

Annual Review of South Asian Languages and Linguistics
2008



Trends in Linguistics

Studies and Monographs 209

Editors

Walter Bisang

Hans Henrich Hock

(main editor for this volume)

Werner Winter

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Annual Review of South Asian Languages and Linguistics

2008

edited by

Rajendra Singh

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin.

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines
of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

ISBN 978-3-11-020829-0

ISSN 1861-4302

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© Copyright 2008 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this
book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechan-
ical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, with-
out permission in writing from the publisher.

Cover design: Christopher Schneider, Laufen.

Typesetting: Asco Typesetters, Hong Kong.

Printed in Germany.

Contents

Editorial preface	vii
-------------------------	-----

General Contributions

Transparency and arbitrariness in Natural Language: Some empirical issues	3
<i>Probal Dasgupta</i>	
Reduplication and ‘echo words’ in Hindi/Urdu.....	21
<i>Annie Montaut</i>	
No smoke without fire: Invisible agent constructions in South Asian languages.....	63
<i>Prashant Pardeshi</i>	
A pragmatic account of the Hindi presumptive	83
<i>Ghanshyam Sharma</i>	

Special Contributions: *The Syntactic Typology of Dravidian: A Debate*

What’s so subversive about Dravidian? Revisiting finiteness in Dravidian syntax	117
<i>Sanford B. Steever</i>	
Dravidian syntactic typology: A reply to Steever	163
<i>Hans Henrich Hock</i>	

Regional Reports

North America	201
<i>Tej K. Bhatia</i>	
Linguistic publications in Bengali (2000–2008): A brief review	217
<i>Niladri Sekhar Dash</i>	

South Africa	237
<i>Rajend Mesthrie</i>	

Linguistic publications in Punjabi (2000–2008): A brief survey	243
<i>Joga Singh</i>	

Reviews

<i>Gregory D. S. Anderson</i> – The Munda verb: Typological perspective ...	265
by <i>Ayesha Kidwai</i>	

<i>Joseph Bayer, Tanmoy Bhattacharya and M. T. Hany Babu (eds.)</i> – Linguistic theory and South Asian languages: Essays in honour of K. A. Jayaseelan	273
by <i>Anjum P. Saleemi</i>	

<i>Colin P. Masica (ed.)</i> – Old and new perspectives on South Asian languages: Grammar and semantics	280
by <i>Ashwini Deo</i>	

<i>Ghanshyam Sharma</i> – Il dizionario di Hindi: Dizionario Hindi-Italiano, Italiano-Hindi	288
by <i>Alice Davison</i>	

Dialogue

Bengali Determiner Phrase revisited: A response to Dasgupta and Ghosh	295
by <i>Shishir Bhattacharja</i>	

The study of ‘Indian English’: What is it good for?	307
by <i>Lionel Wee</i>	

Appendices

Announcements: The Gyandeepr prize/Housekeeping	321
Notes on contributors	323

Editorial Preface

Annual Review of South Asian Languages and Linguistics (ARSALL) is devoted to bringing out what is currently being explored in South Asian linguistics and in the study of South Asian languages in general. South Asia is home to a wide variety of languages, structurally and typologically quite diverse, and has often served as a catalyst and testing ground for theories of various kinds.

Although linguists working on South Asia have made significant contributions to our understanding of language, society, and language in society, and their numbers have grown considerably in the recent past, until recently there was no internationally recognized forum for the exchange of ideas amongst them or for the articulation of new ideas and approaches grounded in the study of South Asian languages. *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, of which this annual is a direct descendant, played that role during the last decade, but in 2007 we decided to go a bit further and incorporate a slightly modified form of such a forum into *Trends in Linguistics*. This is the second issue of *ARSALL* as part of the series *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs*.

Each volume of this annual has five major sections:

- i. **General Contributions**, consisting of selected open submissions that focus on important themes and provide various viewpoints.
- ii. **Special Contributions**, consisting of inter-related or easily relatable, invited contributions on important issues, ranging from the narrowly grammatical to the wide-scope socio-linguistic/socio-political. This section will in effect constitute a mini-symposium, albeit in the written form, on the issue chosen for a given year. It will serve the function of familiarizing the reader with current thinking on issues seen as salient in the study of South Asian languages.
- iii. **Reports**, consisting of reports from around the world on research on South Asian languages.

- iv. **Reviews and Abstracts**, consisting of reviews of important books and monographs and abstracts of doctoral theses.
- v. **Dialogue**, consisting of a forum for the discussion of earlier work, preferably previously published in this annual, comments, reports on research activities, and conference announcements.

Other than excellence and non-isolationism, *ARSALL* has no theoretical agenda and no thematic priorities.

The first, general section of this, the second, issue of *ARSALL* contains four contributions: Dasgupta's *Transparency and Arbitrariness in Natural Language*, Montaut's *Reduplication and Echo Words in Hindi/Urdu*, Parde-shi's *Invisible Agent Constructions in South Asian Languages*, and Sharma's *A Pragmatic Account of the Hindi Presumptive*.

The Special Contributions section is dedicated to a debate (between Sanford Steever and Hans Henrich Hock) on the syntactic typology of Dravidian.

As North America, like Europe, continues to be a major center for the study of South Asian languages, we thought it was appropriate to have our Regional Reports section publish a report on North American research on South Asian languages in this issue of *ARSLL*. The first issue, readers may recall, contained a report on European research on South Asian languages. It also contains a report from South Africa and, following the tradition inaugurated in the 2004 issue of *The Yearbook*, reports on recent linguistic publications in two South Asian languages, Bangla (Dash) and Punjabi (Singh).

The Review section of this issue contains reviews of Anderson's recent important book on the Munda verb, Bayer et al's *Festschrift* for Jayaseelan, Masica's Old and new perspectives on South Asian languages, and Sharma's Italian-Hindi-Italian dictionary. These have been written by Kidwai of J.N.U., Delhi, Saleemi of G.C.U., Lahore, Deo of Yale, and Davison of the University of Iowa.

I am particularly happy to note that the Dialogue section of this issue contains responses to two pieces in *ARSALL-2007*. These contributions establish that *ARSALL* has in fact become the forum I wanted it to be.

I am grateful to Dr. Ursula Kleinhenz and Wolfgang Konwitschny of Mouton de Gruyter and Dr. Shishir Bhattacharja of the University of Dhaka for help far beyond the call of duty in the preparation of this issue.

Rajendra Singh

General Contributions

Transparency and Arbitrariness in Natural Language: Some Empirical Issues

Probal Dasgupta

The distinction between nonarbitrariness and transparency has seldom been brought to bear on empirical issues. On the basis of noun phrase data from Bangla (Bengali), the present study, working in the substantivist framework, argues that – faced with a gap in the paradigm (definite human nominals cannot mimic the inanimate definiteness format) – Bangla throws up a minimally arbitrary language-particular format as well as a UG-inspired transparent format to fill the gap. Neither of these blocks the other, suggesting that non-arbitrariness must be distinguished from transparency – and associated with a discourse-focused social science of language and a grammar-focused natural science of language, respectively.

1. Preliminaries

Linguists expect to deal with general patterns in the grammar and with special facts in the lexicon. This expectation does not translate at once into strategies for the proper allocation of grammatical and lexical descriptive resources. On the way to such strategies, we may usefully examine the concepts of transparency and arbitrariness. The present discussion focuses on the conceptual level, in dialogue with empirical material; some earlier writings on these issues were discussed – on the basis of proposals close to those articulated here – by Dasgupta, Ford and Singh (2000: chapter 1).

In the abstract context of linguistic theory, simple signs such as French *chien* ‘dog’ or Bangla (a.k.a. Bengali) *kukur* ‘dog’ are termed “arbitrary” because no biological or other foundation underwrites their concrete forms. Sliding from the “they are ungrounded” version to the “they constitute the ground” version of this doctrine, some linguists view *kukur* as unmotivated, as carrying no clues, while the “relatively motivated” *kukurer* ‘dog’s’ invites comparison with *kukur* ‘dog’, *beRaler* ‘cat’s’ and *beRal* ‘cat’. In such a perspective, arbitrariness and motivation count as natural opposites.

What awaits serious articulation is the relation between “arbitrary/ motivated” and the distinct concept pair “transparent/ opaque”. Transparency refers to the undistorted compositionality of an utterance. A construction is compositional if no opaque barrier within it (such as a world-creating predicate or modal operator) distorts or fragments the cumulation of part-interpretations assembling the interpretation of the whole.

The view that relatively motivated signs like *kukurer* ‘dog’s’ must count as composite signs may lead its proponents to fuse the two concept pairs as follows. A language is anchored in a basic vocabulary consisting of simple (entirely arbitrary/ unmotivated) signs. Every relatively motivated sign is a composite sign, a construction composed of simple or composite signs. The patterns of the composition phenomena of a language are exhaustively describable in terms of rules. Rules specify opacity factor effects where necessary and implement transparent compositionality elsewhere. Rules and phenomena pattern in principled ways that often lend themselves to maximally general description and, at higher levels of analysis, to explanation and more.

We shall use the term “formalist linguistics” for work done on the basis of the package just outlined or of views closely resembling these. The substantivist alternative developed in Dasgupta, Ford & Singh (2000), Dasgupta (1993, forthcoming) and related writings approaches language phenomena in terms of a non-structuralist UG (universal grammar) account of the human language faculty and a non-ethnographizing historical characterization of the human capacity for society. The generalities of a macrolinguistic social science and those of a microlinguistic psychological science meet at the specifically patterned phenomena of language. Substantivist studies systematically co-articulate these patterns with grammar’s maximization of transparency and with the social dimension’s traffic of arbitrariness. The goal of the present study is to contextualize the notions of transparency and arbitrariness in this enterprise.

The formalist fusion of relative motivatedness and relative transparency creates something in the nature of a paradox; bringing substantivist considerations to bear on this issue may help open the domain up for further inquiry. A formalist should a priori expect all relatively motivated forms to be equally easy to learn, since composition comes for free in UG. However, forms exhibiting more and more structure, though this brings with it an increase in motivatedness, actually become harder, not easier, for L1 acquisition in childhood or L2 acquisition in adult life. We shall approach the

matter by first presenting some substantivist considerations about relative difficulty without reference to arbitrariness or transparency. On that basis, we return to these conceptual issues, and, in section 2, we bring some empirical material to bear on the discussion.

Relative difficulty distinguishing the subregions of a person's knowledge of language pertains to issues of heterogeneous access to one's cognition. The overall framework of substantivist linguistics has been developing a distinctive emphasis on cognitive heterogeneity ever since the earliest careful proposals of this type emerged in the seventies. Substantivism can be usefully construed as a family of responses to Tesnière's Problem. While no passage in Tesnière 1959 articulates it directly, the strand of inquiry that runs through his text invites the following formulation: "What grammatical and lexical principles, in general and in particular, underwrite the linguistic equivalence between certain compact expressions such as *nagaram* in Sanskrit and certain diffuse expressions like *to the city* in English?"

Following Tesnière, substantivists use translation as the fundamental analytic metaphor to tackle a family of questions built around this one. Furthermore, again following Tesnière, interlexical research in the substantivist framework uses Esperanto as the medium of lexical content representation; for justification and discussion, see Dasgupta 2007. The central proposal of substantivism is that a linguistic representation constitutively involves simultaneous multiple characterizations. Relations of translation intuitively validated by relevant speakers hold between these co-characterizations. Only some of these relations – a class to be empirically delineated – lend themselves to formally exact description.

To understand the point of such a perspective not just for obvious grammar-society interface phenomena or for cross-language alignment studies but within linguistics proper, consider the multiple genitive problem in English. Speakers can say and understand *the consequences of the destruction of the city* and *the consequences of the city's destruction*, but not *the city's destruction's consequences*. However, formalist methods standard in linguistics – that treat a phrase structure representation, say, as amenable to separate validation independent of its translation relations with the entity's other representations – leave us with an unhelpful competence-performance binary. Formalist assumptions force us to attribute the asymmetry either to the grammar – offering a formal derivation of the asterisk on **the city's destruction's consequences* – or to some performance factor, discoverable through psycholinguistic ingenuity.

In contrast, a substantivist expects to be able to deal with the contrast between ill-formed nominals like *the city's destruction's consequences* and such acceptable cases as *John's father's brother's wife* in terms of specific properties of the words *father*, *brother*, *wife* contrasting with those of *city*, *destruction*, *consequence*, which make *the city's destruction's consequences* count as so hard that one cannot say it. Words, in the substantivist visualization of a lexicon/ encyclopaedia, count simultaneously as lexical entries interacting with the grammar in microlinguistics and as encyclopaedic entries anchored in discourse or macrolinguistics – another case of translation managing co-characterizations. To return to English multiple genitives, substantivist preferences lead us to seek a solution that includes a psycholinguistic account based on the properties of the sets of words, a lexico-grammatical description, and a translation connecting the two analyses.

To summarize, formalism's strategy is to look for a grammatical answer that will trivialize the psycholinguistics, or as a second choice to find a psycholinguistic account that removes the problem from the grammar. But such elimination procedures strike substantivists as missing the point. The guiding intuition of substantivism is that A and B (here psycholinguistics and grammar) get to share the work, and translation oversees the sharing.

Within this framework visualizing language in terms of grammatically and discursively co-specified cognition, substantivists deploy particular resources for the study of the differential accessibility of subregions of such knowledge – one example of cognitive heterogeneity. Translation can gloss *necessitarianistically* as 'in a necessitarianistic way' (inexactly, for this is a feature of lexical glossing), *necessitarianistic* as 'typical of necessitarians', *necessitarian* as 'someone who believes in necessity', and *necessity* as 'the quality of being necessary'. The weight of these glosses marks *necessitarianistically* as more difficult than *happily*.

The logic of glosses leads substantivism in a direction quite distinct from the logic of morphemic decomposition, which in one version or another inspires formalists, and for which even *happy* counts as bimorphemic, given that *hapless* and *happy* subtend an imaginary noun *hap*! This example stands in for a thousand words stating just why, for the morphology module, substantivism adopts WWM, Whole Word Morphology, as articulated in Ford, Singh & Martohardjono 1997 and Singh & Starosta 2003. Substantivists have no doctrinal reason to doubt that *happy* is a maximally accessible word needing no gloss.

The substantivist study of relative difficulty as an instance of cognitive heterogeneity goes back to the marked-unmarked distinction. Access to unmarked defaults is costless. In contrast, the action of producing or comprehending a marked item involves some computational cost for the mind. It is this notion of access cost (a familiar, if insufficiently understood, aspect of the theory of markedness) that enables us to state that *necessitarianistically* is in general harder to say and to understand than the word *happily*, or that *Who does John say Sue thinks Tom believes Jane will marry* is in general less accessible, for production or comprehension, than the sentence *Who does Tom believe Jane will marry*. Does the substantivist story about these sentences mimic the one about words, though?

The concrete procedures of translation that help construct substantivist descriptions of relative difficulty are varied; lexical glossing is only one of them. The choice of implementations flows from the conceptualization of the modules and their interrelations, a domain where substantivist inquiry has been assembling a richer set of questions than Tesnière had access to.

For instance, commenting on the morphology-syntax boundary, one text embodying the decision to adopt WWM as substantivism's characterization of morphology – Dasgupta, Ford & Singh (2000) – makes the constitutive point that there is no syntaxless, infinitely compact language (not even among the polysynthetic languages) that makes every utterance take the form of a polysynthetic megaword. Turning to the syntax-discourse boundary, we may add that there is no discourseless, infinitely syntactic language – not even among those who read Proust with pleasure – that makes multi-sentential discourses vanish and invariably turns each text into one huge sentence. For a closer look at the crucial role of discourse as a site of multiple validation in the earliest articulation of substantivism by Bhartrihari as a counterpoint to Panini's formalism, see Dasgupta (2008). Beyond these points of entry lie certain noteworthy aspects of the syntax-discourse interface that the methods of substantivism compel us to place on the agenda. Here is one example.

Imagine a language *Z* in which the sentence embedding system distinguishes once-embedders, like the particle *that* in *John knows that Susan is coming*, an example of single embedding, from twice-embedders, such as the particle *ZRAT* in the double embedding example *John knows that Bill thinks ZRAT Susan is coming*, and even from thrice-embedders, such as the particle *SHRAT* in the triple embedding case *Tony says that John knows ZRAT Bill thinks SHRAT Susan is coming*.

Now, note that languages such as Z do not exist. All known embedding devices are once-embedders. The substantivist response to this fact is to propose that syntax on its own handles only single embedding; all multiple embedding is jointly managed by syntax and discourse. One way to execute this proposal is a bimodular “Recompose” operation that, given *John knows this* and *Bill thinks that Susan is coming* as input, yields the syntactic object *John knows that Bill thinks that Susan is coming* plus a specified translation relation with the input sentence pair. On such a view, every case of multiple embedding counts as translated – not glossed in the lexical sense – and thus as computably more difficult than sentences lacking such structure.

If we need a sophisticated account of relative difficulty anyway, and specific apparatus for such modules as morphology, syntax and discourse, then the way ahead is to deploy particular devices diversifying what had once been seen as a single, homogeneous type of work – the work that the classical theory of relative motivation was designed to do. The arbitrary as a whole, the socially conventionalized lexical and encyclopaedic knowledge that a child cannot innately inherit and that varies across societies, engages in intricate and differentiated kinds of interplay with linguistic principles. As is suggested in Dasgupta (forthcoming), the macrolinguistic social science of what we are here calling “arbitrary” material and the microlinguistic psychological (natural) science focused on “transparency” manage their interface at the lexicon, which abbreviates the social encyclopaedia and at the same time encapsulates the grammar.

To give a brief example of what the interplay looks like in real linguistics, consider the unacceptable German sentence **Es wurde heute von Pradip nicht gestorben* ‘*It was not died by Pradip today’ and its acceptable Bangla counterpart *prodiper aj mOra holo na* (literally an impersonal passive translating the German sentence, but conveying the sense of ‘Pradip did not get around to dying today’). A substantivist account of such material stresses the option of claiming that UG bans impersonal passives for agentless, truly unaccusative verbs, but that societies attribute agency variably. One is then able to conjecture that discourse-nourished encyclopaedic knowledge makes it easy for speakers of Bangla at least in the ad hoc space of a particular conversation to construe ‘dying’ as an action by an agent, while the social/ discursive background of conversations in German make such a construal far-fetched or unavailable.

It is of course more helpful to develop these ideas in the context of an extended example. Bangla offers two domains of interest to choose from;

for the domain of classification format phenomena, taken up in section 2, this study proposes that a transparent UG stop-gap coexists with a language particular alternative, creating a problem for formalistic accounts based on an absolutized notion of blocking. Another domain – affective context cognate object nominalizations – is considered in Dasgupta (2006), where it is argued that the Word Formation Strategy that cognate object nominalizations encourage us to postulate shows that the demarcation of the lexicon/ grammar boundary must be based on the notion of transparency rather than arbitrariness.

2. Classification formats in Bangla

We begin with some elementary facts about Bangla nominals. Bangla displays noun classification phenomena often described in terms of ‘classifiers’ – which would be a fair description for languages like Bahasa Indonesia, where such a typical expression as *tiga ekor gajah*, literally ‘three tail elephant’, for ‘three elephants’, does use a clearly independent classifier word *ekor* (lit. ‘tail’). The relevant phenomena in Bangla, however, as the following examples involving numerals indicate, invite description in terms of classification formats, not distinct ‘classifiers’, to rehearse a point made in more detail by Dasgupta & Ghosh (2007):

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------|
| (1) | a. | <i>EkTa</i> | <i>meye</i> | <i>jabe.</i> | b. | <i>Ekjon</i> | <i>meye</i> | <i>jabe.</i> |
| | | one.Gnl | girl | go.Fut | | one.Hum | girl | go.Fut |
| | | ‘One girl will go.’ | | | | ‘One girl will go.’ | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| (2) | a. | <i>duTo</i> | <i>meye</i> | <i>jabe.</i> | b. | <i>dujon</i> | <i>meye</i> | <i>jabe.</i> |
| | | two.Gnl | girl | go.Fut | | two.Hum | girl | go.Fut |
| | | ‘Two girls will go.’ | | | | ‘Two girls will go.’ | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| (3) | a. | <i>duTo</i> | <i>ghOr</i> | <i>khali</i> | <i>ache.</i> | | | |
| | | two.Gnl | room | vacant | Cop | | | |
| | | ‘Two rooms are vacant.’ | | | | | | |
| | b. | <i>*dujon</i> | <i>ghOr</i> | | | | | |
| | | two.Hum | room | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| (4) | a. | <i>*duTo</i> | <i>bhOdromohila</i> | | | | | |
| | | two.Gnl | lady | | | | | |

- b. *dujon* *bhOdromohila* *jaben*.
 two.Hum lady go.Fut.Hon
 ‘Two ladies will go.’

The noun *meye* ‘girl’ can occur in Bangla either with a “general” numeral such as *EkTa* ‘one.Gnl’, *duTo* ‘two.Gnl’, or with a “human” numeral such as *Ekjon* ‘one.Hum’, *dujon* ‘two.Hum’. Some nouns are more selective. Thus, *ghOr* ‘room’ cannot take a “human” numeral, hence the starred status of (3b). In contrast, *bhOdromohila* ‘lady’ never occurs with a “general” numeral, which is why (4a) is ill-formed. A detail that will matter later in the discussion appears at the verb: the honorific future form *jaben* ‘will go’ at (4b) contrasts with the non-honorific *jabe* in (1) and (2).

Classification formats are also available at Det, as in (5), or N, as in (6) (the glosses “NuanIndiv” and “NuanColl”, for nuanced individuation and nuanced collectivity, label poorly understood feature matrices):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(5) a. <i>konTa</i>
 which.Gnl
 ‘which one?’</p> <p>c. <i>konkhana</i>
 which.Inan
 ‘which one?’ (inanimate)</p> <p>e. <i>konTi</i>
 which.NuanIndiv
 ‘which one?’</p> | <p>b. <i>konjon</i>
 which.Hum
 ‘which one?’</p> <p>d. <i>kongulo</i>
 which.Coll
 ‘which ones?’</p> <p>f. <i>konguli</i>
 which.NuanColl
 ‘which ones?’</p> |
|---|--|
- (6) *ei* *meyeTa*
 this girl.Gnl
 ‘this girl’

N and Det cannot, however, compete with Numerals and other Quantifiers as far as classificatory richness is concerned:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(7) a. <i>EkTa</i> <i>deyal</i>
 one.Gnl wall
 ‘a wall’</p> | <p>b. <i>Ekjon</i> <i>bhOdrolok</i>
 one.Hum gentleman
 ‘a gentleman’</p> |
|--|---|

- | | |
|---|---|
| c. <i>Ekkhana camoc</i>
one.Inan spoon
‘a spoon’ | d. <i>kOtokgulo ciruni</i>
couple.Coll comb
‘a couple of combs’ |
| e. <i>kOyekTi gan</i>
a.few.NuanIndiv song
‘a few songs’ | f. <i>Onekguli gan</i>
many.NuanColl song
‘many songs’ |
| g. <i>EtoTuku ca</i>
this.much.Dimin tea
‘so little tea’ | h. <i>Ekgacha laThi</i>
one.Quirky stick
‘a (walking) stick’ |
| i. <i>EkpaTi juto</i>
one.Quirky shoe
‘a shoe’ | j. <i>Onekkhani SomOy</i>
much.Expanse time
‘a lot of time’ |
| k. <i>EtoTa kOfi</i>
this.much.Extent coffee
‘so much coffee’ | |

Det does not appear in such forms as **kongacha*, **konpaTi*, **konkhani* ‘which.Quirky, which.Quirky, which.Expanse’ (where “Quirky” signals the extremely specialized lexical selection associating certain classification formats with certain nouns) and cannot switch on the ‘Extent’ meaning to make *konTa* mean ‘what quantity’ along the lines of (7k).

This exercise helps us to choose between a ‘classifier morpheme’ view of the matter and the WWM approach on empirical grounds. A morpheme-based analysis must assign clear and distinct feature compositions separately to a Det/ Num/ Q/ N base and to a Classifier affix morpheme. We have shown elsewhere (Dasgupta, in press) that even the simple grouping of the common ‘Classifier morphs’ into ‘Classifier morphemes’ is an unfeasible project. No proposal postulating morphemes like *Ta*, *Ti*, *gulo*, *guli* can achieve coherence in the face of the facts considered in Dasgupta (in press). It is argued in Dasgupta & Ghosh (2007) that the segmentability assumption accepted in Dasgupta (in press) for argument’s sake, that a ‘Classifier morph’ can be separated from a ‘base’ in featural terms, is unsustainable.

While we do not have the space to rehearse those arguments here, it is important to look at the classification formats a noun can exhibit in order to mark definite/specific readings (specific with a demonstrative and definite elsewhere), now that we have agreed not to recognize a classifier affix. No noun appears in a human /Xjon/ format, as shown in (8), but the /XTa/

format is widely used for singulars and /Xgulo/ for plurals, see (9), while /Xkhana/ marks inanimate singulars, as in (10):

- (8) a. **meyejon*
girl.Hum
'the girl'
- b. **bhOdromohilajon*
lady.Hum
'the lady'
- c. **upacarjojon*
vice-chancellor.Hum
'the vice-chancellor'
- (9) a. *meyeTa*, **meyekhana*
girl.Gnl, *girl.Inan
'the girl'
- b. *meyegulo*
girl.Coll
'the girls'
- c. *ei meyeTa*
this girl.Gnl
'this girl'
- d. *ei meyegulo*
this girl.Coll
'these girls'
- (10) a. *camocTa*, *camockhana*
spoon.Gnl, spoon.Inan
'the spoon'
- b. *camocgulo*
spoon.Coll
'the spoons'
- c. *ei camocTa/ camockhana*
this spoon.Gnl/ spoon.Inan
'this spoon'
- d. *ei camocgulo*
this spoon.Coll
'these spoons'
- e. *DimTa*, *Dimkhana*
egg.Gnl, egg.Inan
'the egg'
- f. *Dimgulo*
egg.Coll
'the eggs'
- g. *ei DimTa/ Dimkhana*
this egg.Gnl/ egg.Inan
'this egg'
- h. *ei Dimgulo*
this egg.Coll
'these eggs'

The interaction between classification format exponence and the noun, the numeral/ quantifier and the determiner is not the focus of the present study; one account of the traffic is provided in Dasgupta & Ghosh (2007). Suffice it to say that a given Bangla nominal structure carries classification features only at one of the three possible sites Det, Num and N. The richest set of formatting options is available at the numeral or quantifier, clearly this phenomenon's centre of gravity in the nominal syntagm.

We turn now to issues related to the way verbs agree with nominals on the honorificity axis, a point briefly touched upon in the context of (4b).

The phrase ‘these five students’ translates two distinct Bangla phrases:

- (11) a. *ei paMcjon chatro* b. *ei paMcTa chatro*
 this five.Hum student this five.Gnl student

The numeral *paMcjon* in (11a), positively specified for a Human feature, contrasts with (11b)’s numeral *paMcTa*, whose feature composition is as general as a numeral will allow it to be. Numerals appear either skeletally, when we count *Ek dui tin car paMc* ‘one two three four five’, or in this format that carries classification features. The present analysis describes (11a,b) in terms of Word Formation Strategies (see Dasgupta & Ghosh 2007 for details omitted here). The relevant strategies can be stated as (12) and (13):

- (12) WFS for Human Numerals
 $[X]_{\text{Num}} \leftrightarrow [X\text{jon}]_{\text{Num, Cla, Hum}}$

- (13) WFS for General Numerals
 $[X]_{\text{Num}} \leftrightarrow [X\text{Ta}]_{\text{Num, Cla, Gnl}}$

Bangla verbs agree with their subject for Person and Honorificity. While a pronoun, as in (14), must formally commit itself to an Honorificity value (Intimate, nonHon, or Hon), a noun is, within limits, free to refer to individuals of varying degrees of honour, as shown in (15):

- (14) ‘You will go tomorrow’, three variants:

- a. *tui kal jabi.*
 you.Intim tomorrow go.Fut.Intim
 b. *tumi kal jabe.*
 you.nHon tomorrow go.Fut.nHon
 c. *apni kal jaben.*
 you.Hon tomorrow go.Fut.Hon

- (15) ‘My student will go tomorrow’, two variants:

- a. *amar chatro kal jabe.*
 my student tomorrow go.Fut.3p.nHon

- b. *amar chatro kal jaben.*
 my student tomorrow go.Fut.Hon

Grammatically, any noun can take either Hon or nonHon agreement. When the noun means ‘baby’ or ‘goat’, Hon agreement signals irony. If the noun means ‘president’ or ‘queen’, nonHon agreement indicates a speaker’s intention of expressing disrespect. Such deviations do not jeopardize grammaticality. Pronouns, however, are committed to a specific feature value and insist on appropriate agreement. If this requirement is not met, the results are neither ironic nor disrespectful, but sharply ungrammatical – compare (14) with the following:

- (16) **tumi kal jaben.*
 you.nHon tomorrow go.Fut.Hon

- (17) **apni kal jabe.*
 you.Hon tomorrow go.Fut.nHon

Particular nouns have no lexically specified absolute Hon values. Formally the freely assigned Hon value a given nominal phrase carries triggers agreement. Does the noun control this Hon value?

- (18) a. *ei paMcjon chatro kal jabe.*
 this five.Hum student tomorrow go.Fut.3p.nHon
 b. *ei paMcjon chatro kal jaben.*
 this five.Hum student tomorrow go.Fut.3p.Hon
 ‘These five students will go tomorrow.’

- (19) a. *ei paMcTa chatro kal jabe.*
 this five.Gnl student tomorrow go.Fut.3p.nHon
 ‘These five students will go tomorrow.’
 b. **ei paMcTa chatro kal jaben.*
 this five.Gnl student tomorrow go.Fut.3p.Hon

Human classification features carried by the numeral are compatible with both nonHon and Hon agreement, we find at (18a,b). But (19) shows that a General numeral triggers nonHon agreement, sharply excluding Hon.

What form should the proper description of this contrast take? This question represents one aspect of the Bangla Honorificity Agreement Problem. We have seen at (15) that a noun can in principle accept both values of Hon. That (18b) contrasts with (19b) shows that the General feature matrix resists Hon agreement, whereas the Human feature composition of the nominal phrase in (18b) permits it. Just what needs to be said to describe both this fact and the rigidity of pronouns?

We would expect the exploration of properties of particular nouns to improve our understanding of these matters. If we had the space to consider nominal subcategory formats of the type studied by Ghosh (2006) here, the reader would have access to a wider data base, but our conclusions would stand; we thus refer the reader to the valuable paper by Ghosh and, for the moment, simply consider the properties of particular nouns like *upacarjo* ‘vice-chancellor (university president, rector)’:

- (20) a. *??ei dujon upacarjo kal jabe.*
 this two.Hum VC tomorrow go.Fut.3p.nHon
 ‘These two vice-chancellors will go tomorrow.’
 b. *ei dujon upacarjo kal jaben.*
 this two.Hum VC tomorrow go.Fut.3p.Hon
 ‘These two vice-chancellors will go tomorrow.’
- (21) a. *ei duTo upacarjo kal jabe.*
 this two.Gnl VC tomorrow go.Fut.3p.nHon
 ‘These two vice-chancellors will go tomorrow.’
 b. **ei duTo upacarjo kal jaben.*
 this two.Gnl VC tomorrow go.Fut.3p.Hon

While *chatro* ‘student’ is a neutral noun, *upacarjo* ‘vice-chancellor’ carries an Hon expectation, which (20b) meets. If a speaker intends disrespect, one expects the offensive use of language to go all the way, as in (21a), where the General (rather than Human) features of the numeral ‘two’ and the nonHon agreement on the verb ‘will go’ both express disrespect. (20a) is so puzzling as to sound like an error; the choice of the Human format for the numeral, together with the pragmatic default of honour for vice-chancellors, leads us to expect an Hon verb, but we get the puzzlingly non-Hon verb *jabe* instead. To rescue (20a), we can imagine it to be uttered by a senior figure who is so far above all vice-chancellors in status that s/he can

afford to use nonHon verbs for them casually, but who wishes to avoid blatant disrespect and thus sticks to the Human format. The need to imagine such a special viewpoint for (20a) is what makes it nearly uninterpretable.

Now, suppose you are a disrespectful speaker and would use (21a). You would then say ‘The vice-chancellor will go tomorrow’ in the singular as (22). If you wish to show normal respect as in (20b), however, your choices are (23a,b). The Nuanced Individuation form, (23a), carries mild irony. The unformatted noun in (23b) can be diagnosed as a case of UG imposing a transparent stopgap in a niche left unoccupied by the arbitrary logic of classification formats in the particular grammar of Bangla. For some evidence for our diagnosis, note that even mild pejoration at *duTi* contradicts honour at the verb so severely as to nearly star (24a):

- (22) *upacarjoTa kal jabe.*
VC.Gnl tomorrow go.Fut.3p.nHon
- (23) a. *upacarjoTi kal jaben.*
VC.NuanIndiv tomorrow go.Fut.3p.Hon
- b. *upacarjo kal jaben.*
VC tomorrow go.Fut.3p.Hon
- (24) a. *??upacarjo-duTi kal jaben.*
VC-two.NuanIndiv tomorrow go.Fut.3p.Hon
- b. *upacarjo-dujon kal jaben.*
VC-two.Hum tomorrow go.Fut.3p.Hon
- c. *upacarjo-duTo kal jabe.*
VC-two.Gnl tomorrow go.Fut.3p.nHon
‘The two vice-chancellors will go tomorrow.’

In other words, speakers choose between the respect-preserving default (24b) and the overtly disrespectful alternative (24c), and have no use for (24a), except perhaps to convey extreme irony. But (23b) sounds normal and (23a) comes out as an only slightly ironic variant. What does this indicate?

Our reading is that the UG default at (23b) and Bangla’s Nuanced Individuation format /NTi/ at (23a) must be stepping in to fill a language-particular system gap. Revisiting (8a–c) helps identify the gap in question

(the format /Njon/ is starred); but the point of interest is the availability of two fillers, not the gap itself. The language-particular system offers a limited extension of /NTi/ at (23a) (limited in that (24) makes /NumTi/'s non-participation evident); UG offers the option that an unformatted Hon noun can take on the definiteness features (see Dasgupta & Ghosh 2007 for details) normally associated with a classification formatted noun; neither of the fillers blocks the other.

Throughout the discussion it has been clear that what are often treated as language particular quirks actually count as quirks in the discursive space of the culture in which Bangla is used. One cannot usefully separate expressions encoding respect in the language from the typical actions of expressing respect by its speakers. Taking this inseparability of the expressions from the expressing seriously is tantamount to accepting the substantivist claim that the arbitrary, word-carried particular realities of a language are discourse-anchored realities in a state of interplay with UG.

How does this interplay work, though? More concretely, the question is: how are we to make sense of the fact that, in a context where resources have to be stretched to meet unusual needs, what the arbitrary or particular face of Bangla has to offer by way of a minimal stretching of the logic of classification formats in order to fill the gap that we first noted at (8) – namely, form (23a) – neither blocks nor gets blocked by (23b), the form that the transparent or UG-welcoming face of the language offers as a filler for the same gap?

To see that this fact contradicts the formalist doctrines, we need to first imagine, along formalist lines, a single dimension ranging from “most arbitrary/opaque” to “most motivated/transparent”, conflating the concept pair “arbitrary/motivated” with the pair “opaque/transparent”. We then note that such a fusion of opacity with arbitrariness entails the prediction that, of the two choices (23a, b), one would block the other. (A stronger, formalist-doctrine-focused variant of the prediction would say that only (23a) should count as well-formed, for (23b) flies in the face of the requirement in Bangla that a definite nominal should use a classification format on the noun.) Comparing this prediction, in either the weak or the strong variant, with the facts, we observe that the facts of (23) clearly disconfirm this prediction. Thus, the availability of (23a, b) confirms the substantivist conjecture that arbitrariness, a matter of provincial, discourse-particular quirks in a given language, needs to be distinguished from the UG concept of transparency.

Perhaps more needs to be said. Once formalist colleagues place (23a, b) in what they see as a defensible theoretical framework, we will be in a position to say more, if need be.

Acknowledgements

The research reported here was enabled in part by an Esperantic Studies Foundation travel grant in 2008.

References

- Dasgupta, Probal
1993 *The Otherness of English: India's Auntie Tongue Syndrome*. New Delhi/London/Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Dasgupta, Probal
2006 Bikiron, aakoronpokkho aar kaayaapokkho. *Sahitya Parishat Patrika* 113 (1–2): 147–57.
- Dasgupta, Probal
2007 Remarks on lexical kernel archiving as a cognitive science enterprise. *South Asian Language Review* 15 (2): 19–39.
- Dasgupta, Probal
2008 Knowledge and language in classical Indian linguistics: some observations. In *Forms of Knowledge in India: Critical Revaluations*, Suresh Raval, G. M. Mehta, Sitanshu Yashaschandra (eds.), 89–104. Delhi: Pencraft.
- Dasgupta, Probal
In press Blocking: a reexamination. In *No More Phemes: Explorations in Whole Word Morphology*, Rajendra Singh (ed.), Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dasgupta, Probal
Forth-coming Characterizations in linguistic science. In *Science, Literature and Aesthetics*, Amiya Dev (ed.). New Delhi: Centre for Studies in Civilizations.
- Dasgupta, Probal, Alan Ford, and Rajendra Singh
2000 *After Etymology: Towards a Substantivist Linguistics*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.
- Dasgupta, Probal, and Rajat Ghosh
2007 The nominal left periphery in Bangla and Asamiya. In *Annual Review of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2007*, Rajendra Singh (ed.), 3–29. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ford, Alan, Rajendra Singh, and Gita Martohardjono

1997 *Pace Panini*. New York: Peter Lang.

Ghosh, Sanjukta

2006 Honorificity-marking words of Bangla and Hindi: Classifiers or not?
Bhashacintana 1.21–27.

Singh, Rajendra, and Stanley Starosta (eds.)

2003 *Explorations in Seamless Morphology*. New Delhi/London/
Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Tesnière, Lucien

1959 *Éléments de Syntaxe Structurale*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Reduplication and ‘echo words’ in Hindi/Urdu

Annie Montaut

The aim of this paper is to enquire into the various meanings of reduplication as a linguistic operation, and not as a merely stylistic or expressive device. The theoretical frame is Antoine Culioli’s ‘énonciative’ linguistics (notion and located occurrence, notional domain and boundary); context and inter-subjectivity are taken into account as much as possible. The first section deals with total reduplication, within the nominal, verbal and adjectival category: it shows that reduplication on an occurrence modifies the relation between the reduplicated term and the term syntactically associated to it by denying the occurrence any specific stable value. It thus modifies the scheme of individuation of the notion (its actualization into an occurrence). The second section, dealing with partial reduplication or echo constructions, whether formed with a v- substitution to the initial consonant or with other forms of alliteration, shows that it modifies the notion itself by de-centring it, and reshapes it by taking into account various forms of heterogeneity, particularly the conflicting viewpoints of speaker and hearer.

Introduction

Reduplication is a pan-Indian phenomenon regularly cited as one of the dozen features accounting for the consistency of the South Asian linguistic area¹. It is however more often quoted than really analysed. Within the Indian area, studies on reduplication have emphasized its structural importance in respect to the linguistic area (from Emeneau 1969, the most solid study, to Abbi 1992) or listed its various forms and meanings in a given language (Abbi 1980). Singh’s 2005 contribution is the first one to give a detailed theory-based analysis of its morphology, formulating a nearly exhaustive set of explicit morphological rules for reduplication processes in Hindi/Urdu. He also associates reduplication to echo-constructions or partial reduplication and to semantic pairs, followed by Montaut (2008). As for the semantics, the most current hypothesis is the thesis of iconicity

(Kouwenberg 2003), with the most interesting discussions bearing on the problems raised by various meanings apparently non iconic (Kyomi 1995). Do these three types represent a same operation (with distinct actualizations) or distinct operations? Here is an attempt to answer this question for the first two types of reduplication.

In the first section, I will show that R (total reduplication: F-F) works on the occurrences of the notion: R is the trace of an operation which prevents singling out and locating any given occurrence; in the second section, I will show that the echo-construction (F-F') modifies the notion itself, which no longer remains centred, whether its traces in R involve the regular *v*- alteration or some other kind of alliteration.

The terms "notion" and "occurrence" as used here belong to the theoretical framework of Culioli (1990a, 1990b, 1999). A notion or notional domain (Culioli 1990b: 181) "can be defined as a complex of physico-cultural representations with no extensional properties" (it is a purely qualitative categorization, purely intentional, for instance "dog"). A notional domain has a centre (in X, what is typically X), and a boundary which delimits its Interior (I) from its Exterior (E). The centre of the notion "dog" for instance is a dog fully conforming to the properties usually associated with it, what we can truly call a dog. "To construct the extension of the notion is to construct its occurrences" (a dog, the dog, this dog, many dogs, etc.), which are "distributed in relation to the organizing centre of the domain" (an occurrence is then locatable: absolute value, referring to the type, is attached to the centre of the domain, whereas relative values decrease as "you move away from the centre"). Constructing the occurrences is the basic scheme of individuation of a notion (it amounts to constructing the extension of the notion), and it consists in an operation of quantification together with qualitative sub-categorization. In the construction of occurrences, the basic operation is that of extraction: "ascribing an existential status to a situated (located) occurrence of a notion", extraction "brings into existence an individuated occurrence that has no other distinguishing feature than the fact that it has been singled out" (Culioli 1990b: 182)². Other operations in the construction of the occurrence involve re-identification (pinpointing: "this dog which we are referring to, the same dog") and scanning. Scanning means that you have to scan the whole notional domain without finding a possible stable location ("any dog, which dog"). A notional domain may be represented as homogeneous (typical values: really *p*) or containing non-typical values (not really *p*, verging on *p'* or non *p*) and so including heterogeneity (Culioli retains 'alterity' for French "alterity").

What follows shows that reduplication modifies the scheme of individuation of the notion (integral reduplication) or the notion itself (partial reduplication): it is obviously far more than a stylistic device or a “way of speaking”, a categorization which implicitly denies R the status of linguistic category and make it an exotic phenomena. The two recently published collections (Hurch 2005 and Kouwenberg 2003) provide the reader with an important mass of data, yet do not always give the appropriate contextualisation for fully understanding the meanings of the data presented. The aim of this paper is to enquire into the various meanings of reduplication as a linguistic operation, and not as a merely stylistic or expressive device, with appropriate contextualisation.

In Hindi, reduplication provides for an important part of the lexicon, both verbal and nominal³, as well as for grammatical structures (distribution, iteration): it belongs to the core of the language, if we hold language to be the regulated organization of given lexical material. It also provides many “manners of speaking”, “stylistic or expressive uses”, which do not obey easily recognizable constraints and are all the more difficult to grasp since they present great variation even between users of the same language, and involve the speaker’s subjectivity.

The paper will deal with the two main areas of reduplication: total or integral reduplication (R), where the whole unit (F) is reduplicated in the same form (F) ($R=F-F$), and echo constructions or partial reduplication (E), where the first unit (F) is altered in the second occurrence (F') in a more or less systematic way ($R=F-F'$).

1. Total Réduplication: Non-centering of the occurrence

The reduplication (R) of an entity modifies the relation of this entity with one or several of the other constituents in the statement: for a noun, R modifies the relation of this noun with the predicate, for an adjective, R modifies the relation between the noun and the adjective, for a verb (always a dependent one when reduplicated in Hindi), R modifies the relation of the dependent predication with the main predication.

1.1. Nouns and numerals

Distribution is the most frequent meaning, often considered as prototypical for the nominal class. In its restricted meaning (for each X, n Y), it however

occurs only with numerals, where R involves more than one relation with the other constituents, which makes it more complex even if it is perceived as more basic.

1.1.1. *The typically distributive meaning: Numeral-numeral nom*

Apart from the iteration of the process for each occurrence of the beneficiary in (1a), “give one X (toffee) to each Y (child)”, hence the possible commutation of (1a) with statements having the indefinite *har* ‘each’ (2a), the reduplication of the numeral acts on the scheme of the individuation of Y (*n* occurrences of “child”) as well as that of X (*n* occurrences of “toffee”)⁴:

- (1) a. *baccoN ko ek-ek tâfî do*
 child-P DAT one-one toffee give
 ‘give a toffee to each child, one toffee per child’
- b. *baccoN ko ek keji tafiyâN do*
 child-P DAT one kilo toffees give
 ‘give one kilo toffees to the children’
- (2) a. *har bacce ko ek tâfî do*
 each child-S DAT one toffee give
 ‘give a toffee to each child’
- b. *bacce ko ek tâfî do*
 child-S DAT one toffee give
 ‘give a toffee to the child’ (definite occurrence)

(1a) shows that the beneficiary is the class of children, morphologically plural, whereas (2a) refers to this same class by a singular, “each child”. On the one hand, we cannot set a definite referential value for “a child”, so that there is no locatable occurrence which we may construct, and on the other hand plurality as constructed by the reduplication of the numeral in (1a) is distinct from plurality as an homogeneous group, in (1b) for instance with the morphological plural, by the fact that each unit is isolated and individuated as a beneficiary (hence the equivalence between (1a) and (2a)). In (1a), the beneficiary is characterized as a non-global plurality which is formed by the exhaustive collection of all the distinct singularities within the set, with no possibility of selecting any of them. The reduplication of

the numeral acts as a variable which makes it necessary to scan the whole set of occurrences without being ever able to stop on any specific occurrence⁵, exactly as does the quantifier *har* 'each'.

1.1.2. The «listing» effect: noun or pronoun in the singular

The reduplication of singular relatives or interrogatives gives the meaning "each element, with no exception", and suggests a complete series which, again, constructs a plurality made of *n* singularities, in a non cumulative and non interchangeable way, so that there is no single occurrence we can pick up and locate, and we have to go through the whole set of occurrences – a typical case of scanning too:

- (3) a. *tum kahâN kahâN gae?* *tumne kyâ kyâ dekhâ?*
 you where where went you-ERG what R saw?
 'where did you go?' 'what did you see?'
 (give a list of all and every place)
- b. *jo-jo âegâ use batânâ ki maiN*
 who who will-come 3S-DAT say that 1s
 ek ghaNTe bâd âûNgî
 1 hour after come-fut
 'say to whoever will come (to all and every visitor) that I will
 come back in one hour'

The reduplication of singular nouns, which often creates intensive meanings or even amounts to presenting the entity as an extreme, can be explained in the same way: intensiveness in (4a) results from the construction of an exhaustive series, with all its elements collected one by one, hence the effect of an integral hair-raising; in (4b) "know" is predicated not about an occurrence but about a set of occurrences (each of them being considered as a singular occurrence), which tends to mean that its validity is above any contingency; as for the meaning "even", it results from the improbability of the relation between predicate and noun (know / child).

- (4) a. *uskâ rom-rom tharrâ uThâ*
 his hair-MS-hair-MS rise get up-AOR-MS
 'each of his hair rose up / his hair rose up all over his body'

- b. *baccâ baccâ jântâ hai*
 child-MS child-MS know PRES-3MS
 ‘the last boy is aware/ even a child knows that, every child
 including the last one knows that’

Here we construct a set which is distinct from the ordinary (homogeneous) plural by the fact that each constituent retains its singularity and is not fused into a global whole, and at the same time it cannot be located in isolation. This distinction between a set of individualities and a global atomic plurality, two different meanings of plural, has been worked out in Fassi-Fehri and Vinet (2001). In (4) as well as (1a) both plurals are of the first type; but in (4) we construct plural out of singular, whereas in (1a), “give a toffee to the kids” (= to each of them), we construct singular out of plural, since we reconstruct the beneficiary, out of a homogeneous plural, as unique for every toffee distributed.

1.1.3. *Reduplication of plural nouns*

It is less common, and even less frequently mentioned in the relevant literature, with the meaning “exclusiveness” or “restrictiveness”. Reduplication of plural nouns constructs the notional domain (*p*) in relation to its complementary *p'* (non *p* or other than *p*), a meaning which can be reinforced by the exclusive particle *hî*:

- (5) a. *yahâN mahilâeN-mahilâeN baiTheNgî*
 here women-women will-seat
 ‘here only women / women and only women will seat’
 (context: there are too rooms, one for men, one for ladies)
- b. *bookmarkoN-bukmârkoN meN hî bât hotî calî gâi*
 bookmarks-bookmarks in just speech be went
 ‘the conversation went on exclusively by means of bookmarks’
 (two lovers strictly looked after by the girl’s family: M. Joshi, K)

The operation in fact always deals with a set of occurrences and not with the notional domain. The statement (5a) is meaningful only within a context where the set has been selected in a paradigm where it is opposed to the other elements of the paradigm. Within a context of segregation of women