

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

2  
3 *Annie Montaut*  
4  
5  
6  
7

8 *The aim of this paper is to enquire into the various meanings of reduplication*  
9 *as a linguistic operation, and not as a merely stylistic or expressive device.*  
10 *The theoretical frame is Antoine Culioli’s ‘énonciative’ linguistics (notion*  
11 *and located occurrence, notional domain and boundary); context and inter-*  
12 *subjectivity are taken into account as much as possible. The first section deals*  
13 *with total reduplication, within the nominal, verbal and adjectival category: it*  
14 *shows that reduplication on an occurrence modifies the relation between the*  
15 *reduplicated term and the term syntactically associated to it by denying the*  
16 *occurrence any specific stable value. It thus modifies the scheme of individua-*  
17 *tion of the notion (its actualization into an occurrence). The second section,*  
18 *dealing with partial reduplication or echo constructions, whether formed with*  
19 *a v- substitution to the initial consonant or with other forms of alliteration,*  
20 *shows that it modifies the notion itself by de-centring it, and reshapes it by*  
21 *taking into account various forms of heterogeneity, particularly the conflict-*  
22 *ing viewpoints of speaker and hearer.*  
23  
24

## 25 **Introduction**

26

27 Reduplication is a pan-Indian phenomenon regularly cited as one of the  
28 dozen features accounting for the consistency of the South Asian linguistic  
29 area<sup>1</sup>. It is however more often quoted than really analysed. Within the In-  
30 dian area, studies on reduplication have emphasized its structural impor-  
31 tance in respect to the linguistic area (from Emeneau 1969, the most solid  
32 study, to Abbi 1992) or listed its various forms and meanings in a given  
33 language (Abbi 1980). Singh’s 2005 contribution is the first one to give a  
34 detailed theory-based analysis of its morphology, formulating a nearly ex-  
35 haustive set of explicit morphological rules for reduplication processes in  
36 Hindi/Urdu. He also associates reduplication to echo-constructions or par-  
37 tial reduplication and to semantic pairs, followed by Montaut (2008). As  
38 for the semantics, the most current hypothesis is the thesis of iconicity

1 (Kouwenberg 2003), with the most interesting discussions bearing on the  
 2 problems raised by various meanings apparently non iconic (Kyomi 1995).  
 3 Do these three types represent a same operation (with distinct actualiza-  
 4 tions) or distinct operations?

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

11 The terms “notion” and “occurrence” as used here belong to the theo-  
 12 retical framework of Culioli (1990a, 1990b, 1999). A notion or notional do-  
 13 main (Culioli 1990b: 181) “can be defined as a complex of physico-cultural  
 14 representations with no extensional properties” (it is a purely qualitative  
 15 categorization, purely intentional, for instance “dog”). A notional domain  
 16 has a centre (in X, what is typically X), and a boundary which delimits its  
 17 Interior (I) from its Exterior (E). The centre of the notion “dog” for in-  
 18 stance is a dog fully conforming to the properties usually associated with  
 19 it, what we can truly call a dog. “To construct the extension of the notion  
 20 is to construct its occurrences” (a dog, the dog, this dog, many dogs, etc.),  
 21 which are “distributed in relation to the organizing centre of the domain”  
 22 (an occurrence is then locatable: absolute value, referring to the type, is at-  
 23 tached to the centre of the domain, whereas relative values decrease as “you  
 24 move away from the centre”). Constructing the occurrences is the basic  
 25 scheme of individuation of a notion (it amounts to constructing the exten-  
 26 sion of the notion), and it consists in an operation of quantification together  
 27 with qualitative sub-categorization. In the construction of occurrences, the  
 28 basic operation is that of extraction: “ascribing an existential status to a sit-  
 29 uated (located) occurrence of a notion”, extraction “brings into existence  
 30 an individuated occurrence that has no other distinguishing feature than  
 31 the fact that it has been singled out” (Culioli 1990b: 182)<sup>2</sup>. Other operations  
 32 in the construction of the occurrence involve re-identification (pinpointing:  
 33 “this dog which we are referring to, the same dog”) and scanning. Scanning  
 34 means that you have to scan the whole notional domain without finding a  
 35 possible stable location (“any dog, which dog”). A notional domain may be  
 36 represented as homogeneous (typical values: really *p*) or containing non-  
 37 typical values (not really *p*, verging on *p'* or non *p*) and so including hetero-  
 38 geneity (Culioli retains ‘alterity’ for French “alterity”).

1       What follows shows that reduplication modifies the scheme of individ-  
2 uation of the notion (integral reduplication) or the notion itself (partial re-  
3 duplication): it is obviously far more than a stylistic device or a “way of  
4 speaking”, a categorization which implicitly denies R the status of linguistic  
5 category and make it an exotic phenomena. The two recently published col-  
6 lections (Hurch 2005 and Kouwenberg 2003) provide the reader with an  
7 important mass of data, yet do not always give the appropriate contextual-  
8 isation for fully understanding the meanings of the data presented. The aim  
9 of this paper is to enquire into the various meanings of reduplication as a  
10 linguistic operation, and not as a merely stylistic or expressive device, with  
11 appropriate contextualisation.

12       In Hindi, reduplication provides for an important part of the lexicon,  
13 both verbal and nominal<sup>3</sup>, as well as for grammatical structures (distribu-  
14 tion, iteration): it belongs to the core of the language, if we hold language  
15 to be the regulated organization of given lexical material. It also provides  
16 many “manners of speaking”, “stylistic or expressive uses”, which do not  
17 obey easily recognizable constraints and are all the more difficult to grasp  
18 since they present great variation even between users of the same language,  
19 and involve the speaker’s subjectivity.

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

25

## 26 **1. Total Réduplication: Non-centering of the occurrence**

27

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

34

### 35 **1.1. Nouns and numerals**

36

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

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

4  
 5

6 1.1.1. *The typically distributive meaning: Numeral-numeral nom*

7  
 8 Apart from the iteration of the process for each occurrence of the benefi-  
 9 ciary in (1a), “give one X (toffee) each Y (child)”, hence the possible com-  
 10 mutation of (1a) with statements having the indefinite *har* ‘each’ (2a), the  
 11 reduplication of the numeral acts on the scheme of the individuation of Y  
 12 (*n* occurrences of “child”) as well as that of X (*n* occurrences of “toffee”)⁴:

- 13  
 14 (1) a. *bacon ko ek-ek tâfî do*  
 15 child-P DAT one-one toffee give  
 16 ‘give a toffee to each child, one toffee per child’  
 17 b. *baccoN ek keji tafiyâN do*  
 18 child-P DAT one kilo toffees give  
 19 ‘give one kilo toffees to the children’

- 20  
 21 (2) a. *har bacce ko ek tâfî do*  
 22 each child-S DAT one toffee give  
 23 ‘give a toffee to each child’  
 24 b. *bacce ko ek tâfî do*  
 25 child-S DAT one toffee give  
 26 ‘give a toffee to the child’ (definite occurrence)

27  
 28 (1a) shows that the beneficiary is the class of children, morphologically plu-  
 29 ral, whereas (2a) refers to this same class by a singular, “each child”. On the  
 30 one hand, we cannot set a definite referential value for “a child”, so that  
 31 there is no locatable occurrence which we may construct, and on the other  
 32 hand plurality as constructed by the reduplication of the numeral in (1a) is  
 33 distinct from plurality as an homogeneous group, in (1b) for instance with  
 34 the morphological plural, by the fact that each unit is isolated and individ-  
 35 uated as a beneficiary (hence the equivalence between (1a) and (2a)). In  
 36 (1a), the beneficiary is characterized as a non-global plurality which is  
 37 formed by the exhaustive collection of all the distinct singularities within  
 38 the set, with no possibility of selecting any of them. The reduplication of

1 the numeral acts as a variable which makes it necessary to scan the whole  
 2 set of occurrences without being ever able to stop on any specific occur-  
 3 rence<sup>5</sup>, exactly as does the quantifier *har* 'each'.

4  
 5  
 6 1.1.2. *The «listing» effect: noun or pronoun in the singular*

7  
 8 The reduplication of singular relatives or interrogatives gives the meaning  
 9 "each element, with no exception", and suggests a complete series which,  
 10 again, constructs a plurality made of *n* singularities, in a non cumulative  
 11 and non interchangeable way, so that there is no single occurrence we can  
 12 pick up and locate, and we have to go through the whole set of occurrences  
 13 – a typical case of scanning too:

- 14  
 15 (3) a. *tum kahâN kahâN gae?*      *tumne kyâ kyâ dekhâ?*  
 16      you where where went      you-ERG what R saw?  
 17      'where did you go?'      'what did you see?'  
 18      (give a list of all and every place)
- 19      b. *jo-jo âegâ use batânâ ki maiN*  
 20      who who will-come 3S-DAT say that 1s  
 21      *ek ghaNTe bād âûNgî*  
 22      1 hour after come-fut  
 23      'say to whoever will come (to all and every visitor) that I will  
 24      come back in one hour'

25  
 26 The reduplication of singular nouns, which often creates intensive meanings  
 27 or even amounts to presenting the entity as an extreme, can be explained in  
 28 the same way: intensiveness in (4a) results from the construction of an ex-  
 29 haustive series, with all its elements collected one by one, hence the effect  
 30 of an integral hair-rising; in (4b) "know" is predicated not about an occur-  
 31 rence but about a set of occurrences (each of them being considered as a  
 32 singular occurrence), which tends to mean that its validity is above any con-  
 33 tingency; as for the meaning "even", it results from the improbability of the  
 34 relation between predicate and noun (know / child).

- 35  
 36 (4) a. *uskâ rom-rom tharrâ uThâ*  
 37      his hair-MS-hair-MS      rise get up-AOR-MS  
 38      'each of his hair rose up /his hair rose up all over his body'

- 1           b. *baccâ baccâ           jântâ hai*  
 2           child-MS child-MS   know PRES-3MS  
 3           ‘he last boy is aware/ even a child knows that, every child  
 4           including the last one know that’  
 5

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

16

17

18 1.1.3. *Reduplication of plural nouns*

19

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

25

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

34

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

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

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

20

21

## 22 1.2. Reduplication of the verb: Iteration of the process

23

24 In the verbal class, only nonfinite verbal forms can reduplicate with the pat-  
 25 tern F-F<sup>6</sup>. Various occurrences of reduplicated participles (imperfect or  
 26 present/perfective or past, conjunctive participles (*V-kar*) are grammati-  
 27 cized in various types of iteration, the typical meaning of non-centring  
 28 when processes are concerned. Since reduplicated participles are already de-  
 29 pendent verbal forms, the occurrence of the process cannot be localized but  
 30 by the main verb: R cannot be, as it is in the nominal category, responsible  
 31 for the non-localized, non-stabilized status of the occurrence, in need of lo-  
 32 calization. R indeed affects the occurrence in need of localization in such a  
 33 way as to multiply it into  $n$  similar occurrences, none of which is the best  
 34 (definite) value, but all of them construct a series which fragments the pro-  
 35 cess (or make the state into a durative) and draws its meaning from the re-  
 36 lation with the main finite verb. Iteration within the verbal category and  
 37 distribution within the nominal category are thus symmetrical. In this way,  
 38 with an action or event main verb as in (6a), not to speak “eating-eating”

1 means that each word/statement is associated with an occurrence of eating,  
 2 hence the illusion of more simultaneity<sup>7</sup>, and in (6b), the reduplication of  
 3 the past stative participle “slept-slept” with main verb “die” means that at  
 4 some moment in this state (sleep) he died, hence the appearance, here again,  
 5 of a perfect concomitance. In (6c) the reduplicated conjunctive participle  
 6 *Tahal-Tahalkar* multiplies the occurrences of wandering, so that the process  
 7 may appear more imprecise (non-telic) but this indefiniteness comes from  
 8 the semantics of the verb. In (6d), the iteration of n occurrences of “laugh”  
 9 adds a meaning of intensity, here again a side-effect of the basic operation  
 10 of de-centring by scanning, while (6e–f), with two action processes, displays  
 11 the basic effect of R when non iterative, that is, giving temporal width to  
 12 the dependent process (no one single locatable occurrence):

- 13  
 14 (6) a. *khâte-khâte mat bolo*                      *khâte (hue) mat bolo*  
 15        eating-eating NEG speak-imper        eating been NEG speak!  
 16        ‘do not speak while eating / don’t speak when eating’  
 17        b. *soye-soye mar gayâ*                      *???soye mar gayâ*  
 18        slept-slept die went                      slept die went  
 19        he died in his sleep /        ???in his sleep he died’  
 20        c. *maiNne Tahal-Tahalkar*                      *sârâ din kâTâ*  
 21        1S-ERG wander-wander-Cp        whole day cut  
 22        ‘I spent the whole day wandering (here and there, in various  
 23        places)’  
 24        d. *usne haNs-haNs-kar*                      *pûrî kahânî sunâi*  
 25        3S-ERG laugh-laugh-CP        entire story told  
 26        ‘he told the whole story laughing (a lot, at many times)’  
 27        e. *mârg meN calte-calte*                      *âj mâN se ek savâl pûchhâ*  
 28        street in walking-walking        today mother to one question asked  
 29        ‘today, while walking on the road, I ask Mother a question’  
 30        f. *jâte-jâte*                      *ve kahte*  
 31        going-going        3p said  
 32        ‘he used to say while going’ (from Santapt, like (6e))  
 33  
 34

35 Both the following series exhibit a specific relation between reduplicated  
 36 participle (conjunctive, accomplished or unaccomplished) and main verb.  
 37 If the main verb represents a transient state and the dependent participle  
 38 an action, the relation is causal (cause-effect: cf. Abbi 1980), which amounts



1 to representing a series of iterations leading to a result (successful accumu-  
2 lation) such as in (7):

- 3  
4 (7) a. *yah câdar dhul-dhulkar phaT gaî*  
5 this sheet wash-wash-CP tear went  
6 'this sheet got torn by/following repeated washings'
- 7 b. *tumhârî shikâyat sunte-sunte (sun-sunkar) main ûb gayâ thâ*  
8 your complaint hearing-hearing (-CP) I bore go ppft  
9 'I was fed up listening to your complaint'
- 10 c. *vahâN akele baiThe-baiThe ûb gayâ*  
11 here alone sat-sat bore went  
12 'he got fed up of sitting here (inactive)'
- 13 d. *rote-rote uskî ânkhēN sûjh gaîN*  
14 crying-crying his eyes swell went  
15 'his eyes got swollen by (repeatedly, thoroughly) crying'
- 16

17  
18 If the main verb represents avoidance («be-saved/escape», «remain, stay») and the participle action or event, reduplication means that the accumu-  
19 lation of occurrences does not reach the normally expected result, hence the  
20 lacunar value in (8):  
21

- 22 (8) a. *vah girte-girte bac gaya*  
23 3s falling-falling escape went  
24 'he almost fell (failed to fall?)'
- 25 b. *yah bâT hoNThoN par â-âkar rah gaî*  
26 this thing lips on come-come-CONJ.PART stay went  
27 'I was about to say this thing but did not'
- 28 c. *bârish hote-hote rah gaî*  
29 rain being-being stay went  
30 'it almost rained (but did not)/it was about to rain but did not'
- 31

32  
33 In statements like (7) where the relation is between a dependent action verb  
34 and a main verb expressing a transient state, reduplication is necessary for  
35 the cause-effect meaning (9a), and a non-reduplicated participle will pro-  
36 duce simple concomitance between both processes (9b). Moreover, a non-  
37 reduplicated participle not only fails to produce the avoidance meaning  
38 in statements like (8), but it is non-grammatical with main verb meaning

1 “escape” (10a) while the reduplicated participle with an action main verb  
2 means concomitance (10b):

3

- 4 (9) a. *sîtâ kâm karte (hue) thak gâi*  
5 Sita work doing (been) got tired  
6 ‘Sita got tired when working’  
7 b. *kâm karte karte thak gâi*  
8 work doing doing got tired  
9 got tired of/by working’  
10

- 11 (10) a. *???vah girte bach gayâ*  
12 3s falling escape went  
13 ‘while falling he screamed’  
14 b. *girte girte zor se chillâyâ*  
15 falling falling strong screamed  
16

17

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

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

33 However it is quite clear that, even with such “prototypical” meanings,  
34 the supplement supposedly added by R is only the trace of an operation  
35 which does not amount to say more but modifies the relation between N  
36 and V or dependent V and main V. The meanings of reduplication observed  
37 above in examples (1a), (3), (4), (6), (7), (8) such as distribution, list ef-  
38 fect, iteration, do not amount to saying more but to conceive differently the

1 relation between the reduplicated entity and the constituents with which it is  
2 syntactically associated in the statement. The case of the adjective is even  
3 more revealing, since the meanings of R are more proliferating.

4  
5  
6 1.3. Reduplicated adjectives: Degree, expressivity or neutralisation of the  
7 differential property?

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

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

33 Normally an adjective qualifies the noun by conferring to it a differential  
34 property (which makes it descriptive): *lambâ laRkâ* ‘tall boy’, or *lambe*  
35 *laRke* ‘tall boys’, refers to a boy or a set of boys with tallness as a distinctive  
36 property (as compared to other boys, small and medium-sized); being tall  
37 here is a differential property. The reduplicated expressions, on the con-  
38 trary, *lambâ-lambâ laRkâ*, as well as *lambe-lambe laRke*, do not identify

1 the noun as being qualified by the property “being tall” in contrast with  
 2 other possible properties, but suggests either that the relation boy-tall is al-  
 3 ready pre-constructed (the noun is pre-identified by the property ‘being tall’  
 4 and reduplication stands for a valuation of this tallness, in a subjective ap-  
 5 preciation<sup>11</sup>) or that it has a distributive meaning – each of the boys is tall,  
 6 the only commented meaning for plural in the relevant literature.

7

8

9 1.3.1. ‘Intensity’ and ‘high degree’: Surface effects of various operations

10

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

19

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

33

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

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

- 4  
 5 (12) a. yah rahâ tumhârâ kok, pî lo, ThaNDâ-ThaNDâ hai  
 6 here is your coke, drink take, cold-cold is  
 7 ‘here is your coke, drink it, it is nicely cold’ (not “very cold”)  
 8 b. yah lo tumhârî cây. Garam-garam hai, piyo  
 9 this take your tea hot-hot is, drink  
 10 ‘take your tea. It is nicely hot, drink it’  
 11 c. yah lo tumhârî cây. Garam / bahut garam /  
 12 this take your tea hot / very hot /  
 13 ??garam-garam hai, abhî mat pio  
 14 ??hot-hot is right now NEG drink  
 15 ‘here is your tea, it is very hot, don’t drink it now’  
 16

17 In (12), R does not correspond to high degree but to the optimal degree, the  
 18 ideal temperature for a good tea according to the speaker and addressee.  
 19 “Ideal” means that the degree of hotness is conform to the expectations of  
 20 the drinkers on the basis of the speaker’s (and hearer’s) cultural habits and  
 21 knowledge. “Very hot” is descriptive: it measures a degree and intends to be  
 22 objective, and can be contrasted with comparative (X is hot but Y is hot-  
 23 ter). “Nicely hot” does not allow such a contrast (\*X *garam-garam hai par*  
 24 *Y zyada garam(-garam) hai*) because is does not measure the degree. It  
 25 is not descriptive and that is the reason why it sounds somewhat like a sub-  
 26 jective appreciation. Similarly, vegetable and fruit sellers in markets, when  
 27 they advertise their goods, systematically reduplicate the adjective (fresh-  
 28 fresh vegetable, fresh-fresh news, hot-hot *pakaure*, etc.). Quality is empha-  
 29 sized, but rather for its adequateness to the customer’s expectations than  
 30 for its objective degree. In such examples, the noun (compact) is the bearer  
 31 of the property and its relation with the adjective has already been con-  
 32 structed, freshness or hotness being pre-requisite qualities in the given con-  
 33 texts. A simple adjective would simply indicate that the tea is neither cold  
 34 nor lukewarm, but R neutralizes the feature “differential” in the property  
 35 in order to emphasize its manifestation: conformity with the typical ideal  
 36 of good tea (nicely hot, but precisely not too hot) sets the value, shared par  
 37 the subject S and hearer as imagined by S. Similarly, the *pakaure* are not  
 38 described as hot in contrast with cold, and the vegetable are not described

1 as fresh rather than rotten or dry, but as hot-*pakaure* and as fresh-vegetable  
 2 whose quality is commented as ideal. There is no room for a different eval-  
 3 uation which could exclude the property (hot, fresh), the speaker does not *a*  
 4 *priori* allows the possibility for the hearer to conceive the entity with an-  
 5 other property. This explains that the property is represented as saturated,  
 6 in conformity with what the speaker imagines concerning the hearer's ex-  
 7 pectations, and that such constructions trigger empathy with the hearer<sup>13</sup>.

8 As for the colour of grass in (13), it is neither greenish nor pale green, it  
 9 is fully green and saturated, in conformity with the Bollywood stereotype of  
 10 pleasant scenes, even if the noun is in the singular (supposed to automati-  
 11 cally shift to the low degree with R):

- 12  
 13 (13) *peRoN kî châNv meN kuch yugal tarûN harî-harî mulâyam*  
 14 trees of shadow in some couple young green-green tender  
 15 *ghâs par cahalqadmî kar rahe the*  
 16 grass on stroll were doing  
 17 'some youths in couple were strolling under the shadow of the trees,  
 18 on the green tender grass' (Himanshu Joshi, *Yatharth*)

19  
 20 Here reduplication grants the property both an appreciative character and  
 21 saturation. Subjective appreciation accommodates qualitative variation,  
 22 which is only possible because the property has previously been pre-  
 23 constructed as homogeneous in contrast to the various choices maintained  
 24 as other possibilities when there is no R. For instance when a gardener  
 25 wishing to grow a lawn and selecting his plants among various colours,  
 26 will ask for green (or dark green, or pale green, eventually yellow, etc.) in  
 27 using the simple adjective (pointing to basic heterogeneity: colour as a dif-  
 28 ferential property), and not R. In a similar configuration, a "blue-blue sky"  
 29 is most often interpreted as "quite blue", "really blue", "very pure":

- 30  
 31 (14) *yah nilâ-nîlâ âkâsh dekhkar mujhe pahâR meN bachpan kî yâd âi*  
 32 this blue-blue sky see-CP 1s-dat mountain in childhood of memory  
 33 came  
 34 'seeing such a blue sky I remembered my childhood in the mountains'

35  
 36 The pre-construction here is not cultural but situational: the speaker does  
 37 not describe the sky with its colour as he discovers it when stepping out-  
 38 doors, but dreams over the associations he can relate to the blue sky which

1 he is confronted with, as such. The colour of the space of the sky (bearer of  
 2 the property) is already made homogeneous. In contrast, a speaker for  
 3 weather forecast cannot describe the sky by using reduplication, even if he  
 4 wishes to emphasize its perfect blueness and clarity, because what he aims  
 5 at is communicating information on the colour of tomorrow sky (neither  
 6 grey nor black nor covered), with no pre-construction. Similarly a peasant  
 7 who says “if the sky is blue tomorrow (the weather is fine) I will begin the  
 8 crop”, cannot use R because the anticipated blue of the sky is only one pos-  
 9 sibility among others and retains its meaning of differential property. More  
 10 generally, a sky which is blue (not grey, not black) is expressed by the sim-  
 11 ple adjective, whereas a blue-sky (which may be particularly blue, evoca-  
 12 tive, or else) is expressed with R<sup>14</sup>.

13

14

15 1.3.2. “*Low degree*” and attenuation: *Different operations according to the*  
 16 *semantics of the noun (discrete, compact, dense)*

17

18 In a general way, the attenuative (approximation, diminution) meaning is  
 19 related to the mode of presence of an entity. The notion of ‘mode of pres-  
 20 ence’ relates to a particular stand of the speaker: tell the world (a given en-  
 21 tity of the world) such as he is confronted to it (and not in a descriptive, an-  
 22 alytical, way), hence the affinities with verbs of perception.

23

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

29

30 (15) a. *nice nîlâ-nîlâ pâñî bahâ rahâ thâ*  
 31 below blue-blue water flow PROG impft  
 32 ‘bluish water was running below’

33

34 b. *sâmne nîle-nîle pahâr kî rekhâ dikhâ de rahî thî*  
 35 in-front blue-blue mountains of line be-seen PROG IMPFT  
 36 ‘the bluish line of the mountains could be seen in front’

37 Such examples as (15) can be contrasted with the “truly blue sky” of (14)  
 38 which implied a pre-constructed relation, whereas (15) pertains to direct

1 perception<sup>15</sup>. In the series (16), we may similarly explain the attenuative  
 2 meaning (16a) by the association to a noun categorized as discrete (paper)  
 3 of a property which is presented as a mode of presence (yellow-yellow):  
 4 without any verb of perception, narration itself constraints the viewpoint  
 5 of an observer in the process of getting aware of what is visible around  
 6 him. In contrast, in (16b), at a wall paper sender, the selection of a roll of  
 7 paper chosen for its differential property (yellow, and not blue or green) re-  
 8 quires the simple (non-R) adjective (*pîlâ-vâlâ*: “the yellow one”)<sup>16</sup>; only if  
 9 the hearer (Culioli’s co-énonciateur: S1) answers by repeating the already  
 10 selected colour, reduplication can occur, since it presents the mode of con-  
 11 struction of the property (the colour yellow-yellow itself), with an homoge-  
 12 neization on ‘yellow’, so that the meaning is saturation (bright yellow,  
 13 frankly yellow).

- 14  
 15 (16) a. *ek purânî ciTThî paRî thî, pîle-pîle kâgaz par câr shabd likhe the*  
 16 an old letter fall had been, yellow-yellow on 4 words written were  
 17 ‘an old letter was lying on the floor, four words were written on the  
 18 yellowed (yellowish) paper’  
 19 b. A. *pîlâ-vâlâ lo ! – B. yah pîlâ-pîlâ rang kamre meN acchâ nahîN*  
 20 *lagegâ*  
 21 yellow-that take ! this yellow-yellow colour room in good NEG will-  
 22 seem  
 23 ‘A. take the yellow one ! B. this bright yellow won’t fit in the room’  
 24

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

- 34  
 35 (16) c. *dekho, kitnâ âm rasîlâ / chilkâ uskâ pîlâ-pîlâ*  
 36 look, how-many mango juicy / skin its yellow-yellow  
 37 *lagtâ kitnâ tâzâ hai / âm phaloN kê râjâ hai*  
 38 seems how-much fresh is / mango fruits of king is



1 'look, how juicy is the mango/ its skin deep yellow (yellowish) /  
2 how fresh it looks / mango is the king of fruits''

3  
4 Whatever the meaning, approximation or saturation, it flows from the neu-  
5 tralization of the differential property in the adjective. That is why redupli-  
6 cation cannot be correlated or contrasted with the simple adjective for the  
7 same quality as seen in (16d)<sup>17</sup>:

8  
9 (16) d. \*yah langRâ âm khaTTâ hai, par vah dashaharî âm khaTTâ-haTTâ  
10 hai  
11 this langra mango sour is, but that dashahari mango sour-sour is  
12 (\*this Langra mango is sour but that Dashahari is sourish)  
13

14  
15 An adjective (simple) conveying a differential property cannot correlate  
16 with an adjective conveying the neutralization of a differential property.

17 Finally, it is noteworthy that low degree is not exclusively restricted to  
18 colours and taste, since the reduplication of an adjective, whether or not  
19 referring to colour/taste, is compatible with the approximation suffix -sâ<sup>18</sup>.  
20 Certainly, the reduplication of a colour or taste adjective is always attenua-  
21 tive with this suffix: *pilâ-pilâ-sâ ujevâlâ* (yellow-yellow-like brightness), 'a  
22 vaguely yellow brightness, a pale luminosity', *kâlâ-kâlâ-sâ kapRâ* (black-  
23 black-like cloth) 'blackish garment'. But other adjectives in similar contexts  
24 (-sâ) may also have, if not systematically, the low degree meaning. *bholâ-*  
25 *bholâ sâ laRkâ*, simple-simple-sâ boy 'a rather naïve boy', *Tarch kî marî-*  
26 *marî-sî roshnî*, torchlight of dying-dying-sâ light 'quasi dying /agonizing  
27 light of the torchlight' but *simTâ-simTâ-sâ baccâ* shrank-shrank-sâ child,  
28 '(totally) curled over child'.

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

1 **2. Echo-constructions: De-centring the notion**

2

3 It has been shown above that integral reduplication amounts to taking into  
 4 account the  $n$  occurrences of the reduplicated term. As a non-centring de-  
 5 vice allowing for qualitative variation (each occurrence retains its singu-  
 6 larity), it rules out the possibility of assigning a specific definite value to  
 7 the occurrence and redefines the relation between the reduplicated term and  
 8 another term in the statement: noun and verb, participle (dependent verb)  
 9 and main verb, adjective and noun, with the typical meanings of distribu-  
 10 tion and iteration but also with a whole series of different meanings. The  
 11 echo construction (a phonetic alteration of F into F') bears on the no-  
 12 tion: it works as an extension of the notional domain ("N and other sim-  
 13 ilar things"). It is on the domain and not on the occurrence that the echo  
 14 construction operates as a de-centering process: it introduces here "alter-  
 15 ity" (heterogeneity) by simultaneously taking into account several view-  
 16 points on the notion associated to the reduplicated term. These heteroge-  
 17 neous viewpoints correspond to a particular structuration of the notional  
 18 domain in different zones, each of them defining a distinct mode (zone)  
 19 of the notion (and a viewpoint on it): Interior, noted below I (really  $p$ : the  
 20 viewpoint is centred), boundary, noted I-E (not really  $p$ : the viewpoint is  
 21 de-centred, but compatible with I), and Exterior, noted E (other than  $p$ :  
 22 the viewpoint is de-centred and not compatible with I)<sup>19</sup>. Echo construc-  
 23 tions mean that, parallel to the centred viewpoint, a de-centred viewpoint  
 24 is taken into account: this second viewpoint is construct either as co-  
 25 extensive to the first one, or as opposed to it (as a deconstruction of the  
 26 viewpoint which is centered), or it can also represent an alternative with no  
 27 possible choice. It results from this that many usages of the  $v$ - alteration,  
 28 not mentioned in the relevant literature, tend not to create a mere extension  
 29 or approximation of the notional domain but to create parody, or deroga-  
 30 tory meaning.

31 An instance of the mere extension of the notional domain is the classi-  
 32 cal *cây-vây* (tea-echo), "tea and other eatable and drinkable", *shâdî-vâdî*  
 33 (marriage-echo) 'marriage and so on', *pen-ven* 'pen and the like'. The  
 34 "semantic supplement" glossed by "etc.", "and so on", "and all", "e tutti  
 35 quanti", "and the like" in classical descriptions such as Abbi (1980), show  
 36 that we get out of the centred domain (tea which is really tea, what we can  
 37 call tea, tea-tea) and include the neighbouring notional domain or stay at  
 38 the margins of the domain: tea and other drinkable or eatable which can

1 be associated to the ritual afternoon or morning tea, pen and other neces-  
2 sary stuff used for writing<sup>20</sup>.

3

4

### 5 2.1. Form of the canonical constructions in v-

6

7

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

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

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

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

1 2.2. Basic semantics of the construction: de-centring and extension of the  
2 notional domain

3  
4 In grammars, the only meaning mentioned for such constructions is the ex-  
5 tension of the notional domain. The echo reduplication modifies the no-  
6 tional domain by including neighbouring zones and defining thus a new  
7 inclusive or associative domain, a process clearly emphasized by the termi-  
8 nology adopted by Parkvall (“associative reduplication”: 2003: 27). This  
9 extension amounts to introduce ‘alterity’ (“and other things”) within the  
10 notion, by associating to the Interior (pen in (17a), tea in (17b), marriage  
11 above, etc.) something located at the limit between Interior and Exterior of  
12 the notional domain, on the boundary I-E (other items than pen, tea, mar-  
13 riage *stricto sensu*, etc.: other but related items). The association is sug-  
14 gested by the context: within a context where a schoolboy asks a friend if  
15 he has taken *pen-ven* when leaving for school, the domain resulting from  
16 taking I-E into account besides I will include exercise-book, pencils, rub-  
17 bers, whereas within a context where somebody searches his pockets to  
18 note down a phone number on his agenda, the notional domain is more  
19 limited (pencil, stylo, ink pen).

20  
21 (17) a. *mere pās koī pen-ven nahīN*  
22 of-me near INDEF pen-echo NEG  
23 ‘I don’t have anything to write’

24  
25 Asking a visiting friend the following:

26  
27 (17) b. *tum cāy-vāy piyoge?*  
28 2 tea-echo drink-FUT-2  
29 ‘will you drink something?’

30  
31 amounts to asking him if he will have something to drink, tea, coffee,  
32 cold drink or any other related thing, and an answer such as “No, I rather  
33 have coffee” would be at least strange, whereas it is perfectly natural for a  
34 similar question asked with the simple noun (F: *cāy*) instead of E (F-F’:  
35 *chāy-vāy*).

36 In the above two examples E redefines the notion F such that F is only  
37 one element of a paradigm in a wider notional domain, and the other ele-  
38 ments, which remain implicit (hence the fuzzy character, vagueness, often

1 referred to), may further in the exchange, be either selected instead of F or  
 2 added to F in a cumulative way. As for the semantic area of F, it may be  
 3 vague (17c) or precise (17a–b).

4  
 5 (17) c. *khânâ-vânâ vahîN ho saktâ hai*  
 6 eat-echo there-only be can PRES-3S  
 7 'we can have food and everything there (we'll find everything  
 8 there for meal)'

9  
 10 Here the co-existence of Interior and boundary (I-E) is cumulative, its sig-  
 11 nals that we are not restricted to I but associate I-E to I, with an emphasis  
 12 on I in I-E (the boundary is represented as related to the Interior of the  
 13 notion). Since the non centring on I (F: tea, pen, food), because of the asso-  
 14 ciation of I-E to I, imports a fuzzy supplement of neighbouring notions  
 15 (regulated by the specific context or the cultural habits of the speakers), the  
 16 meanings may exhibit quite considerable variation.

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

22  
 23 (17) d. *vivâh kar lenâ koî âsân kâm nahîN hai, aur aisâ bhî nahîN hai ki*  
 24 *adâlat meN gae to bas shâdî ho gaî. notis-votis bhî to denâ paRtâ*  
 25 *hai*  
 26 'get married is not an easy thing, don't think it is enough you go to  
 27 the court and that's it, you are married (lit. such is not the case  
 28 that you go to the tribunal then enough, marriage happened). It is  
 29 also compulsory to *give notice and the like*' (*noTis-voTis*: there are  
 30 papers to sign / a whole administrative procedure to follow, in-  
 31 cluding the publication of pre-marriage notice)

32  
 33 On verbal bases too, the echo formation amounts in (17e) to extending the  
 34 domain of the notion from the typical meaning of *sajânâ* 'get dressed, deco-  
 35 rated and prepared' to the neighbouring meanings "festive atmosphere  
 36 and devotion", with the additional connotations of affectionate ("nicely,  
 37 fondly") attitude towards the divine couple Shiv-Parvati made by the  
 38 devotee:

- 1 (17) e. [*mân*] *miTTî mangâkar usse shiv-pârvatî banâtî, kele ke patte se*  
 2 *sajâ-vajâkar pûjâ kartî . . .*  
 3 ‘mother asked for earth and made an image of Shiv-Parvati out of  
 4 it, she fondly decorated it with banana leaves and did her puja (did  
 5 her ritual offering to the deity)’  
 6

7 2.3. Polemical use of the relation between F and F’: De-centring and  
 8 disqualification of F by F’  
 9

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

- 31 (18) a. *tâsh-vâsh khelne kî bajây apnâ kâm khatm karo*  
 32 card-echo play instead REFL work finish do  
 33 ‘instead of losing your time in playing cards (or similar stupid  
 34 games) / these damned cards, you should finish your work’  
 35  
 36 b. *koî lekin-vekin nahîN*  
 37 INDEF but-echo NEG  
 38 ‘there is no ‘but’, stop escaping’

- 1 c. *mere pās Taim-vaim nahîN hai*  
 2 of-me near time(Engl)-echo NEG est  
 3 'I have no time to lose (stop hassling me please)'
- 4 d. *kripayâ jab tak main hûN nayâ-vayâ nahîN niklegâ,*  
 5 please till I am new-echo NEG go-out-fut  
 6 *jismeN roz khâte haiN usî meN khâeNge*  
 7 in-which everyday eat that in will-eat  
 8 'please, till I am here, do not take out the new plates, we will eat  
 9 in the plates we use everyday'

10  
 11 The statement in (18b) quotes a previously uttered "but" in order to dis-  
 12 qualify it, but (18a) and (18c) simply refer to a notion which is new in the  
 13 context, new but presented as triggering disagreement: the *v*-echo that  
 14 modifies the original form F in F-F' betrays the altercation of two different  
 15 viewpoints at odds, A trying to invalidate B's supposed idea on the matter.  
 16 On "cards", the echo adds a negative comment from A about the game, on  
 17 "time", it comments not the notion itself but B's assumption that A has  
 18 time and is free. Similarly "new" in (18d) is more a critique of the mother's  
 19 clumsy behaviour and a manifestation of the speaker's irritation at it than a  
 20 critique of novelty or new plates.

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

25  
 26 2.3.1. *Depreciative parody within a polemical goal: I vs I-E*

27  
 28 Proper nouns F echoed by F' have most of the time a derogatory effect  
 29 like any deformation of names in various languages. The polemical charge  
 30 embedded in the echo construction is not related to a paradigmatic treat-  
 31 ment within a wider set of neighbouring notions of which they would repre-  
 32 sent one of the possible examples. In this way, when an elderly counter-  
 33 revolutionary or non concerned youngsters utter the name of Lenine with  
 34 the alteration *lenin-venin* (*lenin-henin* in Pahari), the name Russia (*rûs*)  
 35 distorted into *rûs-hûs*, addressing a young fiery communist<sup>24</sup>, they only  
 36 wish to communicate their hatred and dislike towards what is associated  
 37 with both names. The name distorted in this way is presented as between  
 38 inverted comas, as if A was quoting B, with the comas referring to A's

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

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

- 28  
 29 (19) a. – *kyâ huâ isko ? – ishq. – ishk-phishk to ham jânte nahîN bhâi*  
 30 interr fut to-him ? – love. – love-echo TOP we know not brother  
 31 '– what is happening to him ? – love. – love and what so, we don't  
 32 un derstand, brother (we know nothing about all this crap)'  
 33 b. '*vah lekhak hai*'. lekhak-vekhak hai, yah sab unkî samajh meN âtâ  
 34 na hîN thâ  
 35 'he writer-echo is'. writer-echo is, this all his mind in come not  
 36 IMPFT  
 37 'He is a writer'. He could be a so-called writer, that was meaning-  
 38 less for her'



1 c. *yah tumhârâ Tyûshan-hyûshan ghar ke bhîtar nahîN hogâ*  
2 this your tuition-echo home inside not will-be  
3 'no way you introduce at home your (trick of the) tuition'

4  
5 Whether the speaker who distorts the signifier of a notion knows or does  
6 not know the precise meaning of it is not relevant. The echo construction  
7 F-F', which amounts here to set F in a quasi metalinguistic status (a word  
8 selected for comment by A), indicates that A rejects the positive viewpoint  
9 that he attributes to B, and he rejects it by re-qualifying negatively B's  
10 notion of F<sup>25</sup>. A at the same time emphasizes the added symbolical value  
11 of the word for F (noble word, poetic word, foreign word, technique word,  
12 etc.) and he rejects it: the echo makes explicit the positive connotations of  
13 the notion (even if not intended by B), such as the romantic halo of love  
14 supposed to justify all misbehaviours, the respectable status of writers, the  
15 safeness and professionalism of private tuitions), and he reduces to nil these  
16 positive connotations. Echo reduplication of "tuition" here, in a context of  
17 quotation ("your"), signal less the incomprehension or rejection of the En-  
18 glish term by a villager than the strong refusal of the very idea of tuition,  
19 very well understood by A (since it would allow the young boy to get close  
20 to the girl). What is added by the distorting echo is the aggressive charge:  
21 "you can go to hell, you and your private tuitions". Here again, the aggres-  
22 siveness comes from the opposition, by A, of I-E to I, I being the notion as  
23 A thinks B interprets it.

24 Significantly, the syntactic context is always negative in these polemical  
25 uses which disqualifies the notion, or the way B uses the notion (jus-  
26 tification for crazy acts out of love, magnification in presenting the visitor,  
27 strategy for infiltration). What justifies such a rejection if the disqual-  
28 ification (or negative requalification) of the term, a disqualification ob-  
29 tained by opposing I and I-E. That it is not cumulative (not I + I-E) like  
30 in (17) is made clear by example (20). In (20), the notion "pandit" can in  
31 no way be extended by the echo to other connected notions, since it is  
32 used as an appellative – a term of address traditionally used by women  
33 in this family for the men (father and son) – and "pandit" is the only  
34 possible term as a traditional appellative in the context. A young ser-  
35 vant is quarrelling with her husband, also working as a servant in the  
36 same family, about how to call the young master, who does not like to  
37 be called "pandit" since he rejects the traditional appellatives and culture  
38 altogether.

- 1 (20) *unheN paNDit-vaNDit mat kahâ karo, unheN acchâ nahîN lagtâ*  
 2 3P-ACC pandit-echo NEG call FREQ-IMPER 3P-DAT good NEG seems  
 3 ‘stop calling him Pandit (don’t tag him a pandit), he doesn’t like it’

4  
 5 The young woman protests against the designation *pandit* for the young  
 6 master, who prefers to be called *sâhab*, «sir». While doing so with E, she  
 7 does not construct any notional extension where “pandit” would represent  
 8 the most typical of the traditional appellative terms. She does not ironize ei-  
 9 ther on the general designation of the learned Brahmins by the word “pan-  
 10 dit”, or on its adequateness as an appellative for other people – she keeps  
 11 calling the old Master “pandit”. But she refuses, in agreement with the  
 12 young master himself, to use a term he does not like, inadequate for this  
 13 only reason. Moreover, by doing so, she opposes her husband, a servant but  
 14 a traditionalist too. The echo construction makes fun of the husband’s con-  
 15 cept of appellatives. The conflict between the two interpretations, that of B  
 16 (S1) the husband, and that of A (So) the wife, is about the interpretation of  
 17 both speech-act participants regarding the validity of the designation “pan-  
 18 dit” for the young master: you think it is a good one, I think it is absurd.  
 19 With the echo formation, at the same time I make your viewpoint explicit  
 20 and I invalidate it as absurd. I oppose I-E, which I construct on the notion  
 21 “pandit”, to the Interior which you stick to because you are panditaized<sup>26</sup>.

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

- 29  
 30 (21) *vamneccâ par hâvî hotî merî krântîcchâ, risarc-visarc ke lie zarâ bhî*  
 31 *utsâhî na thî, maiN kisânoN yâ mazdûroN ke bîch jâkar kâm karnâ*  
 32 *châhtâ thâ*  
 33 ‘my fire for revolution was dominated by a fire for radical left, with-  
 34 out the least enthusiasm for research-echo, I wanted to go and work  
 35 with the peasants and workers’

36  
 37 The unit *visarc* (F’:I-E) is opposed to *risarc* (F:I) as A’s (So’s) conception  
 38 (the true revolutionary must live with the workers and peasants) to the

1 conception of B (S1) as imagined by A (for the uncle, research is the good  
2 choice for an intellectual revolutionary).

3  
4  
5 2.3.2. "Pedagogic" requalification of the notion: I but also I-E  
6

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

21  
22 (22) a. I understand you very well, I too have been young and communist  
23 *lekin kuch din krânti-vrânti kî bât mat kîjîe,*  
24 but some days revolution-echo of speech NEG do  
25 *krânti (\*vrânti) kî hî khâtir ke lie*  
26 revolution (\*echo) of only interest for  
27 'but forget for sometimes your revolutionary big talk (do not speak  
28 of revolution-echo), in the interest of revolution itself (echo is  
29 impossible)'  
30

31 With F-F', the speaker quotes what corresponds to the knowledge shared  
32 by him and his hearer about "revolution" as an experience of his nephew:  
33 it may be linked to a halo of dreams and activities, but the main connota-  
34 tion is the blame and rejection in the dominant public opinion. A here sim-  
35 ulates the viewpoint of others, those hostile to revolution. The second oc-  
36 currence of the term (F) reflects the speaker's own opinion: it rules out the  
37 echo F' because the term here refers to the Interior of the notion ('act for  
38 the benefit of revolution').

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

8  
 9 (22) b. *bhâvnâ kî bhâvnâ karne se vâsnâ paidâ hotî hai aur vâsnâ se andhâ*  
 10 *huâ vyakti sahî mârg dekh nahîN pâtâ hai . . . islie bhavuktâ se khud*  
 11 *dûr raho . . . ab jâo . . . thoRe din ke lie prem-vrem bhûlâ kar sârâ*  
 12 *dhyân paRhâ par lagâo*  
 13 ‘being in love with love (by feeling the feeling) necessarily ends up  
 14 with lust and a person blinded by lust is unable to see the right  
 15 path . . . this is why you should keep away from emotionality . . .  
 16 now go . . . forget this silly business of love (love-echo) and devote  
 17 your whole attention to your studies’

18  
 19 The echo construction on *prem* “love” is a simple summary and translation  
 20 of the argument previously stated (without reduplication), but it is meant to  
 21 have a stronger effect on the hearer. It marks a shift in the discourse from  
 22 the pompous stiffness of high rationalized language and general truths to  
 23 colloquial and personalized exchange in the everyday register<sup>27</sup>. The first  
 24 part of the speech, with its quasi scientific rigor and aloofness does not  
 25 involve the speaker nor hearer’s subjectivity, can remain distant for the  
 26 hearer, an alien discourse not specially intended for him, whereas the redup-  
 27 licated term results from the notion such as constructed by S1 or the  
 28 hearer B (F *prem*) according to So or A, and it is this construction that So  
 29 denies with I-E (F’: *vrem*).

30  
 31  
 32 2.4. (Re)construction of the notion as a plurality of viewpoints, I et I-E  
 33 being in disjunction

34  
 35 2.4.1. *Disjunction in a negative syntactic context*

36  
 37 In all the previous contexts, negative too, the speaker aimed at denying or  
 38 ridiculize the hearer’s viewpoint on F (parody), or at obtaining from the

1 hearer that he adopts a different viewpoint (pedagogical intent). Heteroge-  
 2 neity ('alterity') resulted from the co-existence of two diverging viewpoints,  
 3 one of which being strongly qualified as bad. Less often, and still in a nega-  
 4 tive context, the echo formation conveys the simple disjunction of two view-  
 5 points on the notion, without any value judgement. In (23a), a dying agnos-  
 6 tic tells his last wishes to his best friends, who are believers, and whom he  
 7 entrusts for the execution of his wishes after his death. He uses E on the  
 8 notion *âtâmâ* (soul) in a non-derogatory meaning; the construction may be  
 9 considered at best associative (soul and other metaphysical or spiritual not-  
 10 tions), but it mainly conveys that the speaker acknowledges a double view  
 11 point on the matter: I don't believe, you do, each one his opinion and I re-  
 12 spect yours as I plead you to respect mine.

13  
 14 (23) a. *maiN âtmâ-vâtmâ par vishvâs nahîN*  
 15 I soul-echo on trust NEG  
 16 *kartâ, âp log karte haiN . . .*  
 17 do, you people do PRES  
 18 'I don't believe in soul (God or such things), you people you  
 19 do . . .'

20 In (23a) the speaker takes B's viewpoint into account, although it differs  
 21 from his own, and he does not pass any judgement about the legitimacy of  
 22 any viewpoint. In (23b), the notion *ThaND* (cold) is not requalified nor ex-  
 23 tended (to the general discomfort related by sleeping on the floor??) since  
 24 a parallel is given with the warmth which overcomes cold, but it kind of  
 25 quotes the fear expressed by the speaker's auntie (*aisî*: 'such, of this type,  
 26 as it had been told') and E signals that, contrary to the aunt's fear, there  
 27 has been no feeling of cold.  
 28

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

36  
 37 'Alterity' (heterogeneity) here results from the contrast between what is  
 38 really felt (no cold) and what was expected (that cold she was fearing). In

1 both cases, although (23b) and not (23a) grants the notion a possibility of  
 2 internal variation, both conflicting viewpoints of A and B are maintained,  
 3 and E suggests that the notion is constructed in reference to B's viewpoint.

4  
 5  
 6 2.4.2. *Disjunction in a positive context*

7  
 8 Finally, in positive contexts, the echo formation has most often positive  
 9 connotations which contrast with the negative (or neutral) qualification sup-  
 10 posed to be that of speaker B. The following examples may help grasping at  
 11 such meanings. They all belong to the same scenario: two Indians settled in  
 12 Paris, from Madhya Pradesh, about forty years old, one has just lost his job  
 13 and is depressed, the other is a good friend who tries to support him in find-  
 14 ing the best solutions to overcome depression:

- 15  
 16 (24) a. *pârTî-vârTî do, bhîR-bhâR milâe*<sup>28</sup>, *pakauRe-vakauRe banâeN*,  
 17 party-echo give, crowd-echo meet-CAUS, fried-dip-echo make  
 18 'give a big party, meet lots of people, we will prepare vegetable  
 19 fried-dips'  
 20 b. *biyar-viyar ho jâe ... laRkî-vaRkî pakRe na!*  
 21 bier-echo be-go-SUBJ ... girl-echo grasp-SUBJ tag  
 22 'there will be bier (it will be nice) ... and you'll find a girlfriend /  
 23 if you could manage to grasp at some girl (s.e. that would be the  
 24 good thing for you)'  
 25

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

33 But, contrary to the enumeration of simple (non-reduplicated) terms,  
 34 which would present a neutral catalogue of solutions, the idea of beer as  
 35 suggested by A to B includes euphoric and bountiful connotations, the  
 36 idea of dip-fried suggests that there will be plenty, nicely flavoured, that of  
 37 the girl, that she is both anonymous and attractive. Whereas the simple enu-  
 38 meration (X,Y,Z) can be specified (Gold bier, nicely fried *pakaure*, *pakaure*

1 fried in ghee, a blue-eye girl), the enumeration of E (F-F'=v-) rules out  
 2 such specifications, but displays to the subject imagination a whole spec-  
 3 trum of unspecified qualitative variations which A invites B to share with  
 4 him. Reduplication means that viewpoints are multiple: these viewpoints  
 5 are not in conflict but simply mean that each of them (you and I) may find  
 6 the appropriate item, what he needs and wishes. If each of these notions,  
 7 whether compact or discrete, in their echo form, is presented in (24) as the  
 8 "good" thing to do in the given situation (fight against depression), that is,  
 9 trigger the reluctant hearer's adhesion<sup>29</sup>, by suggesting he modifies his (ini-  
 10 tially neutral) viewpoint on the notion, it is largely due to the discursive  
 11 context and the verbal mood. Yet if such serendipity is possible, it is due  
 12 to the introduction, in the notional domain, of positive connotations in ac-  
 13 cordance with the cultural stereotypes shared by the speakers. The feature  
 14 F', its "alterity", comes from the added inner variety which gives assurance  
 15 of getting the good item, in contrast with the definite occurrence (F, in the  
 16 singular) or the homogeneous plural (F in the plural). Non-centred, the no-  
 17 tional domain becomes variegated and diverse enough to suit every wish.

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

- 21 (25) a. *are, koî saNDvic-vaNDvic khâ lo, mujhe tang mat karo*  
 22 hey, some sandwich-echo eat take, 1S-ACC bother NEG do  
 23 'oh just get any sandwich whatever, and stop bothering me'  
 24  
 25 b. *koî laRkî-vaRkî DhûNDh lo, aur shikâyat karnâ band karo*  
 26 some girl-echo look-for take, and complaint do stop do  
 27 'you manage to fish any girl and stop complaining'

28 What is obtained in the echo formations of (25) is a requalification of the  
 29 notion so as to make all possible actualisations equivalent: any kind of  
 30 sandwich will do, cheese, chicken or salad, any kind of girl will do, slim or  
 31 fat, tall or small, there is choice enough for you to be pleased and stop  
 32 bothering me.  
 33

34  
 35 2.5. On the predicative notion: Demultiplying the process

36  
 37 When the echo reduplication affects a predicative notion (verbal basis in a  
 38 finite syntagma), the result is not a derogatory parody. In appearance, there

1 is an extension of the notional domain, with a fragmentation of the process,  
 2 without its successive occurrences being equivalent to each other. Speakers  
 3 refer to this modification in the meaning by describing the process as less  
 4 precise, less definite, kind of fuzzy or blurred. The verb *moRnâ*, which  
 5 means “to turn”, gets with the echo (*moRnâ voRnâ*), the meaning of to  
 6 globally change direction, in one or several turns, without referring to one  
 7 definite occurrence (like a single turn), or even to a precise orientation (you  
 8 may go in a zigzag manner). In (26a) two friends in a car have taken by  
 9 mistake a single way in the wrong way, the driver gets upset, the passenger  
 10 tries to cool him down:

11

- 12 (26) a. *bas, âge kahîN moR-voR lenâ,*  
 13 enough, ahead somewhere turn-echo take,  
 14 *is saRak se nikleNge*  
 15 this street out will-go  
 16 ‘no problem, all we need is to take any turn somewhere and we  
 17 will get out of this street’

18

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

34

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



1 In (26a) and (26b) the notion gets infused with inner differentiation and  
 2 is no longer presented as homogeneous and centered as it is with the non  
 3 reduplicated stem: echo makes it multiple, each possible occurrence differ-  
 4 ing from others in quality. In the same way as plural singularity can be con-  
 5 structed in the nominal class, with inner differentiation ("the plural left")<sup>31</sup>,  
 6 here in the verbal class echo adds qualitative plurality to the notion,<sup>32</sup> in-  
 7 cluding typical values as well as non typical ones (not really read, not  
 8 frankly turn). Cumulative and lacunary functions are both present here (cf.  
 9 Kaboré 1998).

10

11

## 12 2.6. Other formations with echo or alliteration

13

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

21 Some adverbs are lexicalized in standard Hindi in their echo form, as *âs-*  
 22 *pâs* or *âr-pâr* both meaning 'around' (*pâr* 'beyond', *pâs* 'near'): they involve  
 23 an extension of the notional domain (truly close + not really close; truly  
 24 across and not really across). But most of the alliterating formations are  
 25 found in colloquial speech, such as *kabhî-kabhâr* (on *kabhî* 'once, ever') 'oc-  
 26 casionally, sometimes not so often', with more dissemination than the stan-  
 27 dard *kabhî-kabhî* 'sometimes'. Example (24) above includes a noun (*bhîR*  
 28 'crowd'), whose distorting alliteration (*bhîR-bhâr*), like the *v-* echo, adds a  
 29 plural qualification to the notion: many various people, people of all kinds.  
 30 But most of the time this type of alliteration is found on verbal basis, in non  
 31 finite forms (favouring monosyllabic items?). In a process (*dekh*-‘see’-*dâkh*,  
 32 *pûch*-‘ask’-*pâch*, *bech*-‘sell’-*bâch*), the difference with the simple form of the  
 33 verb relates to inner plurality, similarly to the standard echo (F-*v-*) forma-  
 34 tion. The process may be completed in several times ((27a), a statement ad-  
 35 dressed to a friend who is anxious about the location of the appoint place),  
 36 or presented as a re-examination (second visit to a flat, that the hearer hesi-  
 37 tates renting in (27b)), or presented as the final result of a long process  
 38 (27c), or even as anticipated and feared ((27d), where two lovers meet

1 secretly). Such a representation of the process means that its occurrences are  
 2 potentially multiple but there will be a final or good occurrence (although  
 3 not known in advance).

- 4 (27) a. *kisî se pûch-pâch lenâ*  
 5 somebody from ask-echo take  
 6 ‘you just ask to anybody (it is not a big thing, you will easily find  
 7 somebody to tell you)’  
 8  
 9 b. *dekh-dâkh lenâ zarâ dhyân se*  
 10 see-echo take little attention with  
 11 ‘look (at it) thoroughly, quite well, pay attention to everything’  
 12 (just need to go back and visit again to confirm that yes, should  
 13 you take it)  
 14 c. *sab kuch bec-bâc-kar vilâyat calâ gaya*  
 15 all sell-echo-CP foreign leave went  
 16 [after father’s death he] ‘sold everything out and left for England’  
 17 d. *kisîne hameN dekh-dâkh liyâ to badnâm hogâ*  
 18 someone us-acc see-echo took then bad-name will-be  
 19 ‘if anybody happens to see us (catch us) we will be dishonoured’  
 20

21 The *-â* formations specifically favour the representation of a process as fi-  
 22 nalized, although its realization may be difficult or hazardous. Hence the  
 23 definite character of the process, however groping the previous stages of  
 24 realisation, hence the use of these forms in contexts where A wishes to stop  
 25 B’s hesitations. The alliteration on *bhûlnâ* ‘forget’ is a good illustration:  
 26 whereas forget is usually a non intentional and spontaneous process, with-  
 27 out any display of stages leading to the result, the expression *bhûl-bhâl kar*,  
 28 which is quasi lexicalized, means ‘put a final stop to something, a definite  
 29 end to some thought, empty one’s mind of something’. The process may be  
 30 deliberate (“you should take this out of your mind, do manage to get over  
 31 and forget everything”) and may also result from absolute unconsciousness,  
 32 but in the latter case unconsciousness is represented as hardly conceivable  
 33 (“he forgot his own family, his native land, as if all that no longer existed  
 34 for him”). The non-reduplicated expressions *bhûlkar* ‘forgettingly, by mis-  
 35 take’, and *bhûlkar bhî* ‘even by mistake’, constructed on the notion as a ho-  
 36 mogeneous centred one, do not convey any particular value judgement and  
 37 involve no teleonomy, but the reduplicated expression *bhûl-bhâlkar*, con-  
 38 structed on the notion as heterogeneous, emphasizes the radical character

1 of the result, presented as allowing no coming back, a superlative forgetful-  
2 ness in relation to all various forms of forgetfulness included in the notion.<sup>33</sup>

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

11

12

### 13 **Conclusion**

14

15 Although numerous points raised in this study still need further exploration,  
16 and notional reduplication should be taken into account in the same per-  
17 spective<sup>34</sup>, it is obvious that reduplication in Hindi/Urdu is a linguistic cat-  
18 egory in its own right: it encodes an operation which can be analyzed. Far  
19 from being the icon of excess (the "more" we say in reduplication being  
20 responsible for the meanings of intensity, distribution, iteration), convert-  
21 ible into "less" and lacunar meanings by way of fragmentation, it operates  
22 in a systematic way. Integral reduplication R ( $F=F'$ ) modifies the scheme  
23 of individuation of the notion by opposing the centring of the occurrence:  
24 it modifies the relation between the reduplicated term and the constituent(s)  
25 to which it is syntactically associated (relation Noun – Verb, dependent  
26 verb – main Verb, Adjective – Noun), according to the category of the re-  
27 duplicated term. Modifying the scheme of individuation may involve the  
28 subjective interaction of the speaker and hearer's viewpoints. Partial or al-  
29 literating reduplication E ( $F'$  is an altered form of F) modifies the notion  
30 itself by introducing a pole of heterogeneity ('alterity') I-E, which means  
31 that not only the centred notion I is taken into account, but its modified  
32 form too (I-E), and this account may be of a cumulative, contrastive or dis-  
33 junctive type. Interior is emphasized (weight on I), and the operation in-  
34 volves almost always the confrontation of two distinct viewpoints. There is  
35 nothing "stylistic" there and still it is true that R, in its tree main types, is  
36 far more generalized at the informal and colloquial level (apart from the  
37 grammatical uses of total R) than in the formal or objective discourse. The  
38 reason for these discursive preferences is that R, in all its non-grammatical

1 uses, involves the confrontation of two viewpoints (speaker's and hearer's  
2 viewpoints, So and S1), a confrontation which is not necessarily aggressive  
3 and may rely on adjustment: it is then natural that R occurs with more fre-  
4 quency in the space of intersubjectivity and dialogue.

## 7 Notes

- 8
- 9 1. Masica 1992, Emeneau 1980, along with the phonological opposition of cere-  
10 bral to dental consonants, the rigid word order SOV, postpositions, ante-  
11 position of genitive complements, anteposition of adjectives and determina-  
12 tive relatives, morphologically related causatives, transitive and intransitives,  
13 verbo-nominal predicates, compound verbs, marked definite or human objects,  
14 dative subjects, etc.
- 15 2. "The extracted occurrence is not just *any* occurrence, but it is endowed with a  
16 differential property that stabilizes it as being *this* occurrence" (Culioli 1990b:  
17 183). Extraction involves quantification (it relates the occurrence to a definite  
18 portion of space in the domain), whereas pin-pointing also involves qualifica-  
19 tion, in a preponderant way. Culioli 1999 gives more details and analyses on  
20 the operations involved in constructing the domain and its scheme of individu-  
21 ation, but with no section in English.
- 22 3. From the clearly onomatopoeic formations (*khaT-khaT* 'toc toc', *khây-khây*,  
23 *sây-sây* 'sound of the wind in the trees', *kal-kal* 'sound of running water', *tap-*  
24 *tap* 'sound of dripping water', *Dam-Dam* 'drumming'), to terms in relation  
25 with sensorial register, which rely on a correspondence between audition and  
26 other senses (*cham-cham* 'twinkling', *jham-jham* 'glittering', *gich-gich* 'sticky').  
27 Derived verbs are also more or less iconic (*dhakdhakânâ* 'palpitate', *hinhinânâ*  
28 'neigh', *khaTkhaTânâ* 'knock on the door'). Such onomatopoeics occur with or  
29 without derivational suffix.
- 30 4. In the transcription of Hindi, the sign ^ on a vowel indicates length, capitals  
31 indicates retroflex consonants except for N which indicates nasalization. The  
32 abbreviations are the usual ones: dat for dative, erg, ergative, etc.
- 33 5. Culioli 1990: 183. "Scanning (French 'parcours') consists in running over the  
34 whole domain without being willing or able to pick out one distinguished  
35 value" (to scan: French 'parcourir').
- 36 6. Except of course when simple repetition is involved, emphasizing what the  
37 speakers says in the same way as oral stress (*baRhtâ calâ gayâ*, *baRhtâ hî calâ*  
38 *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.
7. Simultaneity is only apparent for strictly transient processes also, such as  
"reach": *us kûche tak pahuNchte-pahuNchte maiN âj bhî thoRî der ke lie râste*

- 1 *kî un dukânoN par rukûNgâ* (that lane till reaching-reaching I today too little  
2 time for road of those shops on will-stop) 'today also I will stop for a moment  
3 while (until) reaching that lane at the shops on my way' (K. B. Vaid, *Guzrâ*  
4 *huâ zamâna*). Reduplication of a strictly transitory process gives it a temporal  
5 thickness, beyond a strict stabilization, as is even more obvious with a main  
6 verb in the inceptive: *sir joRne kî bârî âte âte vab mehnat vyarth lagne lagî* (Gi-  
7 tanjali Shri, *Mai*) (head joining of turn coming coming this effort useless seem  
8 began) 'when the time came for joining the head (to the body of the doll made  
9 by the little girl with cloth) all this labour began to appear meaningless' (= by  
10 the time it came to joining the head. . . ).
- 11 8. Quite frequent in creoles and contact languages (Moravsick 1978, Kouwenberg  
12 2003), where it can display various sub-meanings such as diminutive, attenua-  
13 tion, approximation, the middle or low degree has come to be considered as  
14 prototypical as well as the high degree (Chaudenson 1974, Kyomi 1995): Chau-  
15 denson (1974: 367) gives examples in the Creole of Réunion Island such as *en*  
16 *zafer ruz ruz* 'something reddish', *fay-fay* 'slightly tired, weak', besides exam-  
17 ples of high degree such as *en bel-bel koson* 'a huge pig'. See also in Mauritius  
18 Creole, *li met en rob ruz-ruz* 'she wears a reddish dress', *zot res dan en kaz*  
19 *malang-malang* 'they live in a house which is a bit dirty', the second constituent  
20 alone being stressed (Baker 2003: 214). In this view, ambivalence itself becomes  
21 the prototypical meaning.
- 22 9. This distinction of various plans of variation is borrowed from Denis Paillard,  
23 in his study of reduplication in Khmer (International Conference on Identity:  
24 *L'Identité*, Université de Tours, 29–30 novembre 2008, To be published in the  
25 *Proceedings*).
- 26 10. Similarly, in French, the qualifying adjective in the left position (pre-nominal)  
27 has no descriptive properties, contrary to the post-nominal one (right position).
- 28 11. S the subject grades the property as optimal according to his personal taste,  
29 «nicely» tall, which is not necessarily very tall.
- 30 12. As in: *is galî meN sirf bare-baRe ghar haiN* (this street in only big-big houses  
31 are) 'there are only big houses in this street, every house is big' or *is galî meN*  
32 *nîle-nîle ghar haiN* 'every house is blue in this street'. Note that in the absence  
33 of *sirf* 'only', the last sentence will be preferably interpreted as "there are blu-  
34 ish houses in the street", which means that *sirf* 'only' is responsible for the dis-  
35 tributive meaning.
- 36 13. "Optimal" is of course specified by the context. In this way, a negative  
37 or derogatory context will associate the reduplicated adjective to an  
38 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'

- 1 14. Even discovered as a new experience a “blue sky” can be represented as con-  
2 conveying a preconstruct:

3 *itnâ gahrâ nilâ-nilâ âsmân maiNne pahî bâr dekhâ*  
4 so deep blue-blue sky I-erg first time saw  
5 ‘it was the first time I saw such a blue sky’

6 The preconstructed blueness is emphasized (*itnâ*), saturated (*gahrâ*) and mar-  
7 vellous or astonishing, that is to say appealing the the subjectivity of the  
8 speaker (R).

- 9 15. Like the oft quoted examples (without context) such as “greenish sari” (*harî*  
10 *harî sârî*), “bluish cap” (*nilî nilî topî*): in order to be interpreted with the  
11 meaning of low degree, these statements have to relate to direct perception. It  
12 seems that the mode of presence is crucial here, more than the character of the  
13 noun (dense, compact, discrete) since the cap like the sari rather belong to the  
14 category “discrete”.
- 15 16. The suffix *-vâlâ*, which, in this context, indicates selection, rules out reduplication:  
16 *\*pîlâ-pîlâ vâlâ*.
- 17 17. Example from Abbi (1980: 107), who also gives example of the possible occur-  
18 rence of the same structure with different qualities: *yah âm khaTTâ hai, par vo*  
19 *âm miThâ-miThâ hai* (this mango sour is, but that mango sweet-sweet is), ‘this  
20 mango is sourish, but that one is sweetish’. However, the explanation given  
21 in Abbi (antonymic semantic features “exact” for the simple adjective vs “in-  
22 exact” for R), is not confirmed by other devices of approximation, which can  
23 correlate with simple (‘exact’) adjectives: *vah âm thoRâ-sâ khaTTâ hai, par yah*  
24 *vâlâ ekdam khaTTâ hai* (that mango somewhat sour is but this one really sour  
25 is) ‘that mango is somewhat sour but this one is really sour’.
- 26 18. This suffix, like the full form *jaisâ*, ‘like’, ‘similar to’, is a de-centring device (it  
27 may also, particularly with dimensional and quantifying adjectives, result in  
28 a high degree interpretation: *bahut-se*, “really many”), but it bears only on the  
29 adjective and not, like the reduplicated structures, on the relation between ad-  
30 jective and noun.
- 31 19. In what follows I, I-E or E stand for such viewpoints on the notion as they al-  
32 low for different ways of taking it into account. These viewpoints do not neces-  
33 sarily correspond to different speakers and their subjective positions. The no-  
34 tions and notations of, I-E, E are borrowed from the theory of the notion and  
35 notional domain in Antoine Culioli (1999) as well as the notation of So for the  
36 subjective position of the speaker and S1 for the subjective position of the  
37 hearer, who can be an abstraction internalized by So.
- 38 20. 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’).
21. Pahari («mountain») varieties include mainly Garhwali and Kumaoni. *ishk*  
transcribes the native pronunciation of *ishq*. This type of echo is even pan-

- 1 indian (Emeneau 1980), with various consonants used for the first consonant in  
 2 F', such as *g-* in Telugu (*puli-guli* «flower»).
- 3 22. Which may trigger suspicion for the ignorant as is the case in (17d): “Beware, it  
 4 is more than a simple advice you will have to give to marry in the court, do not  
 5 imagine it is a simple thing, it is not as easy as you fancy”. The context is the  
 6 following: a young boy is fed up with the obstacles raised by the family which  
 7 do not want to let him marry the girl he loves, and he discloses his intention of  
 8 a civil marriage in front of his uncle. (17d) is the uncle’s answer. (cf. *infra*).
- 9 23. We may assume that the distortion on the signifier is by nature derogatory,  
 10 and so come back to the iconic virtue or reduplication, but what follows shows  
 11 that such is not always the case.
- 12 24. This example (Pahari: /h/ est la consonne initiale de F') is drawn from a long  
 13 dialogue in a contemporary novel of Mahohar Shyam Joshi (*Kyâp*, onomato-  
 14 peic title, 2000) dont d’autres contextes sont cités plus loin (exemples 19, 21, 22,  
 15 23b).
- 16 25. Or in (19b) the narrator rejects the viewpoint that A attributes to B (since the  
 17 sequence is in the indirect reportive style).
- 18 26. Upendranâth Ashk, *Kiskî bât* (one act play from the mid twentieth century).
- 19 27. A function often performed by code-switching (Hindi/English).
- 20 28. Which can be contrast with the derogatory meaning of the same echo in a less  
 21 optimistic, and non inter-subjective context (because of the relation with the  
 22 predicate), as:
- 23 *maiNne yah sab choR diyâ, pâRTiyoN-vârTiyoN meN jânâ band kar diyâ*  
 24 1s-ERG this all quit gave, party-echo(v-) in go stop do gave  
 25 ‘I dropped all this, stopped going in parties and such foolishness’
- 26 In (24)a, the alliterative reduplication parallels the *v-*construction, in the same  
 27 meaning.
- 28 29. But there are also purely descriptive contexts, aiming only at conveying a eu-  
 29 phoric ambiance, by calling up (with E) connotations culturally associated to  
 30 the typical ideal party (heaps of flavored pakauras, lots of bier, etc.). It sug-  
 31 gests a real party, in conformity with everybody’s expectations (“as you can  
 32 imagine”).
- 33 30. Example from the contemporary novel of Krishna Baldev Vaid, *Naukarâni kî*  
 34 *Dâyrî* (Diary of a servant, 2000).
- 35 31. Example commented in Maria Jarrega’s PhD (2000), “la gauche plurielle”.
- 36 32. Favoured by the use of verbal vector *lenâ*, which not only turns the process to-  
 37 wards the subject (auto-benefactive) but makes it perfective too.
- 38 33. Hence the unacceptability of *\*bhûl-bhâlkar bhî* in the meaning of “by mistake”.
- 39 34. The fact that it involves two notions (and not one, nor one occurrence) makes  
 it both similar to and different from 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.

1 **References**

2

3 **Abbi, Anvita**4 1980 *Semantic Grammar of Hindi, A Study in Reduplication*, Delhi, Bahri  
5 Publications.6 1992 *Reduplication in South Asian Languages. An Areal, Typological and*  
7 *Historical Study*. Delhi: Allied Publishers.8 **Baker, Peter**9 2003 Reduplication in Mauritian Creole with notes on Reduplication in  
10 Reunion Creole, In Kouwenberg 2003: 211–18.11 **Chaudenson, Robert**12 1974 *Le Lexique du parler créole de la Réunion*. Paris: Champion.13 **Culioli, Antoine**14 1990a The Concept of Notional Domain. In *Pour une linguistique de l'énon-*  
15 *ciation. Opérations et représentations*, Vol. 1. Gap: Ophrys: 67–82.16 1990b Representations, referential processes and Regulation. In *Pour une*  
17 *linguistique de l'énonciation. Opérations et représentations*, Vol. 1.  
18 Gap: Ophrys: 177–214.19 1999 *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation. Domaine notionnel*, Vol. 3.  
20 Gap: Ophrys.21 **Emeneau, Muray B.**22 1969 Onomatopoeics in the Indian Linguistic Area. *Language* 45-2: 294–  
23 99.24 **Fassi-Fehri, A. and Vinet, M. T.**25 **■■■■** Distribution of Number and Classifier in Arabic and Chinese and  
26 Parametrization. *Linguistic Research* 9-1. IERA Publications, pp. 6–  
27 51.28 **Hurch, Bernard (ed.)**29 2005 *Studies in Reduplication*, Berlin/New-York: Mouton de Gruyter.30 **Jarrega, Maria**31 2000 *Le rôle du pluriel dans la construction des syntagmes nominaux en*  
32 *français contemporain*. Thèse de doctorat en sciences du langage.  
33 Paris X Nanterre.34 **Kaboré, Raphael**35 1998 La Réduplication. *Faits de Langue* 11-12, *Les langues d'Afrique sub-*  
36 *saharienne*, 359–376.37 **Kouwenberg Sylvia and Darlène LaCharité**38 2001 The iconic interpretation of reduplication: Evidence from Caribbean  
39 Creole languages. *European Journal of English Studies* 15, 59–80.40 **Kouwenberg Sylvia and Darlène LaCharité**41 2005 Less is More: Evidence from Diminutive Reduplication in Caribbean  
42 Creole Languages. In Hurch (ed.), 533–45.



- 1 Kouwenberg Sylvia (ed.)  
2 2003 *Twice as Meaningful: Reduplication in Pidgins, Creoles and other con-*  
3 *tact languages*. Londres: Batlebridge.
- 4 Kyomi, S.  
5 1995 A New Approach to Reduplication: a Semantic Study of Noun and  
6 Verb Reduplication in Malayo-Polynesian Languages. *Linguistics*  
7 33: 1145–1167.
- 8 Montaut, Annie  
9 2008 Réduplication et constructions en écho en hindi/ourdou. *Faits de*  
10 *Langue, Les Cahiers 1*, ■■–■■.
- 11 Montaut, Annie  
12 2007 Formes et valeurs de la reduplication totale en hindi/ourdou. *Faits de*  
13 *Langue 29, La Réduplication*, pp. 175–190.
- 14 Montaut, Annie  
15 2004 *Hindi Grammar*. München: Lincom-Europa.
- 16 Moravcsik, Edith  
17 1978 Reduplication. In *Universals of human language*. Volume 3: *Word*  
18 *structure*, Greenberg Joseph H. (ed.), 297–33. Stanford: Stanford  
19 University Press.
- 20 Parkvall, Michael  
21 2003 Reduplication in Atlantic Creoles. In Kouwenberg (ed.), 19–36.
- 22 Singh, Rajendra  
23 2005 Reduplication in Modern Hindi and the Theory of Reduplication, In  
24 Hurch (ed.), 263–81.
- 25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38