



## Reduplication and echo words in Hindi/Urdu

Annie Montaut

► **To cite this version:**

Annie Montaut. Reduplication and echo words in Hindi/Urdu. Singh Rajendra. Annual Review of South Asian Languages and Linguistics, Mouton de Gruyter, pp.21-91, 2009. <halshs-00449691>

**HAL Id: halshs-00449691**

**<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00449691>**

Submitted on 22 Jan 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Reduplication and ‘echo words’ in Hindi/ Urdu

Annie Montaut, Inalco, Paris

*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 intersubjectivity 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 quoted as one of the dozen features accounting for the consistency of the South Asian linguistic area<sup>1</sup>. 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 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 the 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)<sup>2</sup>. 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 collective books (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 nominal<sup>3</sup>, 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 a 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 reduplication: 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”)<sup>4</sup>:

(1) a *baccoN ko ek-ek tâfi do*  
 child-P DAT one-one toffee give  
 ‘give a toffee to each child, one toffee per child’

(1) 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 tâfi do*  
 each child-S DAT one toffee give  
 ‘give a toffee to each child’

(2) b *bacce ko ek tâfi do*  
 child-S DAT one toffee give  
 ‘give a toffee to the child’ (definite occurrence)

(1a) shows that the beneficiary is the class of the 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 occurrence<sup>5</sup>, 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)

- (3) b *jo-jo âegâ use batânâ ki maiN ek ghaNTe bâd âûNgî*  
 who who will-come 3s-DAT say that 1s 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 present 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-rising; 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’

- (4) b *baccâ baccâ*                      *jântâ hai*  
 child-MS child-MS                      know PRES-3MS  
 ‘he 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)
- (5) b *bookmarkoN- bukâmakoN 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, in the matter, within a context of

segregation of women vs men: with reference to the meeting hall, the reduplication of “women” means that the opposition women / men is disqualified in order to focus and homogenize on “women” (“women-women” meaning “women and not other-than-women”:  $p$  and not  $p'$  other than  $p$ ,  $p$  in relation to  $p'$  other than  $p$ ). In (5b), whereas in the beginning the lovers used various devices to communicate (the bookmarks being only one of these), now we focus on and homogenize “bookmarks” (irrespective of other communication devices), which amounts to disqualifying the other devices previously resorted to.

The restrictive meaning (restriction to the set X, exclusion of other than X) is associated with contexts with a previous segregation. In (5a), such a context relies on, apart from the institutionalisation of sexual segregation, the announcement of a meeting concerning women. In (5b), where the narrative context alone can fulfil such a segregating function, *hî* ‘only, just’ is required to block the distributive meaning (“in each and every bookmarker”). The meaning involved here, differential qualification of a set, is less grammaticized in the language than the distributive meaning since we may add the restrictive particle *hî* after the reduplicated form (*mahilâeN hî mahilâeN*), whereas *har* ‘each’ and reduplication cannot cumulate.

## 1.2. Reduplication of the verb: iteration of the process

In the verbal class, only nonfinite verbal forms can reduplicate with the pattern F-F<sup>6</sup>.

Various occurrences of reduplicated participles (imperfect or present/perfective or past, conjunctive participles (V-*kar*) are grammaticized in various types of iteration, the typical meaning of non-centring when processes are concerned. Since reduplicated participles are already dependent verbal forms, the occurrence of the process cannot be localized but by the main verb: R cannot be, as it is in the nominal category, responsible for the non-localized, non-stabilized status of the occurrence, in need of localization. R indeed affects the occurrence in need of localization in such a way as to multiply it into  $n$  similar occurrences, none of which is the best (definite) value, but all of them construct a series which fragments the process (or make the state into a durative) and draws its meaning from the relation with the main finite verb. Iteration within the verbal category and distribution within the nominal category are thus symmetrical. In this way, with an action or event main verb as in (6a), not to speak “eating-eating” means that each word/statement is associated with an occurrence of eating, hence the illusion of more simultaneity<sup>7</sup>, and in (6b), the reduplication of the past



stative participle “slept-slept” with main verb “die” means that at some moment in this state (sleep) he died, hence the appearance, here again, of a perfect concomitance. In (6c) the reduplicated conjunctive participle *Tahal-Tahalkar* multiplies the occurrences of wandering, so that the process may appear more imprecise (non-telic) but this indefiniteness comes from the semantics of the verb. In (6d), the iteration of n occurrences of “laugh” adds a meaning of intensity, here again a side-effect of the basic operation of de-centring by scanning, while (6e-f), with two action processes, displays the basic effect of R when non iterative, that is, giving temporal width to the dependent process (no one single locatable occurrence) :

- (6) a *khâte-khâte mat bolo*                                 *khâte (hue) mat bolo*  
 eating-eating NEG speak-imper                         eating been NEG speak!  
 ‘do not speak while eating / don’t speak when eating’
- (6) b *soye-soye mar gayâ*                                     *???soye mar gayâ*  
 slept-slept die went   slept die went  
 he died in his sleep             /                         ??? in his sleep he died’
- (6) c *maiNne Tahal-Tahalkar*                                 *sârâ din kâTâ*  
 1S-ERG wander-wander-CP                                 whole day cut  
 ‘I spent the whole day wandering (here and there, in various places)’
- (6) d *usne haNs-haNs-kar*                                     *pûrî kahânî sunâi*  
 3S-ERG laugh-laugh-CP                                     entire story told  
 ‘he told the whole story laughing (a lot, at many times)’
- (6) e *mârg meN calte-calte*     *âj*     *mâN se*     *ek savâl pûchhâ*  
 street in walking-walking   today mother to   one question asked  
 ‘today, while walking on the road, I ask Mother a question’
- (6) f *jâte-jâte*                     *ve kahte*  
 going-going     3p said  
 ‘he used to say while going’ (from *Santapt*, Nemisharay, like (6e))

Both the following series exhibit a specific relation between reduplicated participle (conjunctive, accomplished or unaccomplished) and main verb. If the main verb represents a transient state and the dependent participle an action, the relation is causal (cause-effect : cf. Abbi 1980), which amounts to representing a series of iteration leading to a result (successful accumulation) such as in (7):

- (7) a *yah câdar dhul-dhulkar phaT gaî*  
 this sheet wash-wash-CP tear went  
 ‘this sheet got torn by/following repeated washings’
- (7) b *tumhârî shikâyat sunte-sunte (sun-sunkar) main ûb gayâ thâ*  
 your complaint hearing-hearing (-CP) I bore go ppft  
 ‘I was fed up listening to your complaint’
- (7) c *vahâN akele baiThe-baiThe ûb gayâ*  
 here alone sat-sat bore went  
 ‘he got fed up of sitting here (inactive)’
- (7) d *rote-rote uskî ânkhēN sūjh gaîN*  
 crying-crying his eyes swell went  
 ‘his eyes got swollen by (repeatedly, thoroughly) crying’

If the main verb represents avoidance (« be-saved/escape », « remain, stay ») and the participle action or event, reduplication means that the accumulation of occurrences does not reach the normally expected result, hence the lacunar value in (8):

- (8) a *vah girte-girte bac gaya*  
 3s falling-falling escape went  
 ‘he almost fell’
- (8) b *yah bât hoNThoN par â-âkar rah gaî*  
 this thing lips on come-come-CONJ.PART stay went  
 ‘I was about to say this thing but did not’
- (8) c *bârish hote-hote rah gaî*  
 rain being-being stay went  
 ‘it almost rained (but did not)/it was about to rain but did not’

In statements like (7) where the relation is between a dependent action verb and a main verb expressing a transient state, reduplication is necessary for the cause-effect meaning (9a), and a non-reduplicated participle will produce simple concomitance between both processes (9b). Moreover, a non-reduplicated participle not only fails to produce the avoidance meaning in statements like (8), but it is non-grammatical with main verb meaning “escape” (10a) while the reduplicated participle with an action main verb means concomitance (10b):

- (9) a. *sîta kâm karte (hue) thak gâi*  
 Sita work doing (been) got tired  
 ‘Sita got tired when working’  
 b. *kâm karte karte thak gâi*  
 work doing doing got tired  
 got tired of/by working’

- (10) a. *??? vah girte bac gayâ*  
 3s falling escape went  
 ‘while falling he screamed’  
 b. *girte girte zor se cillâyâ*  
 falling falling strong screamed

Non-centring is responsible for the special meanings of (7-8). A reduplicated dependent process in relation with a state (or change of state) main verb respectively may either entail a result if repeated or on the contrary drag on without any result. In other terms, R tends to make the dependent process more autonomous from the main verb, which modifies the simply temporal concomitance.

Needless to add that scholars claiming for the iconic interpretation of reduplication have granted a central role to distributive and iterative meanings, similarly to the plural meanings in languages which display it. “Twice is meaningful” : if one assumes that ‘repeat’ always amounts to “say more”, distribution, iteration and intensity which are often correlated (4, 6d) are obviously in conformity with this intuition. Fragmentation and dissemination, as well as avoidance, to the extent that such meanings point to non-single-time processes, have also been claimed to be indirectly iconic (Kouwenberg & LaCharité 2001, 2005).

However it is quite clear that, even with such “prototypical” meanings, the supplement supposedly added by R is only the trace of an operation which does not amount to say more but modifies the relation between N and V or dependent V and main V. The meanings of reduplication observed above in examples (1a), (3), (4), (6), (7), (8) such as distribution, list effect, iteration, do not amount to saying more but to conceive differently the relation between the reduplicated entity and the constituents with which it is syntactically associated in the statement. The case of the adjective is even more revealing, since the meanings of R are more proliferating.

### 1.3 Reduplicated adjectives : degree, expressivity or neutralisation of the differential property ?

Within the frame of iconicity, high degree (intensity : “much, very, quite, completely A”) derives quite naturally from the postulate ‘twice means more’. Low degree, as well as medium degree, more and more commented with the growing presentation of data and descriptions, needs on the contrary some justification.<sup>8</sup> Such a justification is proposed in a clever argumentation (Kouwenberg 2003, Kouwenberg & LaCharité 2005) by means of fragmentation and dissemination, forms of discontinuity in their own right, which parallels distribution as a form of discontinuity. A colour which is not represented as plain and saturated but appears in the form of spots, stripes or scattered zones, that is, in discontinuity, represents the “lacunary” meaning, and by extension the low degree. The animal with black spots is then what links the animal completely black or very black to the animal not really black.

But here again, the Hindi data display a series of meanings including many other values than these two polar cases, a series which besides rarely display the real high degree, but which shows that reduplication of A, like N or V, affects the relation between the syntactically associated constituent, in the matter N and A. AA N modifies in a systematic way the relation A-N, namely the attribution of the property A to the noun N, with the various meanings resulting from the different nature of nouns (discrete or compact) and the context which actualizes AN as an occurrence (with or without preconstruction, as a mode of presence, as the construction of the property)<sup>9</sup>. As opposed to the simple adjective, the reduplicated adjective is not descriptive<sup>10</sup>.

Normally an adjective qualifies the noun by conferring to it a differential property (which makes it descriptive): *lambâ laRkâ* ‘tall boy’, or *lambe laRke* ‘tall boys’, refers to a boy or a set of boys with tallness as a distinctive property (as compared to other boys, small and medium-sized) ; being tall here is a differential property. The reduplicated expressions, on the contrary, *lambâ-lambâ laRkâ*, as well as *lambe-lambe laRke*, do not identify the noun as being qualified by the property “being tall” in contrast with other possible properties, but suggests either that the relation boy-tall is already pre-constructed (the noun is pre-identified by the property ‘being tall’ and reduplication stands for a valuation of this tallness, in a subjective appreciation<sup>11</sup>) or that it has a distributive meaning – each of the boys is tall, the only commented meaning for plural in the relevant literature.

### *1.3.1. ‘Intensity’ and ‘high degree’ : surface effects of various operations*

Existing descriptions are mainly compatible with the iconic function of R. But before studying the most interesting examples of adjectival reduplication, it is worth noticing that none of the generalities commonly found in existing descriptions holds against counter-examples: for instance reduplicated adjectives with plural nouns should always be distributive<sup>12</sup>, and reduplicated adjectives with singular nouns should be intensive (high degree: “very much”), while reduplicated adjectives of colour or taste should always mean approximation or low degree (“almost, more or less”).

In reality, the reduplicated adjective with a plural noun rarely has a distributive meaning: *choTe-choTe bacche* (small-small children) for instance rarely refers to a set of children where each of them is small, although it of course may do so in some contexts, but rather expresses that the speaker is in an empathic relation with the children, who are not particularly tiny besides, but, as little children, suggest affectionate thoughts. It may simply be the plural of the singular reduplicated expression. As for the example (11), it is a conventional portrait of beauty and not a cartoon-like negative description as would suggest the standard interpretation of the reduplicated colour adjective in the low degree (if you take *bâl* ‘hair’ as a collective singular) and of the reduplicated “big” with a plural noun as distributive; the alternative interpretation of the reduplicated colour adjective, with a plural *bâl* ‘hair’, would be equally displaced within the general tone of such a portrait, which is appreciative for all Hindi speakers.

- (11) *uske bâl kâle-kâle the, uskî ânkhēN baRî-baRî thîN*  
 her hair black-black were, her eyes big-big were  
 ‘she had very (dark) black hair, large (attractive) eyes’  
 ??? she had blackish hair / each of her hair was black and each of her eyes was big

As for (12a), R is certainly “intensive”, but is not equivalent to high degree, as shown by the unnatural character of reduplication for expressing excess, according to most speakers (12c):

- (12) a *yah rahâ tumhârâ kok, pî lo, ThaNDâ-ThaNDâ hai*  
 here is your coke, drink take, cold-cold is  
 ‘here is your coke, drink it, it is nicely cold’ (not “very cold”)
- (12) b *yah lo tumhârâ cây. Garam -garam hai, piyo*  
 this take your tea hot-hot is, drink  
 ‘take your tea. It is nicely hot, drink it’

- (12) c *yah lo tumhârî cây. Garam / bahut garam /*  
 this take your tea hot / very hot /  
 ??*garam –garam hai, abhî mat pio*  
 ?? hot-hot is right now NEG drink  
 ‘here is your tea, it is very hot, don’t drink it now’

In (12), R does not correspond to high degree but to the optimal degree, the ideal temperature for a good tea according to the speaker and addressee. “Ideal” means that the degree of hotness is conform to the expectations of the drinkers on the basis of the speaker’s (and hearer’s) cultural habits and knowledge. “Very hot” is descriptive: it measures a degree and intends to be objective, and can be contrasted with comparative (X is hot but Y is hotter). “Nicely hot” does not allow such a contrast (\*X *garam-garam hai par Y zyada garam(-garam) hai*) because is does not measure the degree. It is not descriptive and that is the reason why it sounds somewhat like a subjective appreciation. Similarly, vegetable and fruit sellers in markets, when they advertise their goods, systematically reduplicate the adjective (fresh-fresh vegetable, fresh-fresh news, hot-hot *pakaure*, etc.). Quality is emphasized, but rather for its adequateness to the customer’s expectations than for its objective degree. In such examples, the noun (compact) is the bearer of the property and its relation with the adjective has already been constructed, freshness or hotness being pre-requisite qualities in the given contexts. A simple adjective would simply indicate that the tea is neither cold nor lukewarm, but R neutralizes the feature “differential” in the property in order to emphasize its manifestation : conformity with the typical ideal of good tea (nicely hot, but precisely not too hot) sets the value, shared par the subject S and hearer as imagined by S. Similarly, the *pakaure* are not described as hot in contrast with cold, and the vegetable are not described as fresh rather than rotten or dry, but as hot-*pakaure* and as fresh-vegetable whose quality is commented as ideal. There is no room for a different evaluation which could exclude the property (hot, fresh), the speaker does not *a priori* allows the possibility for the hearer to conceive the entity with another property. This explains that the property is represented as saturated, in conformity with what the speaker imagines concerning the hearer’s expectations, and that such constructions trigger empathy with the hearer<sup>13</sup>.

As for the colour of grass in (13), it is neither greenish nor pale green, it is fully green and saturated, in conformity with the bollywood stereotype of pleasant sceneries, even if the noun is in the singular (supposed to automatically shift to the low degree with R):

- (13) *peRoN kî châNv meN kuch yugal tarûN harî-harî mulâyam*  
 trees of shadow in some couple young green-green tender  
*ghâs par cahalqadmî kar rahe the*  
 grass on stroll were doing  
 ‘some youths in couple were strolling under the shadow of the  
 trees, on the green tender grass’ (Himanshu Joshi, *Yatharth*)

Here reduplication grants the property both an appreciative character and saturation. Subjective appreciation accommodates qualitative variation, which is only possible because the property has previously been pre-constructed as homogeneous in contrast to the various choices maintained as other possibilities when there is no R. For instance when a gardener wishing to grow a lawn and selecting his plants among various colours, will ask for green (or dark green, or pale green, eventually yellow, etc.) in using the simple adjective (pointing to basic heterogeneity: colour as a differential property), and not R. In a similar configuration, a “blue-blue sky” is most often interpreted as “quite blue”, “really blue”, “very pure”:

- (14) *yah nilâ-nîlâ âkâsh dekhkar mujhe pahâr meN bachpan kî yâd ât*  
 this blue-blue sky see-CP 1s-DAT mountain in childhood of memory came  
 ‘seeing such a blue sky I remembered my childhood in the mountains’

The pre-construction here is not cultural but situational: the speaker does not describe the sky with its colour as he discovers it when stepping outdoors, but dreams over the associations he can relate to the blue sky which he is confronted with, as such (blue-sky). The colour of the space of the sky (bearer of the property) is already made homogeneous. In contrast, a speaker for weather forecast cannot describe the sky by using reduplication, even if he wishes to emphasize its perfect blueness and clarity, because what he aims at is communicating information on the colour of tomorrow sky (neither grey nor black nor covered), with no pre-construction. Similarly a peasant who says “if the sky is blue tomorrow (the weather is fine) I will begin the crop”, cannot use R because the anticipated blue of the sky is only one possibility among others and retains its meaning of differential property. More generally, a sky which is blue (not grey, not black) is expressed by the simple adjective, whereas a blue-sky (which may be particularly blue, evocative, or else) is expressed with R<sup>14</sup>.

1.3.2. “Low degree” and attenuation : different operations according to the semantics of the noun (discrete, compact, dense)

In a general way, the attenuative (approximation, diminution) meaning is related to the mode of presence of an entity. The notion of ‘mode of presence’ relates to a particular stand of the speaker: tell the world (a given entity of the world) such as he is confronted to it (and not in a descriptive, analytical, way), hence the affinities with verbs of perception.

What is crucial is not the fact that the adjective refers to singular, nor even that it expresses a colour or a taste, but its relation with the noun. In the singular (15a) as well as in the plural (15b), the property “blue” assumes the attenuative meaning “bluish” with a noun of the category ‘dense’ (mountain crests, water-stream of a mountain river) in a relation adjective-noun pertaining to the mode of presence.

- (15) a *nice nîlâ-nîlâ pâî*                      *bahâ rahâ thâ*  
 below blue-blue water                      flow PROG IMPFT  
 ‘bluish water was running below’
- (15) b *sâmne nîle-nîle pahâr kê rekhâ*                      *dikhâ de rahî thî*  
 in-front blue-blue montains of line                      be-seen PROG IMPFT  
 ‘the bluish line of the mountains could be seen in front’

Such examples as (15) can be contrasted with the “truly blue sky” of (14) which implied a pre-constructed relation, whereas (15) pertains to direct perception.<sup>15</sup> In the series (16), we may similarly explain the attenuative meaning (16a) by the association to a noun categorized as discrete (paper) of a property which is presented as a mode of presence (yellow-yellow): without any verb of perception, narration itself constraints the viewpoint of an observer in the process of getting aware of what is visible around him. In contrast, in (16b), at a wall paper sender, the selection of a roll of paper chosen for its differential property (yellow, and not blue or green) requires the simple (non-R) adjective (*pîlâ-vâlâ*: “the yellow one”)<sup>16</sup>; only if the hearer (Culioli’s co-énonciateur : S1) answers by repeating the already selected colour, reduplication can occur, since it presents the mode of construction of the property (the colour yellow-yellow itself), with an homogenization on ‘yellow’, so that the meaning is saturation (bright yellow, frankly yellow).

- (16) a *ek purânî ciTThî paRî thî, pîle-pîle kâgaz par câr shabd likhe the*  
 an old letter fall had been, yellow-yellow on 4 words written were  
 ‘an old letter was lying on the floor, four words were written on  
 the yellowed (yellowish) paper’



- (16) b A. *pîlâ-vâlâ lo !* – B. *yah pîlâ-pîlâ rang kamre meN acchâ nahîN lagegâ*  
 yellow-that take ! this yellow-yellow colour room in good NEG will-seem  
 ‘A. take the yellow one ! B. this bright yellow won’t fit in the room’

Besides, there are statements which allow both interpretations, like (16d) which associates the reduplication of “yellow” to the noun “mango” in a nursery rime for children and may have the reading “intensive” or “attenuative”. Interpreted as a direct perception (*dekho* ‘look’), the property is constructed as a ‘mode of presence’ and means “greenish yellow”, “yellowish” (particularly since these mangos are fresh and not extra-ripe); interpreted as generic and because of that in disjunction from any specific perception (“the king of fruit”), the property is saturated and means “truly yellow”, “a nice /deep yellow”.

- (16) c *dekho, kitnâ âm rasîlâ /* *chilkâ uskâ pîlâ-pîlâ*  
 look, how-many mango juicy / skin its yellow-yellow  
*lagtâ kitnâ tâzâ hai /* *âm phaloN kê râjâ hai*  
 seems how-much fresh is / mango fruits of king is  
 ‘look, how juicy is the mango/ its skin deep yellow (yellowish) /  
 how fresh it looks / mango is the king of fruits’

Whatever the meaning, approximation or saturation, it flows from the neutralization of the differential property in the adjective. That is why reduplication cannot be correlated or contrasted with the simple adjective for the same quality as seen in (16d)<sup>17</sup>:

- (16) d \* *yah langRâ âm khaTTâ hai, par vah dashaharî âm khaTTâ-haTTâ hai*  
 this langra mango sour is, but that dashahari mango sour-sour is  
 (\* this Langra mango is sour but that Dashahari is sourish)

An adjective (simple) conveying a differential property cannot correlate with an adjective conveying the neutralization of a differential property.

Finally, it is noteworthy that low degree is not exclusively restricted to colours and taste, since the reduplication of an adjective, whether or not referring to colour/taste, is compatible with the approximation suffix *-sâ*<sup>18</sup>. Certainly, the reduplication of a colour or taste adjective is always attenuative with this suffix: *pîlâ-pîlâ-sâ ujevâlâ* (yellow-yellow-like brightness), ‘a vaguely yellow brightness, a pale luminosity’, *kâlâ-kâlâ-sâ kapRâ* (black-black-like cloth) ‘blackish garment’. But other adjectives in similar con-

texts (-sâ) may also have, if not systematically, the low degree meaning. *bholâ-bholâ sâ laRkâ*, simple-simple-sâ boy ‘a rather naïve boy’, *Tarch kî marî-marî-sî roshnî*, torchlight of dying-dying-sâ light ‘quasi dying /agonizing light of the torchlight’, but *simTâ-simTâ-sâ baccâ* shrank-shrank-sâ child, ‘(totally) curled over child’.

It is then very clear that integral reduplication, whether of nouns, verbs or adjectives, is not only a “way of speaking” to be treated as a stylistic or expressive device, nor is it, as claimed by the theory of iconicity, a manner of saying more. Certainly intensive meanings and lacunar meanings (the latter verging on augmentation and multiplication by means of dissemination and fragmentation) are very frequent. But we have seen that these meanings can be accounted for by an operation of non-centring which acts on the relation NV, NA or V2V1 respectively. This operation has nothing to do with iconicity (or very indirectly), but it modifies the scheme of individuation of the notion into an occurrence.

## 2. Echo-constructions: de-centring the notion

It has been shown above that integral reduplication corresponds to taking into account the  $n$  occurrences of the reduplicated term. As a non-centring device allowing for qualitative variation (each occurrence retains its singularity), it rules out the possibility of assigning a specific definite value to the occurrence and redefines the relation between the reduplicated term and another term in the statement: noun and verb, participle (dependent verb) and main verb, adjective and noun, with the typical meanings of distribution and iteration but also with a whole series of different meanings. The echo construction (a phonetic alteration of F into F') bears on the notion : it works as an extension of the notional domain ("N and other similar things"). It is on the domain and not on the occurrence that the echo construction operates as a de-centering process: it introduces here "alterity" (heterogeneity) by simultaneously taking into account several viewpoints on the notion associated to the reduplicated term. These heterogeneous viewpoints correspond to a particular structuration of the notional domain in different zones, each of them defining a distinct mode (zone) of the notion (and a viewpoint on it): Interior, noted below I (really  $p$ : the viewpoint is centred), boundary, noted I-E (not really  $p$ : the viewpoint is de-centred, but compatible with I), and Exterior, noted E (other than  $p$ : the viewpoint is de-centred and not compatible with I)<sup>19</sup>. Echo constructions mean that, parallel to the centred viewpoint, a de-centred viewpoint is taken into account: this second viewpoint is constructed either as co-extensive to the first one, or as opposed to it (as a deconstruction of the viewpoint which is centered), or it can also represent an alternative with no possible choice. It results from this that many usages of the  $v$ - alteration, not mentioned in the relevant literature, tend not to create a mere extension or approximation of the notional domain but to create parody, or derogatory meaning.

An instance of the mere extension of the notional domain is the classical *cây-vây* (tea-echo), "tea and other eatable and drinkable", *shâdî-vâdî* ( marriage-echo) 'marriage and so on', *pen-ven* 'pen and the like. The "semantic supplement" glossed by "etc.", "and so on", "and all", "e tutti quanti", "and the like" in classical descriptions such as Abbi (1980), show that we get out of the centred domain (tea which is really tea, what we can call tea, tea-tea) and include the neighbouring notional domain or stay at the margins of the domain: tea and other drinkable or eatable which can be associated to the ritual afternoon or morning tea, pen and other necessary stuff used for writing<sup>20</sup>.

### 2.1. Form of the canonical constructions in v-

The first consonant of a mono- or poly-syllabic word is replaced by v- : *shâdi* (marriage)-*vâdî* ‘marriage etc.’, *cây*(tea)-*vây*, ‘tea etc.’, *paRhnâ-vaRhnâ* ‘read etc.’, if we retain temporarily the standard translation as given in the relevant literature for such expressions. When the vowel in the first syllable is rounded, the initial consonant disappears: *ghoRâ* ‘horse’ *ghoRâ-oRâ*, ‘horse etc.’. When there is no initial consonant in F, F’ is formed by adjunction and not substitution : *âtmâ-vâtmâ* ‘soul etc.’. If the word begins with a consonant cluster, the second too is retained: *krânti-vrânti* ‘revolution-etc.’, *prem-vrem* ‘love-etc.’. We can then set the following rule: for F = C-, F’ = v-; for F = Co/u-, F’ = o/u- ; for F = V-, F’ = vV-.

Both units F and F’ vary when the word allows variation (number, case for instance): *pakauRâ-vakauRâ* ‘vegetable fried preparation etc.’ has the plural form *pakauRe-vakauRe*, since singular masculine nouns in -â inflect to -e in the plural, and *laRkî-vaRkî* ‘girl-etc.’ substitutes the plural ending -iyâN to the singular ending -î: *laRkiyâN-vaRkiyâN*.

English words are reduplicated under the same conditions: *pen-ven* ‘pen etc.’, *Taim-vaim* ‘time-etc’, *noTis-voTis* ‘notice etc.’, and if required inflect according to the native Hindi system (plural feminine for instance, -î > -iyân : *pârTiyân-vârTiyân*). The variation is similar for Persian words (*shâdî-vâdî* ‘marriage’), Arabic words (*qismat-vismat* ‘destiny’, *talâq-valâq* ‘divorce’) and Sanskrit words (*karma-varma* ‘fruit of action’). All the categories of speech are freely derivable with this strategy, be it verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs.

Such a phenomena is omnipresent in all the so-called “dialects” or regional varieties of Hindi, although it often displays a consonant different from the v- used in Standard Hindi : In Panjabi and Panjabi-ized Hindi for instance *sh-* is used to derive F’ (*matlab-shatlab* “signification”, with some of such formations quasi lexicalized (*gap-conversation- shap*, ‘gossiping, talking’); in the Pahari (mountain) speeches, *h-* or *ph-* is used with the same function (*lenîn-henîn, rûs-hûs, ishk-phishk* ‘love-etc.’ <sup>21</sup>).

### 2.2. Basic semantics of the construction : de-centring and extension of the notional domain

In grammars, the only meaning mentioned for such constructions is the extension of the notional domain. The echo reduplication modifies the notional domain by including neighbouring zones and defining thus a new inclusive or associative domain, a process clearly emphasized by the terminology adopted by Parkvall (“associative reduplication”: 2003 : 27). This

extension amounts to introduce ‘alterity’ (“and other things”) within the notion, by associating to the Interior (pen in (17a), tea in (17b), marriage above, etc.) something located at the limit between Interior and Exterior of the notional domain, on the boundary I-E (other items than pen, tea, marriage *stricto sensu*, etc.: other but related items). The association is suggested by the context: within a context where a schoolboy asks a friend if he has taken *pen-ven* when leaving for school, the domain resulting from taking I-E into account besides I will include exercise-book, pencils, rubbers, whereas within a context where somebody searches his pockets to note down a phone number on his agenda, the notional domain is more limited (pencil, stylo, ink pen).

- (17) a *mere pâs koî pen-ven nahîN*  
of-me near INDEF pen-echo NEG  
‘I don’t have anything to write’

Asking a visiting friend the following:

- (17) b *tum cây-vây piyoge ?*  
2 tea-echo drink-FUT-2  
‘will you drink something ?’

amounts to asking him if he will have something to drink, tea, coffee, cold drink or any other related thing, and an answer such as “No, I will rather have coffee” would be at least strange, whereas it is perfectly natural for a similar question asked with the simple noun (F: *cây*) instead of echo construction (F-F’: *chây-vây*).

In the above two examples, the echo construction redefines the notion F in such a way that F is only one element of a paradigm in a wider notional domain, and the other elements, which remain implicit (hence the fuzzy character, vagueness, often referred to), may further in the exchange, be either selected instead of F or added to F in a cumulative way. As for the semantic area of F, it may be vague (17c) or precise (17a-b).

- (17) c *khânâ-vânâ vahîN ho saktâ hai*  
eat-echo there-only be can PRES-3S  
‘we can have food and everything there (we’ll find everything there for meal)’

Here the co-existence of Interior and boundary (I-E) is cumulative, its signals that we are not restricted to I but associate I-E to I, with an empha-

sis on I in I-E (the boundary is represented as related to the Interior of the notion). Since the non centring on I (F: tea, pen, food), because of the association of I-E to I, imports a fuzzy supplement of neighbouring notions (regulated by the specific context or the cultural habits of the speakers), the meanings may exhibit quite considerable variation.

Similarly, the use of current technical terms in English may encapsulate a whole process whose details are not fully or exactly known but are roughly pointed to by the notion F. The echo construction in these contexts stands for an open global idea of F, all the more open since English acts as a screen which may hide by its opacity various unknown items annexed to the notion<sup>22</sup> :

- (17) d *vivâh kar lenâ koî âsân kâh nahîN hai, aur aisâ bhî nahîN hai ki adâlat meN gae to bas shâdî ho gâi. notis-votis bhî to denâ paRtâ hai*  
'get married is not an easy thing, don't think it is enough you go to the court and that's it, you are married (lit. such is not the case that you go to the tribunal then enough, marriage happened). It is also compulsory to give notice and the like' (*noTis-voTis*: there are papers to sign / a whole administrative procedure to follow, including the publication of pre-marriage notice)

On verbal bases too, the echo formation amounts in (17e) to extending the domain of the notion from the typical meaning of *sajânâ* 'get dressed, decorated and prepared' to the neighbouring meanings "festive atmosphere and devotion", with the additional connotations of affectionate ("nicely, fondly") attitude towards the divine couple Shiv-Parvati made by the devotee:

- (17) e *[mân] miTTî mangâkar usse shiv-pârvatî banâtî, kele ke patte se sajà-vajâkar pûjâ kartî...*  
 ‘mother asked for earth and made an image of Shiv-Parvati out of it, she fondly decorated it with banana leaves and did her puja (did her ritual offering to the deity)’

2.3. Polemical use of the relation between F and F’ : de-centring and disqualification of F by F’

Very often, such an extension by associating I-E to the Interior of the notion is used for polemical and derogatory aims, in the same way as other languages may use expressions like “and everything”, “and all this crap”, “et cetera”<sup>23</sup>. In (18a), the game of cards may behave as one paradigmatic element within a wider configuration including implicit other elements such as dice, *karambord* or even *khabbaddi*, but the contextual interpretation (a mother fed up with her child’s laziness) is essentially depreciative. The echo mainly marks that A speaker disapproves of B speaker and blames him for doing or saying something (F) which is not good (F’). In (18b), even if the reading of the echo-expression on “but” as the construction of a wider set of refusals or escapes, the most obvious meaning of the structure is the polemical intent. Similarly (18c) reduplicates “time” with an echo formation which refers to the inner state of the speaker and not of the addressee. Obviously the speaker is not wishing to extend the notion, already vague and wide enough to include every temporal location, duration or leisure; rather, he simply aims at manifesting to the hearer that he is crossed. Similarly in (18d), the speaker, a young man just presenting his foreign girl friend to his mother who serves the food in foreign newly brought plates, blames his mother for this unwelcome initiative: he creates an echo on the adjective “new”, not so much to discard the new plates (which he incidentally himself brought home) but to suggest that he is upset by this way of welcoming the girl, i.e., as a foreigner.

- (18) a *tâsh-vâsh khelne kî bajây      apnâ kâam khatm karo*  
card-echo play instead      REFL work finish do  
 “instead of losing your time in playing cards (or similar stupid games) / these damned cards, you should finish your work’
- (18) b *koî lekin-vekin nahîN*  
 INDEF but-echo NEG  
 ‘there is no ‘but’, stop escaping’

- (18) c *mere pâs      Taim-vaim      nahîN hai*  
of-me near      time(Engl)-echo      NEG est  
‘I have no time to lose (stop hassling me please)’
- (18) d *kripayâ    jab tak main hûN    navâ-vayâ nahîN niklegâ,*  
please    till    I    am    new-echo NEG go-out-fut  
*jismeN roz khâte haiN usî meN khâeNge*  
in-which everyday eat that in will-eat  
‘please, till I am here, do not take out the new plates, we will eat  
in the plates we use everyday’

The statement in (18b) quotes a previously uttered “but” in order to disqualify it, but (18a) and (18c) simply refer to a notion which is new in the context, new but presented as triggering disagreement: the *v-* echo that modifies the original form F in F-F’ betrays the altercation of two different viewpoints at odds, A trying to invalidate B’s supposed idea on the matter. On “cards”, the echo adds a negative comment from A about the game, on “time”, it comments not the notion itself but B’s assumption that A has time and is free. Similarly “new” in (18d) is more a critique of the mother’s clumsy behaviour and a manifestation of the speaker’s irritation at it than a critique of novelty or new plates.

Various meanings result from this dynamics of altercation : some of them directly bear on the notion (parody, depreciation), others bear on the adequateness of the notion in the situational context, others on the relation of the addressee with the notion (his own interpretation of the notion).

### 2.3.1. Depreciative parody within a polemical goal: I vs I - E

Proper nouns F echoed by F’ have most of the time a derogatory effect like any deformation of names in various languages. The polemical charge embedded in the echo construction is not related to a paradigmatic treatment within a wider set of neighbouring notions of which they would represent one of the possible examples. In this way, when an elderly counter-revolutionary or non concerned youngsters utter the name of Lenine with the alteration *lenin-venin* (*lenin-henin* in Pahari), the name Russia (*rûs*) distorted into *rûs-hûs*, addressing a young fiery communist<sup>24</sup>, they only wish to communicate their hatred and dislike towards what is associated with both names. The name distorted in this way is presented as between inverted comas, as if A was quoting B, with the comas referring to A’s



viewpoint as a disqualification of B's viewpoint. You name these persons as good, whereas I think that they are nobodies or pests. "Don't bother me with your Lenin /your Russians" could then be a possible translation. The reason why the echo disqualifies the simple term (F: Interior) is that F' (I-E) verges on E and is in contrast to I pour the speaker A (F' *henin*: more a rascal than a hero as posed by F): the notion Lenin (I) is de-centred towards its boundary and the boundary seen from the outside of the domain (more a rascal, E than a hero, I). Here the boundary, added to the notion by the echo, acts as a pole of 'alterity' (heterogeneity). The speaker A (So, "énonciateur") opposes F' to F uttered by the speaker B (or what A internalizes as B: S1 "co-énonciateur"). The opposition of I-E (F') to I (F) often makes the implicit appreciation of B on F appear as positive (at least the appreciation that A attributes to B). De-centring here refers to A's wish to diverge from B by introducing a markedly different viewpoint on F. Here in I-E, E is emphasized, whereas in (17) I was emphasized; the boundary I-E becomes a place for confrontation between both subjects.

Common nouns, particularly learned or abstract words, are often used with **echo** in colloquial exchange in a similar intent of parody and polemical requalification, particularly when they represent the quotation of a previous utterance. The quoting speaker (A) opposes the interpretation explicitly or implicitly proposed by B, by opposing I-E to I, thus de-centring the initial notion. This type of de-centring grants the notion a quasi metalinguistic status, such as in (19a), where B has previously justified the strange behaviour of his friend by love (*ishq*) and A questions this use of "love", and (19c), where A, an illiterate villager, decodes in the term "private tuition" both a way to approach the girl and a pedantic sign (English) of the new urban class.

(19) a - *kyâ huâ isko ? - ishq.* - *ishk-phishk to ham jânte nahîN bhât*  
 interr fut to-him ? – love. - love-echo TOP we know not brother  
 ‘- what is happening to him ? - love. – love and what so, we don't understand, brother (we know nothing about all this crap)’

(19) b ‘*vah lekhak hai*’. *lekhak-vekhak hai,* *yah sab unkî samajh meN*  
 ‘he writer-echo is’. writer-echo is, this all his mind in  
 come not IMPFT  
*âtâ nahîN thâ*  
 ‘ ‘He is a writer’. He could be a so-called writer, that was meaningless for her’

(19) c *yah tumhârâ Tyûshan-hyûshan ghar ke bhîtar nahîN hogâ*

this your      tuition-echo      home inside      not will-be  
 ‘no way you introduce at home your (trick of the) tuition’

Whether the speaker who distorts the signifier of a notion knows or does not know the precise meaning of it is not relevant. The echo construction F-F’, which amounts here to set F in a quasi metalinguistic status (a word selected for comment by A), indicates that A rejects the positive viewpoint that he attributes to B, and he rejects it by re-qualifying negatively B’s notion of F<sup>25</sup>. A at the same time emphasizes the added symbolical value of the word for F (noble word, poetic word, foreign word, technique word, etc.) and he rejects it: the echo makes explicit the positive connotations of the notion (even if not intended by B), such as the romantic halo of love supposed to justify all misbehaviours, the respectable status of writers, the safeness and professionalism of private tuitions), and he reduces to nil these positive connotations. Echo reduplication of “tuition” here, in a context of quotation (“your”), signals less the incomprehension or rejection of the English term by a villager than the strong refusal of the very idea of tuition, very well understood by A (since it would allow the young boy to get close to the girl). What is added by the distorting echo is the aggressive charge: “you can go to hell, you and your private tuitions”. Here again, the aggressiveness comes from the opposition, by A, of I-E to I, I being the notion as A thinks B interprets it.

Significantly, the syntactic context is always negative in these polemical uses which disqualifies the notion, or the way B uses the notion (justification for crazy acts out of love, magnification in presenting the visitor, strategy for infiltration). What justifies such a rejection **is** the disqualification (or negative requalification) of the term, a disqualification obtained by opposing I and I-E. That it is not cumulative (not I + I-E) like in (17) is made clear by example (20). In (20), the notion “pandit” can in no way be extended by the echo to other connected notions, since it is used as an appellative – a term of address traditionally used by women in this family for the men (father and son) – and “pandit” is the only possible term as a traditional appellative in the context. A young servant is quarrelling with her husband, also working as a servant in the same family, about how to call the young master, who does not like to be called “pandit” since he rejects the traditional appellatives and culture altogether.

- (20) *unheN paNDit-vaNDit mat kahâ karo, unheN acchâ nahîN lagtâ*  
 3P-ACC pandit-echo NEG call FREQ-IMPER 3P-DAT good NEG seems  
 ‘stop calling him Pandit (don’t tag him a pandit), he doesn’t like it’

The young woman protests against the designation *pandit* for the young master, who prefers to be called *sâhab*, « sir ». While doing so with echo construction, she does not construct any notional extension where “pandit” would represent the most typical of the traditional appellative terms. She does not ironize either on the general designation of the learned Brahmins by the word “pandit”, or on its adequateness as an appellative for other people – she keeps calling the old Master “pandit”. But she refuses, in agreement with the young master himself, to use a term he does not like, inadequate for this only reason. Moreover, by doing so, she opposes her husband, a servant but a traditionalist too. The echo construction makes fun of the husband’s concept of appellatives. The conflict between the two interpretations, that of B (S1) the husband, and that of A (So) the wife, is about the interpretation of both speech-act participants regarding the validity of the designation “pandit” for the young master: you think it is a good one, I think it is absurd. With the echo formation, at the same time I make your viewpoint explicit and I invalidate it as absurd. I oppose I-E, which I construct on the notion “pandit”, to the Interior which you stick to because you are panditaized<sup>26</sup>.

The contrast between two conflicting viewpoints is sometimes explicit in the context, as for instance in (21), where a young activist, pressed by his uncle to write a thesis in order to escape the police, clearly compares the two ways of living a political involvement: action side by side with the oppressed and intellectual research (*risarc*).the echo (*risarc-visarc*) simply states that the speaker disqualifies the notion as inadequate to his expectations by comparing it to the other option:

- (21) *vamnechâ par hâvî hotî merî krântîcchâ, risarc-visarc ke lie zarâ  
bhî utsâh na thî, maiN kisânoN yâ mazdûroN ke bîch jâkar kâm  
karnâ châhtâ thâ*  
‘my fire for revolution was dominated by a fire for radical left,  
without the least enthusiasm for research-echo, I wanted to go  
and work with the peasants and workers’

The unit *visarc* (F’ : I-E) is opposed to *risarc* (F : I) as A’s (So’s) conception (the true revolutionary must live with the workers and peasants) to the conception of B (S1) as imagined by A (for the uncle, research is the good choice for an intellectual revolutionary).

### 2.3.2. “Pedagogic” requalification of the notion: I but also I-E

In contrast with the previous cases, here there is no assumption by A of the pole of ‘alterity’ corresponding to the boundary I-E . In a non-polemical context, the echo construction, which stages the discrepancy between two viewpoints on the notion, can be used as a dissuasive strategy without necessarily involving the devaluation of the basic notion F. In the case of revolution, a term used a first time with echo and a second time without echo, it is obvious that the speaker (the uncle, in the same scenario as the previous example) has nothing against revolution and defends the objective concept of it (second occurrence). But he also takes into account the disqualification of the term among the conservative folk and the local power, and it is this disqualification that he confronts his nephew with (first occurrence): you should realize that a negative connotation is associated with the term among most of the people (rather than the interpretation “revolution and other contestation discourses”).

- (22) a I understand you very well, I too have been young and communist  
*lekin kuch din krânti-vrânti kî bāt mat kîjīe,*  
 but some days revolution-echo of speech NEG do  
*krânti (\*vrânti) kî hî khâtir ke lie*  
 revolution (\*echo) of only interest for  
 ‘but forget for sometimes your revolutionary big talk (do not  
 speak of revolution-echo), in the interest of revolution itself (echo  
 is impossible)’

With F-F’, the speaker quotes what corresponds to the knowledge shared by him and his hearer about “revolution” as an experience of his nephew: it may be linked to a halo of dreams and activities, but the main connotation is the blame and rejection in the dominant public opinion. A here simulates the viewpoint of others, those hostile to revolution. The second occurrence of the term (F) reflects the speaker’s own opinion: it rules out the echo F’ because the term here refers to the Interior of the notion (‘act for the benefit of revolution’).

In a similar context, in (22), A tries to convince B to adopt a less risky behaviour, now in love matters; A begins to explain the fatal consequences of sentimentality (*bhâvnâ*) in a relatively technical and solemn language, then he draws the conclusion of this sketch describing the unavoidable ruin awaiting the lover, and for that he uses the usual word for love (*prem*) with **echo** (*prem-vrem*); the echo conveys in the form of connotation the meaning of what has been explicitly demonstrated in the previous sentence:

- (22) b *bhâvnâ kî bhâvnâ karne se vâsnâ paidâ hotî hai aur vâsnâ se andhâ huâ vyakti sahî mârg dekh nahîN pâtâ hai... islie bhavuktâ se khud dūr raho ... ab jâo... thoRe din ke lie prem-vrem bhûlâ kar sârâ dhyân paRhâ par lagâo*  
 ‘being in love with love (by feeling the feeling) necessarily ends up with lust and a person blinded by lust is unable to see the right path... this is why you should keep away from emotionality... now go... forget this silly business of love (love-echo) and devote your whole attention to your studies’

The echo construction on *prem* “love” is a simple summary and translation of the argument previously stated (without reduplication), but it is meant to have a stronger effect on the hearer. It marks a shift in the discourse from the pompous stiffness of high rationalized language and general truths to colloquial and personalized exchange in the everyday register<sup>27</sup>. The first part of the speech, with its quasi scientific rigor and aloofness does not involve the speaker nor hearer’s subjectivity, can remain distant for the hearer, an alien discourse not specially intended for him, whereas the reduplicated term results from the notion such as constructed by S1 or the hearer B (F *prem*) according to So or A, and it is this construction that So denies with I-E (F’: *vrem*).

#### 2.4 (Re)construction of the notion as a plurality of viewpoints, I et I-E being in disjunction

##### 2.4.1. *Disjunction in a negative syntactic context*

In all the previous contexts, negative too, the speaker aimed at denying or ridicule the hearer’s viewpoint on F (parody), or at obtaining from the hearer that he adopts a different viewpoint (pedagogical intent). Heterogeneity (‘alterity’) resulted from the co-existence of two diverging viewpoints, one of which being strongly qualified as bad. Less often, and still in a negative context, the echo formation conveys the simple disjunction of two viewpoints on the notion, without any value judgement. In (23a), a dying agnostic tells his last wishes to his best friends, who are believers, and whom he entrusts for the execution of his wishes after his death. He uses echo on the notion *âtmâ* (soul) in a non-derogatory meaning; the construction may be considered at best associative (soul and other metaphysical or spiritual notions), but it mainly conveys that the speaker acknowl-

edges a double view point on the matter: I don't believe, you do, each one his opinion and I respect yours as I plead you to respect mine.

- (23) a *maiN âtmâ-vâtmâ par vishvâs nahîN kartâ, âp log karte haiN...*  
 I soul-echo on trust NEG do, you people do PRES  
 'I don't believe in soul (God or such things), you people you do ...'

In (23a) the speaker takes B's viewpoint into account, although it differs from his own, and he does not pass any judgement about the legitimacy of any viewpoint. In (23b), the notion *ThaND* (cold) is not requalified nor extended (to the general discomfort related by sleeping on the floor??) since a parallel is given with the warmth which overcomes cold, but it kind of quotes the fear expressed by the speaker's auntie (*aisî*: 'such, of this type, as it had been told') and **echo construction** signals that, contrary to the aunt's fear, there has been no feeling of cold.

- (23) b *bichone par sone lagâ. Mujhe aisî koî ThaND-vaND bhî nahîN lagî.*  
 bedding on sleep began 1S-DAT such some cold-echo even NEG felt  
*Shâyad nîche biche krântikârî sâhitya se uThî garmâhaT kî kripâ*  
*thî yah*  
 'I fell asleep on the mat on the floor. I did not feel the slightest cold. May-be that was because of the heat raising from the revolutionary literature lying on the floor'

'Alterity' (heterogeneity) here results from the contrast between what is really felt (no cold) and what was expected (that cold she was fearing). In both cases, although (23b) and not (23a) grants the notion a possibility of internal variation, both conflicting viewpoints of A and B are maintained, and the echo construction suggests that the notion is constructed in reference to B's viewpoint.

#### 2.4.2. *Disjunction in a positive context*

Finally, in positive contexts, the echo formation has most often positive connotations which contrast with the negative (or neutral) qualification supposed to be that of speaker B. The following examples may help grasping at such meanings. They all belong to the same scenario: two Indians settled in Paris, from Madhya Pradesh, about forty years old, one has just lost his job and is depressed, the other is a good friend who tries to support him in finding the best solutions to overcome depression:

- (24) a *pârTî-vârTî do, bhîR-bhâR milâe<sup>28</sup>, pakauRe-vakauRe banâeN*,  
 party-echo give, crowd-echo meet-CAUS, fried-dip-echo make  
 ‘give a big party, meet lots of people, we will prepare vegetable  
 fried-dips’
- (24) b *biyar-viyar ho jâe ... laRkî-vaRkî pakRe na !*  
 bier-echo be-go-SUBJ ... girl-echo grasp-SUBJ tag  
 ‘there will be bier (it will be nice)... and you’ll find a girlfriend /  
 if you could manage to grasp at some girl (s.e. that would be the  
 good thing for you)’

*Biyar-viyar* (beer), *pârTî-vârTî* (party), *pakauRe-vakauRe* (dip-fried vegetable), *laRkî-vaRkî* (girl), occur in a positive context, with imperative or potential predicates which express the supporting attitude of A towards B (suggestion, friend’s advice). There is no extension of the notional domain to other notions in the same paradigm (not ‘beer and/or other alcoholised beverages such as whisky, rum, etc.’, not ‘party or any such festive meeting’, not ‘*pakauRâ* or any such salted fried dish such as *sâmosâ*’).

But, contrary to the enumeration of simple (non-reduplicated) terms, which would present a neutral catalogue of solutions, the idea of beer as suggested by A to B includes euphoric and bountiful connotations, the idea of dip-fried suggests that there will be plenty, nicely flavoured, that of the girl, that she is both anonymous and attractive. Whereas the simple enumeration (X,Y,Z) can be specified (Gold bier, nicely fried *pakaure*, *pakaure* fried in ghee, a blue-eye girl), the enumeration of echo constructions (F-F’=v-) rules out such specifications, but displays to the subject imagination a whole spectrum of unspecified qualitative variations which A invites B to share with him. Reduplication means that viewpoints are multiple: these viewpoints are not in conflict but simply mean that each of them (you and I) may find the appropriate item, what he needs and wishes. If each of these notions, whether compact or discrete, in their echo form, is presented in (24) as the “good” thing to do in the given situation (fight against depression), that is, trigger the reluctant hearer’s adhesion<sup>29</sup>, by suggesting he modifies his (initially neutral) viewpoint on the notion, it is largely due to the discursive context and the verbal mood. Yet if such serendipity is possible, it is due to the introduction, in the notional domain, of positive connotations in accordance with the cultural stereotypes shared by the speakers. The feature F’, its “alterity”, comes from the added inner variety which gives assurance of getting the good item, in contrast with the definite occurrence (F, in the singular) or the homogeneous plural (F in the



plural). Non-centred, the notional domain becomes variegated and diverse enough to suit every wish.

In a slightly aggressive context, if for instance A tries to get rid of B who asks for something to eat with too much insistence, the same constructions F-F' v- take a different meaning, again resulting from inner variation :

- (25) a *are, koî saNDvic-vaNDvic khâ lo, mujhe tang mat karo*  
 hey, some sandwich-echo eat take, 1S-ACC bother NEG do  
 'oh just get any sandwich whatever, and stop bothering me'
- (25) b *koî laRkî-vaRkî DhûNDh lo, aur shikâyat karnâ band karo*  
 some girl-echo look-for take, and complaint do stop do  
 'you manage to fish any girl and stop complaining'

What is obtained in the echo formations of (25) is a requalification of the notion so as to make all possible actualisations equivalent: any kind of sandwich will do, cheese, chicken or salad, any kind of girl will do, slim or fat, tall or small, there is choice enough for you to be pleased and stop bothering me.

### **2.5. On the predicative notion: demultiplying- the process**

When the echo reduplication affects a predicative notion (verbal basis in a finite syntagma), the result is not a derogatory parody. In appearance, there is an extension of the notional domain, with a fragmentation of the process, without its successive occurrences being equivalent to each other. Speakers refer to this modification in the meaning by describing the process as less precise, less definite, kind of fuzzy or blurred. The verb *moRnâ*, which means "to turn", gets with the echo (*moRnâ voRnâ*), the meaning of to globally change direction, in one or several turns, without referring to one definite occurrence (like a single turn), or even to a precise orientation (you may go in a zigzag manner). In (26a) two friends in a car have taken by mistake a single way in the wrong way, the driver gets upset, the passenger tries to cool him down:

- (26)a *bas, âge kahîN moR-voR lenâ, is saRak se nikleNge*  
 enough, ahead somewhere turn-echo take, this street out will-go  
 'no problem, all we need is to take any turn somewhere and we will get out of this street'



Whereas echo is ruled out if we want to tell the driver that he must turn (at the next crossing, turn left), and similarly to prevent misdirection (turn not here but at the next turn), it is appropriate to propose or describe a somewhat groping trajectory, with a clear objective (get out of here and change direction) but improvised means for doing so. We may have to turn several times or only once, the directives may be not precisely located, just try whenever you get the chance. Similarly, the echo on verb *paRh-nâ* “read/study” would have no meaning in reference to a localised definite process (such as “read this poem aloud to me”), but in (26b) it means that the reader is kind of eclectic, interrupts his activity, jumps from one item to another, one readable material to another, takes all and every chance to read with no specific aim (the speaker here is a servant who just learned how to read)<sup>30</sup>. The habitual aspect (frequentative) may be responsible for the fragmentation of the predicative notion, but echo is responsible for the inner diversification of it:

- (26) b *roz kuch paRh-vaRh liyâ kartî hûN*  
 everyday something read-echo take frequentative PRES-1S  
 ‘I use to (manage to) read something or other everyday (when  
 ever I find time, a review, book, booklet, etc.)’

In (26a) and (26b) the notion gets infused with inner differentiation and is no longer presented as homogeneous and centered as it is with the non reduplicated stem: echo makes it multiple, each possible occurrence differing from others in quality. In the same way as plural singularity can be constructed in the nominal class, with inner differentiation (“the plural left”)<sup>31</sup>, here in the verbal class echo adds qualitative plurality to the notion,<sup>32</sup> including typical values as well as non typical ones (not really read, not frankly turn). Cumulative and lacunary functions are both present here (cf. Kaboré 1998).

## 2.6. Other formations with echo or alliteration

Alliterating formations (F’ does not exist as an independent word) are made mainly by modifying the radical vowel: *dekh-dâkh* ‘see/look’ on *dekh* ‘see/look’, *pûch-pâch* ‘inquire’, on *pûch* ‘ask’; the vowel –â- is practically always substituted to any other vowel (e > â, i > â, u > â). In some cases, the vowel alteration occurs with a consonant modification (*kabhî-kabhâr* ‘occasionally’, on *kabhî* ‘once, ever’), and in other cases the first consonant is suppressed (*âs-pâs* ‘around’, on *pâs* ‘near’).

Some adverbs are lexicalized in standard Hindi in their echo form, as *âs-pâs* or *âr-pâr* both meaning ‘around’ (*pâr* ‘beyond’, *pâs* ‘near’): they involve an extension of the notional domain (truly close + not really close; truly across + not really across). But most of the alliterating formations are found in colloquial speech, such as *kabhî-kabhâr* (on *kabhî* ‘once, ever’) ‘occasionally, sometimes not so often’, with more dissemination than the standard *kabhî-kabhî* ‘sometimes’. Example (24) above includes a noun (*bhîR* ‘crowd’), whose distorting alliteration (*bhîR-bhâr*), like the *v-* echo, adds a plural qualification to the notion: many various people, people of all kinds. But most of the time this type of alliteration is found on verbal basis, in non finite forms (favouring monosyllabic items?). In a process (*dekh-‘see’-dâkh*, *pûch-‘ask’-pâch*, *bec-‘sell’-bâc*), the difference with the simple form of the verb relates to inner plurality, similarly to the standard echo (F-*v-*) formation. The process may be completed in several times ((27a), a statement addressed to a friend who is anxious about the location of the appointment place), or presented as a re-examination (second visit to a flat, that the hearer hesitates renting in (27b)), or presented as the final result of a long process (27c), or even as anticipated and feared ((27d), where two lovers meet secretly). Such a representation of the process means that its occurrences are potentially multiple but there will be a final or good occurrence (although not known in advance).

- (27) a *kisî se pûch-pâch lenâ*  
 somebody from ask-echo take  
 ‘you just ask to anybody (it is not a big thing, you will easily find somebody to tell you)’
- (27) b *dekh-dâkh lenâ zarâ dhyân se*  
 see-echo take little attention with  
 ‘look (at it) thoroughly, quite well, pay attention to everything’  
 (just need to go back and visit again to confirm that yes, you should take it)
- (27) c *sab kuch bec-bâc-kar vilâyat calâ gaya*  
 all sell-echo-CP foreign leave went  
 [after father’s death he] ‘sold everything out and left for England’
- (27) d *kisîne hameN dekh-dâkh liyâ to badnâm hogâ*  
 someone us-acc see-echo took then bad-name will-be  
 ‘if anybody happens to see us (catch us) we will be dishonoured’

The –â formations specifically favour the representation of a process as finalized, although its realization may be difficult or hazardous. Hence the definite character of the process, however groping the previous stages of realisation, hence the use of these forms in contexts where A wishes to stop B's hesitations. The alliteration on *bhûlnâ* 'forget' is a good illustration: whereas forget is usually a non intentional and spontaneous process, without any display of stages leading to the result, the expression *bhûl-bhâl kar*, which is quasi lexicalized, means 'put a final stop to something, a definite end to some thought, empty one's mind of something'. The process may be deliberate ("you should take this out of your mind, do manage to get over and forget everything") and may also result from absolute unconsciousness, but in the latter case unconsciousness is represented as hardly conceivable ("he forgot his own family, his native land, as if all that no longer existed for him"). The non-reduplicated expressions *bhûlkar* 'forgettingly, by mistake', and *bhûlkar bhî* 'even by mistake', constructed on the notion as a homogeneous centred one, do not convey any particular value judgement and involve no teleonomy, but the reduplicated expression *bhûl-bhâlkar*, constructed on the notion as heterogeneous, emphasizes the radical character of the result, presented as allowing no coming back, a superlative forgetfulness in relation to all various forms of forgetfulness included in the notion.<sup>33</sup>

If echo formations may be in some way iconic (the distortion of the signifier produces a distortion in the signified, making it approximate or derogatory), here again it is but a gross appreciation of the phenomenon. The phenomenon once analysed, shows that we systematically deal with a process of de-centering of the notion, which plays on the Interior and Exterior of the notion to reshape the contours of the notional domain, most often by contrasting the speaker's viewpoint with the hearer's one (I-E is adjoined to I in a cumulated or opposed way, or in disjunction).

### **Conclusion**

Although numerous points raised in this study still need further exploration, and notional reduplication should be taken into account in the same perspective<sup>34</sup>, it is obvious that reduplication in Hindi/Urdu is a linguistic category in its own right : it encodes an operation which can be analyzed. Far from being the icon of excess (the "more" we say in reduplication being responsible for the meanings of intensity, distribution, iteration), convertible into "less" and lacunar

meanings by way of fragmentation, it operates in a systematic way. Integral reduplication R (F=F') modifies the scheme of individuation of the notion by opposing the centring of the occurrence: it modifies the relation between the reduplicated term and the constituent(s) to which it is syntactically associated (relation Noun – Verb, dependent verb – main Verb, Adjective – Noun), according to the category of the reduplicated term. Modifying the scheme of individuation may involve the subjective interaction of the speaker and hearer's viewpoints. Partial or alliterating reduplication (F' is an altered form of F) modifies the notion itself by introducing a pole of heterogeneity ('alterity') I-E, which means that not only the centred notion I is taken into account, but its modified form too (I-E), and this account may be of a cumulative, contrastive or disjunctive type. Interior is emphasized (weight on I), and the operation involves almost always the confrontation of two distinct viewpoints. There is nothing "stylistic" there and still it is true that R, in its tree main types, is far more generalized at the informal and colloquial level (apart from the grammatical uses of total R) than in the formal or objective discourse. The reason for these discursive preferences is that R, in all its non-grammatical uses, involves the confrontation of two viewpoints (speaker's and hearer's viewpoints, So and S1), a confrontation which is not necessarily aggressive and may rely on adjustment: it is then natural that R occurs with more frequency in the space of inter-subjectivity and dialogue.

<sup>1</sup> Masica 1992, Emeneau 1980, along with the phonological opposition of cerebral to dental consonants, the rigid word order SOV, postpositions, anteposition of genitive complements, anteposition of adjectives and determinative relatives, morphologically related causatives, transitive and intransitives, verbo-nominal predicates, compound verbs, marked definite or human objects, dative subjects, etc.

<sup>2</sup> "The extracted occurrence is not just *any* occurrence, but it is endowed with a differential property that stabilizes it as being *this* occurrence" (Culioli 1990b: 183). Extraction involves quantification (it relates the occurrence to a definite portion of space in the domain), whereas pin-pointing also involves qualification, in a preponderant way. Culioli 1999 gives more details and analyses on

- 
- the operations involved in constructing the domain and its scheme of individuation, but with no section in English.
- <sup>3</sup> From the clearly onomatopoeic formations (*khaT-khaT* ‘toc toc’, *khây-khây*, *sây-sây* ‘sound of the wind in the trees’, *kal-kal* ‘sound of running water’, *tap-tap* ‘sound of dripping water’, *Dam-Dam* ‘drumming’), to terms in relation with sensorial register, which rely on a correspondence between audition and other senses (*cham-cham* ‘twinkling’, *jham-jham* ‘glittering’, *gich-gich* ‘sticky’). Derived verbs are also more or less iconic (*dhakdhakânâ* ‘palpitate’, *hinhinânâ* ‘neigh’, *khaTkhaTânâ* ‘knok on the door’). Such onomatopoeics occur with or without derivational suffix.
- <sup>4</sup> In the transcription of Hindi, the sign ^ on a vowel indicates length, capitals indicates retroflex consonants except for N which indicates nasalization. The abbreviations are the usual ones: DAT for dative, ERG, ergative, etc.
- <sup>5</sup> Culioli 1990: 183. “Scanning (French ‘parcours’) consists in running over the whole domain without being willing or able to pick out one distinguished value” (to scan: French ‘parcourir’).
- <sup>6</sup> Except of course when simple repetition is involved, emphasizing what the speakers says in the same way as oral stress (*baRhtâ calâ gayâ*, *baRhtâ hî calâ gayâ*, “[I] kept going ahead, kept going ahead”, in conclusion of chapter 6 in *Tyâg Patr*. Similarly the commonly used salutation *jîte raho*, *jîte raho*, “keep alive, keep alive”, the insistant *karûNgâ*, *karûNgâ*, “I will do, I will do”, etc.
- <sup>7</sup> Simultaneity is only apparent for strictly transient processes also, such as “reach” : *us kûce tak pahuNcte-pahuNcte maiN âj bhî thoRî der ke lie râste kî un dukânôN par rukûNgâ* (that lane till reaching-reaching I today too little time for road of those shops on will-stop) ‘today also I will stop for a moment while (until) reaching that lane at the shops on my way’ (K.B. Vaid, *Guzrâ huâ zamâna*). Reduplication of a strictly transitory process gives it a temporal thickness, beyond a strict stabilization, as is even more obvious with a main verb in the inceptive: *sir joRne kî bârî âte âte vah mehnat vyarth lagne lagî* (Gitanjali Shri, *Mai* ) (head joining of turn coming coming this effort useless seem began) ‘when the time came for joining the head (to the body of the doll made by the little girl with cloth) all this labour began to appear meaningless’ (= by the time it came to joining the head....).
- <sup>8</sup> Quite frequent in creoles and contact languages (Moravsick 1978, Kouwenberg 2003), where it can display various sub-meanings such as diminutive, attenuation, approximation, the middle or low degree has come to be considered as prototypical as well as the high degree (Chaudenson 1974, Kyomi 1995) : Chaudenson (1974 : 367) gives examples in the Creole of Réunion Island such as *en zafer ruz ruz* ‘something reddish’, *fay-fay* ‘slightly tired, weak’, besides examples of high degree such as *en bel-bel koson* ‘a huge pig’. See also in Mauritius Creole, *li met en rob ruz-ruz* ‘she wears a reddish dress’, *zot res dan en kaz malang-malang* ‘they live in a house which is a bit dirty’, the second

- 
- constituent alone being stressed (Baker 2003: 214). In this view, ambivalence itself becomes the prototypical meaning.
- <sup>9</sup> This distinction of various plans of variation is borrowed from Denis Paillard, in his study of reduplication in Khmer (International Conference on Identity: *L'Identité*, Université de Tours, 29-30 novembre 2008, To be published in the *Proceedings*).
- <sup>10</sup> Similarly, in French, the qualifying adjective in the left position (pre-nominal) has no descriptive properties, contrary to the post-nominal one (right position).
- <sup>11</sup> S the subject grades the property as optimal according to his personal taste, « nicely » tall, which is not necessarily very tall.
- <sup>12</sup> As in : *is galî meN sirf bare-baRe ghar haiN* (this street in only big-big houses are) 'there are only big houses in this street, every house is big' or *is galî meN nîle-nîle ghar haiN* 'every house is blue in this street'. Note that in the absence of *sirf* "only", the last sentence will be preferably interpreted as "there are bluish houses in the street", which means that *sirf* "only" is responsible for the distributive meaning.
- <sup>13</sup> "Optimal" is of course specified by the context. In this way, a negative or derogatory context will associate the reduplicated adjective to an unpleasant emphasis on quality ("optimally boring") with often ironical interpretation:  
*maiN to baRe-baRe logoN kî baRî-baRî bâtoN se tang â gayâ*  
 I top big-big people of big-big talks of bore come went  
 'I became tired of the tall tales of big-shots'
- <sup>14</sup> Even discovered as a new experience a "blue sky" can be represented as conveying a preconstruct:  
*itnâ gahrâ nîlâ-nîlâ âsmân maiNne pahlî bâr dekhâ*  
 so deep blue-blue sky I-erg first time saw  
 'it was the first time I saw such a blue sky'  
 The preconstructed blueness is emphasized (*itnâ*), saturated (*gahrâ*) and marvellous or astonishing, that is to say appealing the the subjectivity of the speaker (R).
- <sup>15</sup> Like the oft quoted examples (without context) such as "greenish sari" (*harî harî sâRî*), "bluish cap" (*nîlî nîlî topî*): in order to be interpreted with the meaning of low degree, these statements have to relate to direct perception. It seems that the mode of presence is crucial here, more than the character of the noun (dense, compact, discrete) since the cap like the sari rather belong to the category "discrete".
- <sup>16</sup> The suffix *-vâlâ*, which, in this context, indicates selection, rules out reduplication : \* *pîlâ-pîlâ vâlâ*..
- <sup>17</sup> Example from Abbi (1980: 107), who also gives example of the possible occurrence of the same structure with different qualities: *yah âm khaTTâ hai, par vo âm miThâ-mîThâ hai* (this mango sour is, but that mango sweet-sweet is), 'this mango is sourish, but that one is sweetish'. However, the explanation given in

- 
- Abbi (antonymic semantic features “exact” for the simple adjective vs “inexact” for R), is not confirmed by other devices of approximation, which can correlate with simple (‘exact’) adjectives: *vah âm thoRâ-sâ khaTTâ hai, par yah vâlâ ekdam khaTTâ hai* (that mango somewhat sour is but this one really sour is) ‘that mango is somewhat sour but this one is really sour’.
- <sup>18</sup> This suffix, like the full form *jaisâ*, ‘like’, ‘similar to’, is a de-centring device (it may also, particularly with dimensional and quantifying adjectives, result in a high degree interpretation : *bahut-se*, “really many”), but it bears only on the adjective and not, like the reduplicated structures, on the relation between adjective and noun.
- <sup>19</sup> In what follows I, I-E or E stand for such viewpoints on the notion as they allow for different ways of taking it into account. These viewpoints do not necessarily correspond to different speakers and their subjective positions. The notions and notations of, I-E, E are borrowed from the theory of the notion and notional domain in Antoine Culioli (1999) as well as the notation of So for the subjective position of the speaker and S1 for the subjective position of the hearer, who can be an abstraction internalized by So.
- <sup>20</sup> This type of « associative » reduplication are found in Atlantic Creoles and Parkvall (2003) relates this presence to the Indian substratum (*kume-bime* ‘to eat and all’).
- <sup>21</sup> Pahari (« mountain») speeches include mainly Garhwali and Kumaoni. *ishk* transcribes the native pronunciation of *ishq*. This type of echo is even pan-indian (Emeneau 1980), with various consonants used for the first consonant in F’, such as *g-* in Telugu (*puli-guli* « flower »).
- <sup>22</sup> Which may trigger suspicion for the ignorant as is the case in (17d) : “Beware, it is more than a simple advice you will have to give to marry in the court, do not imagine it is a simple thing, it is not as easy as you fancy”. The context is the following: a young boy is fed up with the obstacles raised by the family which do not want to let him marry the girl he loves, and he discloses his intention of a civil marriage in front of his uncle. (17d) is the uncle’s answer. (cf. *infra*).
- <sup>23</sup> We may assume that the distortion on the signifier is by nature derogatory, and so come back to the iconic virtue of reduplication, but what follows shows that such is not always the case.
- <sup>24</sup> This example (Pahari : /h/ est la consonne initiale de F’) is drawn from a long dialogue in a contemporary novel of Manohar Shyam Joshi (*Kyâp*, onomatopoeic title, 2000) dont d’autres contextes sont cités plus loin (exemples 19, 21, 22, 23b).
- <sup>25</sup> Or in (19b) the narrator rejects the viewpoint that A attributes to B (since the sequence is in the indirect reportive style).
- <sup>26</sup> Upendranâth Ashk, *Kiskî bāt* (one act play from the mid twentieth century)..
- <sup>27</sup> A function often performed by code-switching (Hindi/English).

---

<sup>28</sup> Which can be contrast with the derogatory meaning of the same echo in a less optimistic, and non inter-subjective context (because of the relation with the predicate), as:

*maiNne yah sab choR diyâ, pârtiyoN-vârTiyon meN jânâ band kar diyâ*  
1S-ERG this all quit gave, party-echo(v-) in go stop do gave  
'I dropped all this, stopped going in parties and such foolishness'

In (24)a, the alliterative reduplication parallels the *v*- construction, in the same meaning.

<sup>29</sup> But there are also purely descriptive contexts, aiming only at conveying a euphoric ambiance, by calling up (with E) connotations culturally associated to the typical ideal party (heaps of flavored pakauras, lots of bier, etc.). It suggests a real party, in conformity with everybody's expectations ("as you can imagine").

<sup>30</sup> Example from the contemporary novel of Krishna Baldev Vaid, *Naukarânî kî Dâyrî* (Diary of a servant, 2000).

<sup>31</sup> Example commented in Maria Jarrega's PhD (2000), "la gauche plurielle".

<sup>32</sup> Favoured by the use of verbal vector *lenâ*, which not only turns the process towards the subject (auto-benefactive) but makes it perfective too.

<sup>33</sup> Hence the unacceptability of *\*bhûl-bhâlkar bhî* in the meaning of "by mistake".

<sup>34</sup> The fact that it involves two notions (and not one, nor one occurrence) makes it both similar to E and different (no variability of emphasis on I or E). I hope to deal with the topic in the form of a note in the next issue of this annual. It is dealt with in French in Montaut 2008.



## References

- Abbi, Anvita  
1980 *Semantic Grammar of Hindi, A Study in Reduplication*, Delhi, Bahri Publications.  
1992 *Reduplication in South Asian Languages. An Areal, Typological and Historical Study*. Delhi: Allied Publishers.
- Baker, Peter  
2003 Reduplication in Mauritian Creole with notes on Reduplication in Reunion Creole, In Kouwenberg 2003, 211-18.
- Chaudenson, Robert  
1974 *Le Lexique du parler créole de la Réunion*. Paris : Champion.
- Culioli, Antoine  
1990a The Concept of Notional Domain. In *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation. Opérations et représentations* Vol 1. Gap: Ophrys, 67-82.  
1990b Representations, referential processes and Regulation . In *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation. Opérations eprésentations* Vol 1. Gap: Ophrys, pp. 177-214.  
1999 *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation. Domaine notionnel*. Vol. 3. Gap: Ophrys.
- Emeneau, Muray B.  
1969 Onomatopoeics in the Indian Linguistic Area. *Language* 45-2, pp. 294-99.
- Fassi-Fehri, A. and Vinet, M.T.  
2001 Distribution of Number and Classifier in Arabic and Chinese and Parametrization. *Linguistic Research* 9-1. IERA Publications, pp. 6-51.
- Hurch, Bernard (ed.)  
2005 *Studies in Reduplication*, Berlin/New-York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jarrega, Maria  
2000 *Le rôle du pluriel dans la construction des syntagmes nominaux en français contemporain*. Thèse de doctorat en sciences du langage. Paris X Nanterre.
- Kaboré, Raphael

- 1998 La Réduplication. *Faits de Langue* 11-12, *Les langues d'Afrique subsaharienne*, 359-376.
- Kouwenberg Sylvia and Darlène LaCharité  
2001 The iconic interpretation of reduplication: Evidence from Caribbean Creole languages. *European Journal of English Studies* 15, 59-80.
- Kouwenberg Sylvia and Darlène LaCharité  
2005 Less is More : Evidence from Diminutive Reduplication in Caribbean Creole Languages. In Hurch (ed.), 533-45.
- Kouwenberg, Sylvia (ed.)  
2003 *Twice as Meaningful: Reduplication in Pidgins, Creoles and other contact languages*. Londres: Batsford.
- Kyomi, S.  
1995 A New Approach to Reduplication: a Semantic Study of Noun and Verb Reduplication in Malayo-Polynesian Languages. *Linguistics* 33, 1145-1167.
- Montaut, Annie  
2009 Reduplication et constructions en écho en hindi/ourdou. *Faits de Langue, Les Cahiers 1*, **under press**.
- Montaut, Annie  
2007 Formes et valeurs de la reduplication totale en hindi/ourdou. *Faits de Langue* 29, *La Réduplication*, pp. 175-190.
- Montaut, Annie  
2004 *Hindi Grammar*. München: Lincom-Europa.
- Moravcsik, Edith  
1978 Reduplication. In Greenberg Joseph H. (ed.), *Universals of human language*. Volume 3: *Word structure*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 297-33.
- Parkvall, Michael  
2003 Reduplication in Atlantic Creoles. In Kouwenberg (ed.), 19-36.
- Singh, Rajendra  
2005 Reduplication in Modern Hindi and the Theory of Reduplication, In Hurch (ed.), 263-81.