, rather than ‘even’ as in (1a). This is predicted by our account: *ma* takes wide scope in (8), yielding an exhaustive cleft-like interpretation, as in (3), with negation in its scope. The realis ending is used rather than *-dar* because (8) fully resolves the QUD “What does Aung not drink?”

(8) Aung-ga ye-*ma* mə-θau?-kε-bu.
 Aung-NOM water-MA NEG-drink-PAST-REAL.NEG
 ‘It’s WATER that Aung doesn’t drink.’

An extension to “focus concord”: The approach to the distribution of main clauses with the relative clause ending *-dar* above, based on a grammaticalization and extension of the pragmatic requirement on relativized clauses in (7), offers a new approach to so-called “focus concord” or *kakari musubi* phenomena, which have been analyzed in terms of syntactic agreement. In the talk, we explore this pragmatic approach to “focus concord” and discuss an extension to contemporary Japanese *-no-da*, which Kato (1998:88–89) has noted to be similar in use to Burmese *-dar*.

References:

Crnič, Luka. 2011. *Getting even*. MIT dissertation.

Kato, Atsuhiko. 1998. *Ekusupuresu Birumago* (Burmese primer). Tokyo: Hakusuisha.

Lahiri, Utpal. 1998. 'Focus and negative polarity in Hindi.' *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 57–123.

Okell, John. 1969. *A reference grammar of Colloquial Burmese*. Oxford.

Roberts, Craige. 1996/2012. 'Information Structure in Discourse: Towards an Integrated Formal Theory of Pragmatics.' *Semantics and Pragmatics* 5(6):1–69.

Sheil, Christine. 2016. *Scottish Gaelic Clefts: Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics*. University of California, Berkeley dissertation.

Velleman, Leah, David Beaver, Emilie Destruel, Dylan Bumford, Edgar Onea and Liz Coppock. 2012. 'It-clefts are IT (inquiry terminating) constructions.' *Proceedings of SALT 22*, 441–460.