

## 6. A COMPARATIVE NOTE ON THE BANGLA PARTICLE *to* AND THE GERMAN PARTICLE *doch*

Josef Bayer

### **Abstract**

The Bangla discourse particle *to* and the German discourse particle *doch* share a number of syntactic and semantic properties. Their phonetic similarity suggests a remote historical relation. While the historical connection will only be mentioned and must remain for the specialists in Indo-European reconstruction, this study will highlight points of convergence between the two languages with respect to these particles along a series of concrete test cases.

**Key words.** Discourse particles, Indo-Germanic, Indo-Aryan, interrogativity, word order, functional heads.

In this note, I would like to draw the attention to a number of parallels that can be found between the Bangla particle *to* and the German particle *doch*. Although appearing in very distant Indo-European languages, the parallels are surprising. Both elements have their roots in Indo-European (IE). Perhaps they have a common ancestor, perhaps not. But even if not, the comparison could still prove to be interesting for reasons of their similar function in grammar and discourse.

The article is organized as follows: After a note on their respective etymologies in section 1, section 2 will start with a dichotomy of morphological autonomy and boundedness that can be found in *to* but not in *doch*. Section 3 will present the semantic core of the particles under consideration. Section 4 turns to shared properties in regard to information structure. Section 5 con-

siders restrictions with respect to sentence mood. Section 6 takes a look at their distribution in embedded clauses and island effects. Conclusions appear in Section 7.

## 1. Etymology<sup>1</sup>

The recent history of German *doch* is well documented. The modern conjunctive adverb *doch* relates to Old High German *thoh*, *thō*, Middle High German *doch*, Old Saxon *thōh*, Dutch *toch*, Old English *þēah*, Modern English *though*, Old Norse *þō* and Gothic *þauh*. The word is originally composed of two parts. Its first part is said to be related to Old Indic *tú*, *tū* which had an adversative meaning and has, according to certain researchers, developed out of the IE 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular *\*tū-*; alternatively, a development out of the pronominal stem *\*te-*, *\*to-* is considered (see Kluge, 2011: 208 and Lühr, 1976: 77-79). The second part relates to the Gothic strengthening particle *-uh*, *-h* ('and'); see also Latin *que*, which derives from Indo-European *\*kue-*.

It is less clear where exactly *to* in modern Indo-Aryan (e.g., in Bangla and Hindi) comes from. According to Sen (1971), it comes from *tad-u*, which is a 'tadbhava' and originates from the Sanskrit *tad* followed by *u*, *tad* being the third person neuter pronoun while *u* is a widely used particle. Montaut (2016) locates the etymology of Hindi *to* in *an ancient pronominal basis (Sanskrit ta-) referring to third person ('that', 'he'), which is still used as such in certain Indo-Aryan languages such as Marathi (to 'he')*. According to Dunkel (2014: vol. II, 776f.), the oldest function of IE *\*tó* was prosecutive, sequential, continuative; the adversative form *\*tú* should be considered to be an ancient Aryan innovation.

## 2. Free versus clitic usage

Whatever the etymological status of Bangla *to* is, it is interesting to see that both interpretations that Dunkel refers to can be found in the modern language. The non-adversative, sequential interpretation can be found in Bangla examples in which *to* starts the sentence.

---

<sup>1</sup>I will throughout represent the examples in the transcription found in the source texts.

(1) to tumi dilli jabe na bole Thik korecho!  
TO you Delhi go.fut.2 not COMP right make.pst.2  
'So you have decided you will not be going Delhi!'

A related usage appears also in final position as in (2) or as a stand-alone as in (3).

(2) ritar dilipke bhalo lage na, to?  
Rita.gen Dilip.obj like.3 not TO?  
'Rita doesn't like Dilip, so what?'

(3) A: baire khub briSTi hocche  
outside much rain occur.3  
'It's heavily raining outside'  
B: to?  
TO  
'So what?'

The same holds for Hindi, as the following examples from Montaut (2016) show:

(4) A: to kyâ huâ?  
TO what be.aor  
'And then, what happened?'  
B: to?  
TO  
'And then?'

In these cases, *to* should not be confused with an interrogative element as the translation may suggest. It simply means '(and) then'. The interrogative impact follows only in a second step, namely by rising intonation and the challenge of the preceding proposition. 'Rita doesn't like Dilip, so what?'" The conversational implicature of this sequencing is question-like ('So what?', 'Who cares?' etc.) but *to* as such has no interrogative impact.

In all these cases, *to* is a free-standing temporal adverb. It fulfills the criteria for what is understood as a ‘discourse marker’ (Schiffrin, 1988). It is outside the clause, and it links the clause to the discourse.

Things change when we consider the usage of *to* as an enclitic element, or what Dasgupta (1984; 1987) calls an ‘anchor’.<sup>2</sup>

- (5) a. dilip to kal aSbe  
Dilip TO tomorrow come.fut.3  
‘Dilip will come tomorrow, won't he?’  
b. dilip kal to aSbe  
c. dilip kal aSbe to

We see a variety of options. The common denominator is that *to* as a weak clitic-like anchor needs a phonological host to its immediate left which it can lean on. As Dasgupta (1987) shows, *to* in the sense of an anchor can never occur in initial position. There is good evidence that the material to the left of *to* must be a major syntactic constituent. In (5a), this constituent is the subject, in (5b) it is the adverb, and in (5c) it is the entire clause.

The discourse marker/clause linker *to* and the clitic *to* can obviously not be identified semantically. In its free appearance, *to* is simply a temporal adverb meaning ‘then’. As a clitic it communicates that the speaker takes the hearer to believe that *p* is true and conveys the additional expectation that the hearer should acknowledge that *p* is true.<sup>3</sup> Thus, clitic *to* triggers a reading according to which the addressee is reminded that *p* holds. Almost certainly, the clitic *to* lacks interrogativity in the same way that the clause linker *to* does. Emphasis of the truth of *p* gives rise to potential adversativity.

---

<sup>2</sup> The difference between a free form of *to* and an enclitic form of *to* has also been described for Hindi in Lakshmi Bai (1977).

<sup>3</sup> Working on *to* in Hindi, Lakshmi Bai (1977) came to a similar conclusion. According to her, the conjunctive *to* in Hindi must be distinguished from what she calls the ‘emphatic’ *to*. The former is a sentence-external discourse marker/clause linker, while the second is a sentence-internal clitic element that attaches to major sub-constituents of the clause.

Adversativity is the core semantic ingredient of German *doch*. Maybe the clearest case is its use as an answering particle. A negative statement like (6) is not corrected with *nein* ('no') but with *doch*.

(6) A: Du bist heute nicht in die Uni gegangen.

you are today not in the university gone

'You didn't go to university today'

B: Doch / \*Nein

DOCH NO

'No, I DID (go to university)'

*Doch* signals rejection of the previous proposition. It comes across as adversative because it is in fact the focalization of the truth of the proposition that has been denied in a previous speech act.<sup>4</sup> Something similar is found when *doch* appears as a clause linker.

(7) Klaus ist intelligent, doch er ist unmotiviert

Klaus is intelligent DOCH he is unmotivated

'Klaus is intelligent {but/however} he is unmotivated'

The second clause does not challenge the truth of the former as such but challenges one aspect of it, here the positive properties of Klaus. One can be both intelligent and unmotivated, but the latter property may hamper one's general success. Various authors have suggested that *doch* p corrects a salient q that entails p; see Abraham (1991), Doherty (1987), Grosz (2014), Karagjosova (2004), Ormelius-Sandblom (1997) and others.

Interestingly, we find in German *doch* also in a role that resembles *to* in its function as an anchor. It is a central property of German discourse particles that they have a clause-medial fixed posi-

---

<sup>4</sup> Thus, it would be worthwhile to explore to what extent there is a use of *doch* that relates it to the familiar notion of 'verum' focus, i.e., focusing the truth value.

tion from which they cannot be moved to the front or to the end of the clause.<sup>5</sup> *Doch* is such a particle. Imagine the following discourse (stress signaled by capitals):

(8) A: Ich fahre morgen ans Meer.

I go tomorrow to.the sea

‘I’ll go to the sea tomorrow’

B: Aber du musst doch ARbeiten!

but you must DOCH work

‘But don’t you have to work!?’

Here, B reminds A of something that A is supposed to know, namely that he or she has to go to work and therefore most likely cannot take a day off at the sea. One can observe that an adversative clause linker, namely *aber* (‘but’), introduces B’s utterance. Thus, *doch* cannot be identified with *aber*. It must by all means make an additional semantic contribution. It functions as a reminder that p (=A must go to work) is true and should be known to A. This is compatible with adversativity as already expressed by *aber*, but it adds a presupposition about the assumed mental state of the addressee. Interestingly, in this function, *doch* must remain in a fixed pre-VP position, and it must find a focused element in its scope, which in (8) is *arbeiten*. The alternative in (9a) lacks the ‘reminder’-meaning of the discourse particle. Notice that (9a) is fully grammatical but only with *doch* interpreted as an adversative clause linker. The reminder-components is definitely missing here. (9b) is downright ungrammatical.

(9) a. Doch du musst ARbeiten!

b. \*Aber du musst ARbeiten doch!

In its role as a discourse particle, *doch* is a functional element on a par with negation and other grammatical elements. Although it is not a clitic like Bangla *to*, it is not a phrasal element either. Various researchers have argued that it is a functional head.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> See Thurmair (1989) among various others.

<sup>6</sup> See Bayer (2018) and works mentioned there.

### 3. Semantics

As already indicated in Section 2, *to* and *doch* are semantically similar. We can distinguish the usage as a clause linker from the usage as a discourse particle. Obviously, both hang together as is especially clear in German *doch*.

#### 3.1 Clause linker

As a clause linker, the function of *doch* is like the logical connective  $\wedge$ , enriched with the property that the simultaneous truth of the propositions *p* and *q* that are linked with  $\wedge$  is unexpected, unusual etc.<sup>7</sup> This is the source of adversativity. In Bangla, one would use the connective *kintu* but not *to*.

- (10) dilip iSkule      jay {kintu/\*to} Sipra baRite thake  
Dilip school.loc go.3 but/then    Sipra home.loc stay.3  
'Dilip goes to school but Sipra stays at home'

#### 3.2 Discourse particle

In their usage as discourse particles, *doch* and *to* are quite similar. The clause linker meaning of *doch* reappears in its use as a discourse particle. Karagjosova (2004:183) suggests that in *doch* (*p*) the speaker's belief is that *p* is explicit but inactive common knowledge. To the extent that *p* is situationally relevant, this amounts to the implicature that the speaker has reason to believe that the hearer has 'forgotten' *p* and needs to be 'reminded' of it.

The Bangla clitic particle *to* has much in common with these characteristics. Again, the speaker assumes that *p* is known to the hearer, and that there is reason to believe that *p* is not in the hearer's focus of attention; *to* is then actually a signal to the hearer to acknowledge *p* and react in a way that is consistent with subscribing to the truth of *p*. This must be the reason why sentences

---

<sup>7</sup> This is the reason why weakly contrastable properties give rise to awkward interpretations as seen in ??*Mary is tall but intelligent*, ??*2+2=4 but 4-1=3*.

with *to* are often interpreted as quasi interrogatives. The addressee is expected to show that he or she acknowledges the truth of *p*. (5c), *dilip kal aSbe to* – is then interpreted in such a way that the speaker claims that *p* holds (*p* = Dilip will come tomorrow), that he assumes that the hearer already knows that *p* but that it is worthwhile to ask him to acknowledge that the truth of *p* should continue to be assumed. Of course, this brings the speech act quite close to the interrogative speech act that involves the enclitic interrogative particle *ki*. (11a) shows an explicit polar question; (11b) shows that the particle *ki* may be missing. The latter is possible if the question is a main clause with rising intonation.<sup>8</sup>

- (11) a. *dilip kal aSbe ki?*  
       Dilip tomorrow come.fut.3 Q  
       ‘Will Dilip come tomorrow?’  
    b. *dilip kal aSbe?* [with rising intonation]

#### 4. Information structure

When *to* is used as a discourse particle, it can be found in different places as has been shown in (5). In (5a), *dilip to kal aSbe*, the speaker wants the hearer to confirm that it is Dilip who will come tomorrow. In (5b), *dilip kal to aSbe*, the speaker wants the hearer to confirm that it is tomorrow that Dilip will come. The most straightforward syntactic solution says that *to* is a functional head. Functional heads do not float around in the clause. They hold a fixed position in the grid of other such positions in clause structure. Functional heads may give rise to a specifier position. Constituents which match the respective head in feature structure can move to its specifier position; *-to* can attract elements if they qualify a) as constituents in Bangla, and b) are drawn from a set of semantic competitors, say, Dilip in comparison with Hiren or Projit or Mukul, or tomorrow in comparison with next week or next month or next year. (5c) would then be the neutral form in which the entire proposition has been moved to the specifier of *to*. In this case, the

---

<sup>8</sup> Some researchers may assume that (11b) is equipped with a zero interrogative particle. I would hesitate to accept such a conclusion. One could in the same way argue that *dilip kal aSbe* is a *to* sentence with a zero particle corresponding to *to*. In my view it is more reasonable to assume that (11b) is syntactically a declarative clause that is pronounced with interrogative intonation as in English *You are married?* The declarative form is underspecified and as such receptive to specifications by intonation.



speaker assumes that *p* is common ground between himself and the hearer, and that it is worth reminding the hearer of *p*.<sup>9</sup> We see that, due to its clitic nature, *to* is able to express different pragmatically relevant focalizations.

The German particle *doch* seems to be a functional head but it is not a clitic; our assumption is that *doch* is generated in a pre-VP position and that VP-internal constituents may move out of the scope of *doch*.

- (12) a. Damals hat doch [dein Bruder] [dem Professor] [seine Dissertation] gezeigt.  
then has DOCH your brother.nom the professor.dat his dissertation.acc shown  
'In those days, your brother showed his dissertation to the professor, didn't he?'  
b. Damals hat [dein Bruder] doch \_\_ dem Professor seine Dissertation gezeigt.  
c. Damals hat [dein Bruder] [dem Professor] doch \_\_ \_\_ seine Dissertation gezeigt.  
d. Damals hat [dein Bruder] [dem Professor] [seine Dissertation] doch \_\_ \_\_ \_\_ gezeigt.

Given that VP is the natural place for focal information and that German allows reordering of arguments (known as 'scrambling'), different options emerge as to which constituent is highlighted by *doch*. In (12a), it is the entire proposition SHOW(*x,y,z*). Here the speaker invites the hearer for confirmation that this proposition is true. Once the subject has been scrambled out of VP, as in (12b), the proposition remains what it is; however, now confirmation is asked for showing the professor his dissertation; the subject is outside the focus domain. In (12d) we see that *doch* can scope over a VP all of whose arguments have been evacuated; only the verb remains. Here the speaker asks for confirmation about the predicate 'show' in comparison with competitors such as 'send' or 'take away' etc. We see that despite their syntactic differences, *to* and *doch* achieve very similar pragmatic effects by seemingly contrary means: While *to* attracts focal elements to its left, *doch* uses scrambling of non-focal so-called 'old information' elements in order to narrow down the domain in which it associates with a focal constituent.

---

<sup>9</sup> This is in a much-abbreviated form of what Bayer, Dasgupta, Mukhopadhyay & Ghosh (2014) have suggested.

## 5. Mood

Given what we have seen so far, it may not be too surprising to see that Bangla *to* and German *doch* attend to the same core restrictions on sentence mood. Both appear in declarative and imperative clauses, and they are strictly impossible in questions. Consider imperatives.

- (13) a. edike            eSo    to  
          this.direction come.2 TO  
          ‘Please come here!’
- b. Komm doch    her!  
          come.2 DOCH here (=toward the speaker)  
          ‘Please come here!’

In both cases, the use of the particle turns the imperative into a friendly invitation. The semantics is not as straightforward as in declaratives. Nevertheless, it may be possible to argue that the particle's adversative potential adds to the speech act in such a way that the speaker invites the hearer to make the underlying proposition true, and that he/she should do so in spite of reasons that may suggest otherwise.

Karagjosova (2004:169), who offers a formal speech-act theoretic account of *doch*, speaks of a *contrast between desire and reality*. The speaker's positive attitude seems to be the result of an enhanced effort to invite the addressee to act in the sense of making the underlying proposition true.

To the extent that verb-less or non-finite fragments of speech exist and are interpreted as imperatives, both Bangla and German show that their respective particles cannot be used in such constructions.<sup>10</sup> For German, see Gärtner (2017).

---

<sup>10</sup> As Jogamaya Bayer points out to me (p.c.), since Bangla is a zero copula language, (14a,b) can be interpreted as declarative sentences, in which case *to* does have a place.

(14)a. matha uMcu!

head up

‘Keep your head up!’

b. \*matha-to uMcu!

c. \*matha uMcu-to!

(15) a. Kopf hoch!

head up

‘Keep your head up!’

b. \*Kopf doch hoch!

(16)a. Alles aussteigen!

all out.step

‘Get all off (the vehicle)!’

b. \*Alles doch aussteigen!

Obviously, fragmentary imperatives of this sort lack functional vocabulary; if in their usage as discourse particle both Bangla *to* and German *doch* are a proper part of the respective language's functional vocabulary, these facts would follow straightforwardly.<sup>11</sup>

Interrogative sentences exclude *to/doch* in both languages.

---

<sup>11</sup>Gärtner (2017) shows that the picture is less than fully homogeneous. DiPs like *mal*, derived from *einmal* ‘once’, and *denn*, related to ‘then’, may appear in fragments.

(i) Alle mal herhören!

all MAL here.hear.inf

‘Everyone listen to me!’

(ii) Wozu denn hingehen?

wherefore DENN there.go.inf

‘Why go there?’

(17) Polar question

- a. tui ki aSbi? / tui aSbi ki?  
you Q come.2 / you come.2 Q  
'Will you come?'
- b. \*tui ki aSbi to? / \*tui aSbi to ki? / \*tui aSbi ki to

(18) a. tui kObe aSbi?

you when come.2  
'When will you come?'

- b. \*tui-to kObe aSbi? / \*tui kObe aSbi-to?

(19) Polar question

- a. Wirst du kommen?  
will.2 you come  
'Will you come?'
- b. \*Wirst du doch kommen?

(20) Constituent question

- a. Wann kommst du?  
when come.2 you  
'When will you come?'
- b. \*Wann kommst du doch?

Given that both particles have roughly the same semantic function, the ban of interrogatives is expected. Since the speaker desires information from the hearer, the true answer cannot be common ground between the interlocutors. As a consequence, the speaker cannot felicitously ask the hearer for confirmation of the underlying proposition.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Notice that not all *wh*-clauses are alike. There are for example *wh*-exclamatives of the style *What a shame!*, *How beautiful!* or *How good your son can already swim!* Here the proposition  $p = P(x)$ , e.g.,  $x$  can swim, is presupposed, and the new contribution is roughly that the speaker exclaims that property  $P$  holds to a surprising degree. German exclamatives of that kind permit *doch*.

Let me finally return to the question of whether the Bangla discourse particle *to*, which we have seen is incompatible with interrogative mood, may itself be a question particle. As such, *to* would be a competitor of *ki*. Intuitions appear to be a bit unreliable. As I said before, *to* sentences are often pronounced with the rising intonation that is typical for questions. Without doubt, *to* sentences can also be ‘answered’ by acknowledging or denying that *p* holds. Therefore, it is advisable to employ more formal testing. Such formal testing is provided by the use of negative polarity items (NPIs). We know that some NPIs are not only licensed by negation but also by interrogativity. As seen in (21), one such NPI is Bangla *ekTu-o* (‘little-even’).

- (21) dilip ki **ekTu-o** Sahajjo koreche?  
 Dilip KI little-even help do.past.3  
 ‘Did Dilip help at all?’

The question is whether the use of *to* provides a relevant NPI-licenser as well. If *to* is related to *ki* in the sense that it is also a source of interrogative force, it should. The result of my little research revealed that examples such as (22) are deviant.<sup>13</sup>

- 
- (i) Wie gut dein Sohn doch schon schwimmen kann!  
 how good your son DOCH already swim can

With *doch* the speaker reminds the hearer of the fact that his son is for his young age a very good swimmer. Interestingly, corresponding *wh*-exclamatives in Bangla like *tomar meye ki Sundor nacche!* (‘How beautifully your daughter is dancing!’) do not permit *to*, as pointed out to me by Probal Dasgupta and Jogamaya Bayer. I have no explanation for this discrepancy.

<sup>13</sup>Probal Dasgupta (p.c.) informs me that in Bangla NPIs may also be licensed by bare interrogative intonation. Unlike in various languages in which the NPI must be licensed by an overt lexeme or by a change in word order as is the case in inversion, (i) seems to be an option in Bangla.

- (i) dilip **ekTu-o** Sahajjo koreche?

If so, *to* may be added to such an interrogative clause in the sense of a tag. (ii), in fact, is possible if intoned with dripping sarcasm and ‘not *p*’ is strongly implicated.

- (ii) ora rakar almari theke EkTa-o gOena curi korte parbe to?  
 they Raka’s cupboard from one-even. ornament steal will be.able.FUT3 TO  
 ‘I bet they won’t be able to steal a single ornament from Raka’s cupboard!’

This analysis would not be available if *to* appears in clause-medial position. Importantly, the designated interrogative marker *ki* gives a licence to the NPI from a clause-medial position as well. Thus, the relevant difference between *ki* and *to* remains.

(22) \*dilip to **ekTu-o** Sahajjo koreche?  
Dilip TO little-even help do.past.3

In German questions, one can use the NPI *überhaupt* ('at all') among others as seen in (23a); non-inversion (alias failure of movement to C) as in (23b) leaves the NPI in limbo.

(23) a. Hast du überhaupt das Licht ausgeschaltet?  
have you at.all the light off.switched  
'Have you switched off the light at all?'  
b. \*Du hast überhaupt das Licht ausgeschaltet  
you have at.all the light off.switched

When we consider the particle *doch*, one could argue that it turns a declarative sentence into a request, which would make it indistinguishably similar to an interrogative. (24) would be a typical check-question for which an affirmative answer is strongly expected.<sup>14</sup>

(24) Du hast doch das Licht ausgeschaltet?  
you have DOCH the light off.switched  
'Have you switched off the light? I hope you have.'

In spite of this pragmatic nearness to real questions, such speech acts must not be confused with real questions. They can never licence an NPI. (25) is as deviant as a pure declarative such as (23b).

(25) \*Du hast doch überhaupt das Licht ausgeschaltet?  
you have DOCH at.all the light off.switched

Thus, to the extent that our comparison between Bangla *to* and German *doch* looks promising so far, the failure of NPI-licensing by *to* seems to converge with this result from German.

---

<sup>14</sup> See Karagjosova (2004: 175ff).

## 6. Islandhood

Particles like Bangla *to* and German *doch* are classical root clause phenomena. The reason must be that they tap into the epistemic system of the speaker and his/her evaluation of the common ground with the addressee. Thus, it is not sufficient for them to be hosted in a proposition; they must be hosted in a speech act that is formally typed according to the mood system of the language. Bangla is a good example for this generalization. According to my joint research with my colleague Probal Dasgupta, the discourse particles of Bangla can hardly ever be found in embedded clauses (clausal complements, relative clauses, adjunct clauses). Normally, if a particle like *to* is located in such an ‘island’, it cannot reach the domain of the root clause, which according to standard assumptions is privileged in being in possession of the grammatical layer in which illocutionary force is implemented.<sup>16</sup>

The situation in German is less clear. There are various particles that can arise in *bona fide* islands; *ja* (lit. ‘yes’) is a notorious example.<sup>17</sup> The situation with *doch* is clearer. It can arise in attributive but not in restrictive relative clauses; see (26a). The former are something like separate (‘parenthetical’) speech acts; the latter are not. *Doch* cannot arise in clausal complements unless they are in the scope of verbs of speaking and thus count as reported speech; this is seen in (26b).

- (26) a. Klaus/\*jeder, [der doch gerade in Indien ist], hat angerufen  
Klaus/everyone who DOCH right.now in India is has called  
‘Klaus/everyone who is right now in India has called’
- b. Jeder sagt/\*glaubt, [dass die Regierung doch versagt hat].  
everyone says/ believes that the government DOCH failed has  
‘Everyone says/believes that the government has failed’

---

<sup>16</sup> For influential early work see Hooper & Thompson (1973).

<sup>17</sup> Extensive work by Yvonne Viesel has explored the use of *ja*. See Viesel (2017) and her ongoing dissertation work.

Islandhood holds for most adjunct sentences. There is, however, an exception: reason clauses. Reason clauses that are initiated with *weil* in German and with *karon* in Bangla are certainly embedded clauses. But both of them can host the respective particles under discussion.

(27) Max geht jetzt ins Bett, [weil er doch morgen einen anstrengenden Tag hat]  
Max goes now in.the bed because he DOCH tomorrow a strenuous day has  
'Max goes to bed now because he will have a strenuous day tomorrow.'

(28)a. dilip aj khub SOkale uTheche [karon o to SOhor-e EkTa  
Dilip today very early rise.past.3 because he TO city-loc one.cl  
mEla dekhte jabe]  
fair see go.fut.3  
'Dilip got up early today because he will go to see a fair in the city.'

b. dilip aj khub SOkale utheche [karon o aj SOhore EkTa mEla dekhte jabe to]

According to Frey (2012), reason clauses belong to a class of what he calls 'Peripheral Adverbial Clauses' (PACs). These clauses show signs of 'non-integration'. Unlike integrated adverbial clauses, PACs seem to have their own illocutionary force. Since they are nevertheless dependent clauses, their force depends on and is in the responsibility of the speaker who utters the root clause. For detailed discussion see Haegeman (2012). It would be worth exploring to what extent Bangla *to* is licit in other clause types that have been subsumed under the PAC-generalization, and to what extent other tests concerning the theoretical isolation of PACs could be applied to Bangla. Following this line of research would, however, be beyond the scope of the present contribution.

## 7. Conclusion

The comparative exploration of the particles *to* and *doch* in Bangla and German, respectively, revealed a surprising convergence in terms of their syntactic and semantic/pragmatic properties.



This convergence may be due to linguistic universality or to large-scale parametric properties. If so, we would expect to find more languages, and in particular also genetically unrelated languages, with similar lexical elements in the service of similar functions and distributions. Given that little attention has so far been paid to ‘little words’ with ‘fuzzy meaning’, such findings could indeed be possible. The other expectation would be that the two elements under discussion emerge in a more narrow sense from a common Indo-European ancestral language. Their phonetic similarity and the few historical records we have access to suggest that this possibility exists. If so, it would be worthwhile to explore more deeply whether the features that are shared by Bangla *to* and German *doch* could indeed have survived in a history of 2000 years or so.

### **Acknowledgments**

Thanks to Jogamaya Bayer for sharing her intuitions about Bangla, to Heinrich Hettrich, Rosemarie Lühr and Paul Kiparsky for useful historical information and especially to Probal Dasgupta for joint research and discussions of Bangla grammar, as well as to Sibansu Mukhopadhyay for compiling a corpus of Bangla sentences with *to*.

A previous version of this article appeared in a web-publication in honor of Angelika Kratzer, s. file:///C:/Users/user/Documents/papers/doch%20&%20to/doch%20&%20to/'A%20Comparative%20Note%20on%20the%20Bangla%20Particle%20'to'\_A.Kratzer%20Festsite.html

## References

- Abraham, Werner. 1991. Discourse particles in German: How does their illocutive force come about? In *Discourse Particles*. Ed. by W. Abraham. 203-252. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bayer, Josef. 2018. Criterial freezing in the syntax of particles. In *Freezing: Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Domains*. Eds. by J. Hartmann, M. Jäger, A. Kehl, A. Konietzko & S. Winkler. 225-263. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bayer, Josef, Probal Dasgupta, Sibansu Mukhopadhyay & Rajat Ghosh. 2014. Functional Structure and the Bangla Discourse Particle ‘to’. Talk at SALA 30, Hyderabad, 06-08 February 2014.
- Dasgupta, Probal. 1984. Bangla emphasizees and anchors. *Indian Linguistics* 45. 102-117.
- Dasgupta, Probal. 1987. Sentence particles in Bangla. In *Selected Papers from SALA 7*. Eds. by E. Bashir, M. Deshpande & P. Hook, 49-75. Distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Doherty, Monika. 1987. *Epistemic Meaning*. Berlin: Springer.
- Dunkel, George E. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Frey, Werner. 2012. On two types of adverbial clauses allowing root-phenomena. In *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons*. 405-430. Eds. by L. Aelbrecht, L. Haegeman & R. Nye. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.

- Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2017. Root infinitivals and modal particles. An interim report. In *The Formal Syntax and Semantics of Discourse Particles*. 115-143. Eds. by J. Bayer & V. Struckmeier. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter.
- Grosz, Patrick. 2014. German doch: An Element that Triggers a Contrast Presupposition. *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. 163-177.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2012. *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and Composition of the Left Periphery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hooper Joan & Sandra Thompson. 1973. On the Applicability of Root Transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4. 465-497
- Karagjosova, Elena. 2004. *The Meaning and Function of German Modal Particles*. Ph.D. thesis, Universität des Saarlandes.
- Kluge, Friedrich. 2011. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Lakshmi Bai, B. 1977. Syntax and semantics of the particle to in Hindi. *Osmania Papers in Linguistics* 3. 64-75.
- Lühr, Rosemarie. 1976. Die Wörter für 'oder' in den germanischen Sprachen. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 34. 77-94.
- Montaut, Annie. 2016 The discourse particle *to* and word ordering in Hindi: From grammar to discourse. In *Information Structuring in Spoken Languages from a Cross-linguistic Perspective*. 263-282. Eds. by M. Fernandez-Vest, M. Jocelyne & R. D. Van Valin. Berlin: de Gruyter.

- Ormelius-Sandblom, Elisabet. 1997. *Die Modalpartikeln ja, doch und schon. Zu ihrer Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1988. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sen, Sukumar. 1971. *An Etymological Dictionary of Bengali: c. 1000-1800 ad*. 2 vols. Calcutta: Eastern.
- Thurmair, Maria. 1989. *Modalpartikeln und ihre Kombinationen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Viesel, Yvonne. 2017. Discourse particles ‘embedded’: German *ja* in adjectival phrases. In *The Formal Syntax and Semantics of Discourse Particles*. 173-202. Eds. by J. Bayer & V. Struckmeier. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter.