

How light verbs shed light on factivity

GOAL. The paper homes in on a correlation between light verbs (LVs) and their contribution in attitude building in Bangla (*aka* Bengali). Bangla has certain attitude verbs that are *complex predicates* (Butt, 2003, 2005, a.m.o.) in nature. These are *mone hO-* ‘think’, *mone pOR-* ‘remember’, *mone ach-* ‘exist in memory’, *mone rakh-* ‘keep in mind/memory’ which have the same preverb *mone* ‘in mind’. Intriguingly, these verbs differ from each other in terms of *factivity* (Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1970; Karttunen, 1971), and we explore if the LVs *viz.* *hO-* ‘happen’, *pOR-* ‘fall’, *ach-* ‘exist’ and *rakh-* ‘keep’ have any role to play in invoking it.

EMPIRICAL LANDSCAPE. The *mind*-verbs, having the ‘*mone* + LV’ form, exhibit different patterns in terms of presupposing the truth of their complements.

- (1) Anu-r mon-e hOY je Rahul khun-Ta kor-ech-il-o, ✓kintu Se
Anu-GEN mind-LOC happen.PRS.3 that Rahul murder-CL do-PRF-PST-3, but he
khun-Ta kOr-e ni.
murder-CL do-3 PRF.PST.NEG
‘Anu thinks that Rahul committed the murder, ✓but he didn’t do so.’
- (2) Anu-r {mon-e pOR-e/mon-e ach-e} je Rahul khun-Ta
Anu-GEN {mind-LOC fall-PRS.3/mind-LOC exist-PRS.3} that Rahul murder-CL
kor-ech-il-o, #kintu Se khun-Ta kOr-e ni.
do-PRF-PST-3, but he murder-CL do-3 PRF.PST.NEG
‘Anu {remembers/has in memory} that Rahul committed the murder, #but he didn’t.’
- (3) Anu mon-e rekh-ech-e je Rahul khun-Ta kor-ech-il-o, #kintu Se
Anu.NOM mind-LOC keep-PRF-PRS.3 that Rahul murder-CL do-PRF-PST-3, but he
khun-Ta kOr-e ni.
murder-CL do-3 PRF.PST.NEG
‘Anu kept in mind that Rahul committed the murder, #but he didn’t do so.’

(1) is compatible with the *but*-clause, which cancels the truth of the complement clause. But, the latter two are not so because the concerned *mind*-verbs in (2,3) **presuppose** the truth of their complements, *i.e.* Rahul did commit the murder. Other presupposition tests (e.g. von Stechow’s (2004) HWAM test etc.) can be carried over to claim for the same. The novelty of this paper lies in exploring how the LV semantics is liable for these readings.

LIGHT VERBS AS MAIN VERBS. In order to know what kinds of LV semantics are involved here, we need to first show how the LVs act when being used as main verbs.

- (4) megh theke briSti hOY. (6) boi-Ta bEg-e ach-e.
cloud from rain happen.PRS.3 book-CL bag-LOC exist-PRS.3
‘Rain **happens** from cloud.’ ‘The book **exists** in the bag.’
- (5) megh theke briSti pOR-e. (7) o boi-Ta Tebil-e rakh-l-o.
cloud from rain fall-PRS.3 s/he book-CL table-LOC keep-PST-3
‘Rain **falls** from cloud.’ ‘S/he **kept** the book on the table.’

(4) depicts a story of transformation from cloud to rain. The THEME of *hO-* ‘happen’, *i.e.* *rain* doesn’t exist prior to the event of happening, whereas in (5) it is as if the THEME *rain* does exist before the event of falling. Both in (6,7) too the THEME *book* has to exist before the concerned event times. We argue that this existential criterion prior to the event time invokes the presuppositions (à la Diesing, 1992).

TO PRESUPPOSE OR NOT TO: ROLE OF THE LIGHT VERBS. We follow Bondarenko (2019) in coining a function τ that gives the interval of the existence of some individual. In our analysis, we define it as $\tau : D_e \times W \rightarrow I$ where W, I denote the set of worlds, set of intervals respectively, and D_e denotes the set of individuals of type e . We also assume that set of eventualities of type v is included within D_e , *i.e.* $D_v \subset D_e$. Following Bondarenko (2019) style denotation, we propose the semantics of *mone pOR-* ‘remember’ in w .

- (8) $\llbracket \text{mone pOR-} \rrbracket^{w,g} = \lambda x \lambda e : \text{LB}(\tau(x, w)) < \text{LB}(\tau(e, w)). \text{fall-in-mind}(x)(e) \wedge e \text{ is in } w$

The *mind*-verb *mone pOR-* in world w takes an individual x and an event argument e . It is defined if the left boundary (LB) of the interval corresponding to the existence of x in w

