



International Journal of Linguistics & Computing Research

Journal Homepage: <http://cphfs.in/research.php>



REFLEXIVIZATION IN BENGALI

Professor Udaya Narayana Singh
Chair-Professor & Head, ACLiS
Amity Centre for Linguistic Studies (ACLiS)
Amity University Haryana, Gurgaon
Pachgaon, Manesar PIN 122431
E-mail: unscii151@gmail.com

0.1 Chatterji (1926) does not go into the details of the nature of the reflexive in constructions in Bengali. He only presents the derivational history of different (well-known and less known) reflexive markers and their dialectal variations. Moreover, he does not make a difference between the reflexives and the pseudo-reflexives. Finally, he lays more emphasis on the reflexive *āpon* and traces out the history of its becoming the honorific second personal pronoun from a reflexive marker. This paper, therefore, aims at presenting a somewhat detailed analysis of the nature of the reflexivization phenomenon in Bengali*.

0.2 The direct and the possessive forms of the pronouns in Bengali are as follows:

PERSON	SINGULAR		PLURAL		
	DIRECT	POSS	DIRECT	POSS	
I.	āmi	āmār	āmṛā	āmāder	
II.	a. Non Honorific	tui	tor	torā	toder
	b. Medium	tumi	tomār	tomṛā	tomāder
	c. Honorific	āpni	āpnār	āpnārā	āpnāder
III.	i. Simple personal				
	a. Non-Hon/Medium	Še	tār	tārā	tāder

	b.	Honorific	tini	tār	tārā	Tāder
	ii.	Demonstrative				
		Personal				
	a.	Near- Non-	e	er	erā	Eder
		Hon / Medium				

b.	Near Honorific	ini	ēr	ēra	ēder
c.	Distant Non-Hon/ Medium	o	or	orā	Oder
d.	Distant Honorific	uni	ōr	ōra	ōder

0.3 Prenominalization in Bengali can occur at two levels, like other language, and these are: (a) discourse level, and (b) sentence level. At the discourse level, a proper or a common name is pronominalized, if it occurs in a previous sentence. This intersentential pronominalization does not concern us, because it creates no syntactic problem. However, the intersentential pronominalization poses some important problems and syntacticians, from time to time, raised different questions regarding its nature. Most of them were concerned the questions like:

- i) whether PRONOMINALIZATION is cyclic or pre-cyclic or post cyclic.
- ii) Whether PRONOMINALIZATION is unidirectional or bidirectional (i.e., whether, in a language, both ‘forward’ and ‘backward’ pronominalizations are possible)
- iii) Whether PRONOMINALIZATION is a universal phenomenon.

0.4 Without going into the details of these problems, one can briefly say that it has by now been universally admitted that PRONOMINALIZATION is a universal syntactic process and that it is cyclic in most of the languages. In Bengali, a RELATIVE REDUCTION RULE precedes it and it is followed by many other transformations like REFLEXIVIZATION and IMPERATIVE SUBJECT DELETION transformations. In English (Ross, 1967) and some other languages, it is bidirectional, but in Bengali, backward pronominalization is not possible. Thus, while one can pronominalize the *rām* in (1) in the forward direction, a backward pronominalization would generate an ungrammatical string like (3). Consider the following examples:

- (1) *rām_i* mone kōre (je) *rām_i* khub buddhimān.
Ram thinks that Ram only +emph intelligent.
“Ram thinks that only Ram (is) intelligent”.
- (2) *rām_i* mone kōre (je) *še_i* khub buddhimān.
- (3) **Še_i* mone kōre (je) *rām_i* khub buddhimān.
- (4) *Še_i* mone kōre (je) *rām_i* khub buddhimān.
- (5) *Še_i* mone kōre (je) *še_i* khub buddhimān.

The sentence (3) is not acceptable, if both NPs are co-referential. If they refer to different persons, however, the same sentence is acceptable as is seen in (4). In (5), the first occurrence of *ram* is pronominalized intersententially and the second one is thus an instance of forward pronominalization.

0.5 Since backward PRONOMINALIZATION is not permitted, one would normally expect that backward REFLEXIVIZATION too produces ungrammatical sentences. This can be exemplified by the following sentences:

- (6) *āmi_i* *āmāke_i* *bhālobāš_i*
I me love
“I love me”
- (7) *āmi_i* *nijeke_i* *bhālobāš_i*
- (8) **nije_i* *āmāke* *bhālobāš_i*.

However, one can say,

- (9) *āmi* *nije* *āmākei* *bhālobāš_i*.
I myself me-only love.
“I myself love me only”

Or (10) *āmi* *nije* *nije-kei* *bhālobāš_i*.

Here *nije* is a pseudo-reflexive, which could be found in such English constructions as :

- (11) I myself have done it.

It may be noted here that backward reflexivization is permitted in some other NIA languages like Marathi (Kashi Wali, 1975) and in certain type of adverbial constructions in Hindi (subbarao, 1967). It seems that in Bengali, such unidirectional constraint on reflexivization is a late development, because in Early Bengali texts, one can find examples of backward reflexivization. Thus in the Caryā-padas, one gets the following constructions :

- (12) *na jānami apā kahi gai paiṭha*
(I) not know ‘self’ where having entered gone
“I know not where (I) myself having gone entered”.
- (13) *apaṇāi mānsē harināi bairī*
Self-of flesh-by the deer (is) a foe.
“Because of its own flesh, the deer is a foe”

While one finds a forward reflexivization (and an optional pronominal deletion) in (12), (13) is clearly an instance of backward reflexivization, because it has an underlying structure like (14).

- (14) *harinā* + poss; *mānsa* + inst *harinā_i* (Vbe) *bairī*”

1.1. Modern Bengali has two markers for reflexives and they are *nija* and *āpan* (e.g. Hindi *apnā*, Marathi *āpaṇ*). In certain Indian languages like Marathi, one finds two reflexive pronouns (*swatāh* and *āpaṇ*), which are in partial complementation, but Bengali does not differentiate between *nija* and *āpan* in that way. It may be noted here that in certain languages like Finnish, it is the non-reflexive non-co-referential NPs that are marked by an element *hānen*, while the co-referential (i.e. reflexivized) NPs are not marked by anything (Mey, 1969: 6). Earlier, as Chatterji (1926: 846) pointed out, Bengali had only one reflexive, i.e., *āpan*. In the Caryā-padas, one finds *nija* occurring only thrice. However, this *āpan* was gradually extended to mean the second personal (honorific) pronoun. ‘It is absent in M. I. A. It is not found in OB and eMB, nor in the older literatures in the other NIA tongues’ (Chatterji, 1926: 847) in this sense. Coming to the present day, in colloquial Bengali, *nija* has almost completely replaced *āpan*, which is now confined to the ‘Sadhu’ (“Archaic”) style of writing. We know that this style is also restricted to certain formal written contexts, and that too within

certain older age-groups (Singh, 1974). Therefore, for our purpose, only *nija*-has been taken into consideration.

1.2. For Hindi and other NIA languages, a clause-mate condition for the reflexives has been proposed (Subbarao, 1967: 5). But for many other languages like Japanese (Kuno, 1972), Korean (McCawley: 1912) and Marathi (Kashi Wali, 1975), such conditions are not necessary, because “the reflexive pronouns in these languages are known to occur within the same clause as its co-referential antecedent NP, as well as in embedded clauses under certain specifiable syntactic conditions”. (Kashi Wali, 1975: 1). The latter type of reflexive construction can be exemplified by the following Japanese sentence (Kuno, 1972):

- (15) *Johni wa* [Mary *ga zibun_i o damasi ta*] koto urande-iru.
John Mary self deceived that vengeful is.
“John is vengeful of the fact that Mary deceived self (=John)”.

Such sentences can be found in Marathi, too (Kashi Wali, 1975):

- (16) *Mini-lā; hi gosta satavte Ki* [āpaṇi; phār unca āhot].
Mini this fact bothers that self very tall is
“It bothers Mini that she is very tall”

1.3. In Bengali, one has certain types of constructions, where an apparent violation of a clause-mate condition is visible. Consider the following examples:

- (17) *āmi; bhāblām (je) āmi jābo nā.*
I thought that I will go not.
“I thought that I would not go”.
- (18) *āmi_i bhāblām (je) nije_i jābo nā.*
- (19) *āmi bhāblām (je) jābo nā.*

It would seem that (18) and (19) are the results of two transformational processes-reflexivization (after a redundant application of pronominalization) in the former and Equi-NP deletion in the latter. This would mean that Bengali, like Marathi, Tamil and Kannada, has two types of reflexivization. But this is not so, because we find a construction like (20), which shows that *nije* of (18) is a pseudo-reflexive which remained on the surface, after the Equi-NP deletion transformation has applied on both (18) and (19).

- (20) *āmi bhāblām (je) āmi nije jābo nā.*
I thought that I self will go not.
“I thought that I would not go myself”.

Hindi reflexives, which obey the clause-mate condition, has a similar pseudo-reflexive in this type of construction, which might apparently suggest a different analysis of reflexives than

what Subbarao (1967) and Kachru (1966) have already suggested. Consider the following example:

- (21) *unhō ne socā ki* $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{swøyem} \\ \text{Khud} \end{array} \right\}$ *vāhā nāhī jānā cāhiye.*

He (hon) thought that self-there not to go should
“He thought that he should not go there himself”.

In these cases, however, *āpnā* cannot be used as a pseudo-reflexive, although in other cases, it could be done.

- (22) **unhō ne socā ki āpnā vāhā nāhī jānā cāhiye.*
- (23) **unhō ne socā ki āpne ko vāhā nehī jānā cāhiye.*

In certain dialects, (23) is, of course, acceptable. Hindi has a construction, parallel to the Bengali sentence (20), at least, dialectically:

- (24) *unhō ne socā ki unko* $\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{swøyəm ko} \\ \text{khud ko} \\ \text{*āpne ko} \end{array} \right\}$
vāhā nehī jānā cāhiye.

The fact that Bengali cannot have a sentence such as (15) or (16) which Japanese and Marathi can have is an additional proof that the above type of constructions exhibits a pseudo-reflexivity. Thus, sentence such as (25) - (26) would not be acceptable in Bengali:

- (25) **nije khub lōmbā eṭā mini-ke khub cintāe pheleche,*
Self very tall it Mini-to very thought-in last.
“Mini is quite sore to the fact that Mini is too tall”.
- (26) **eṭā minike khub cintāe pheleche je nije khub lōmbā.*

(26) is the same as (25), except the fact that it underwent an extra-position *nije* in (26) is not acceptable even as a pseudo-reflexive, use Equi-NP deletion is blocked in the sentences like (26). For example:

- (27) *eṭā minike khub cintāe pheleche je khub lōmbā.*
- (28) *eṭā minike khub cintāe pheleche je še khub lōmbā.*

1.4. The pseudo-reflexive *nije* is at times reduplicated to mean “on one’s own”, but an actual reflexive cannot occur twice. One can index *nije nije* as a separate lexical item in the dictionary, too.

- (29) *rām bhābe še nije nije boro hobe.*
Ram thinks (that) he on his own big will be.
“Ram thinks (that) he would (grow) big on his own”.

Sometimes, a sequence of pseudo-and actual reflexive look like *nije nije* “on his own” on the surface in the sentences like (30):

- (30) $\bar{a}mi_i$ $nije$ $nijeke_j$ $bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}ši$ (onno keu bāšuk bā
nā bāšuk)
I myself myself love other somebody loves or
not loves,
“I (myself) love myself (others may or may not)”.

The first occurrence of *nije* is pseudo-reflexive here.

2.1 In Bengali, two co-referential nouns cannot stay on the surface structure of a sentence. This means that one of them (and in this language, it is NP₂ because backward pronominalization and reflexivization is blocked here) has to be reflexivized. But this does not mean that the reflexivization transformation is obligatorily applied in all cases where NP₁ is identical with NP₂, although in Hindi, this is exactly the case. Consider the following Bengali sentences, where co-referential NPs stay on the surface:

- (31) $\bar{a}mi$ $\bar{a}m\bar{a}ke$ $bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}ši$,
I me love
“I love me”.
- (32) $tumi$ $tom\bar{a}ke$ $bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}šo$ ($\bar{a}r$ $k\bar{a}uke$ $n\bar{o}e$)
you you love other anybody not
“you love yourself, not anybody else”.

In the case of 3rd personal pronoun and nouns, it is not permitted. Thus, sentences such as (33) and (34) are grammatically acceptable only if NPs are not co-referential:

- (33) $\bar{s}e_i$ $t\bar{a}ke_j$ $bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}še$
He him/her loves.
“He loves him/her”.
- (34) $r\bar{a}m_i$ $r\bar{a}mke_j$ $bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}še$.
Ram Ram loves.
“Ram loves Ram”.

One can pronominalize $r\bar{a}mke$ (34), because the two NPs denote different persons. If referred to the same person, the reflexivization was obligatory. Thus although one can get (35) from (34), but not (36):

- (35) $r\bar{a}m_i$ $t\bar{a}ke_j$ $bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}še$
Ram him love.
“Ram loves him”.

- (36) * $r\bar{a}m_i$ $nijeke_j$ $bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}še$.

Incorporating this condition in the rule, one can write a reflexivization rule tentatively in the following way:

- (37) SD : X NP_i Y NP_j Z
SI : 1 2 3 4 5 =>
SC : 1 2 3 *nija* 5

- Conditions: (i) NP_i = NP_j
(ii) 2 and 4 must be clause-mates.
(iii) The rule applies optionally, if

$$NP_i = \left(\begin{array}{l} + \text{ PRO} \\ - \text{ III Person} \end{array} \right)$$

2.2. That reflexivization is a cycle rule in Bengali can be demonstrated by showing that it is neither a pre-cyclic, nor a post-cyclic rule.

There are certain rules that are ordered before the reflexivization transformation, because without that the grammar would generate many ungrammatical sentences. It can be proved by looking at the possessive constructions, where a reflexivization rule has to apply. A sentence (38) comes from an underlying structure (39) by a transformation called relative reduction.

- (38) $\bar{a}mi_i$ $\bar{a}m\bar{a}r_i$ $m\bar{a}-ke$ $khub$ $bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}ši$.
I my mother very love.
“I love my mother very much”.

- (39) [$\bar{a}mi$] $\left[\begin{array}{l} [\text{DET}] \quad je \quad ma \quad \bar{a}mi \quad \text{POSS} \quad h\bar{c}n \\ \text{NP} \quad \quad \quad S_2 \quad \quad \quad S_2 \end{array} \right]$
PDP

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} [m\bar{a}-ke] \\ N \quad N \end{array} \right] \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} [khub \quad bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}ši] \\ YP \quad VP \end{array} \right]$$

NP PDP

The relative reduction transformation deletes identical $m\bar{a}$ in S₂, as well as *je* and *h\bar{c}n* and raises $\bar{a}mi$ + Poss to the higher sentence thus fulfilling the clause-mate condition for reflexivization. Now the reflexivization transformation applies optionally (because NP_i is a non-3rd personal pronoun here) on (38) and generates (40), which follows:

- (40) $\bar{a}mi_i$ $nije_r$ $m\bar{a}-ke$ $khub$ $bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}ši$.

This shows that between relative reduction and reflexivization, the order should be as follows (and not vice-versa),

- i. Relative Reduction.
- ii. Reflexivization.

The pronominalization applies redundantly on (38), because NP_i is already a pronoun. That pronominalization follows relative reduction, but precedes reflexivization can be shown if NP_i of (38), i.e., $\bar{a}mi$ is replaced by a noun, say, $\bar{S}it\bar{a}$. The derivational process of such a sentence would be as follows:

- (41) $\bar{S}it\bar{a} - je$ $m\bar{a}$ $\bar{S}it\bar{a}$ +r $h\bar{c}n$ - $m\bar{a}-ke$ $bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}še$.

Sita which mother Sita's $\bar{i}s$ mother very loves.

First cycle: Relative reduction transformation (obligatory)

- (42) $\bar{S}it\bar{a}_i$ $\bar{t}\bar{a}r_i$ $m\bar{a}-ke$ $khub$ $bh\bar{a}lob\bar{a}še$.

Second cycle : Pronominalization (obligatory)

- (43) *Šitā_i tār_i mā-ke khub bhālobāše.*
Third cycle : Reflexivization (optional)

- (44) *Šitā_i nijer_i mā-ke khub bhālobāše.*

Thus, the order between these three transformations would be:

- i. Relative reduction.
- ii. Pronominalization.
- iii. reflexivization.

2.3. There are some other transformations which must precede reflexivization and one of them is passivization. (46) is a passive version of (45), where *er dārā* “by” has been added and verb *kār* has been replaced by *hō* “be”.

- (45) *rām rābonke khun korechilo.*
Ram Ravana killed.
“Ram killed Ravana”.
- (46) *rābon rām-er dārā khun hoechilo.*
Ravana Ram-by killed was.
“Ravana was killed by Ram”.

One can alternatively form a sentence like (47):

- (47) *rāmer dārā rābon khun hoechilo.*

If these NPs become co-referential, as in (48), one has to apply the passivization before reflexivization, because in applying the latter rule, one has to see which NP_i is the NP₂. Otherwise, the grammar would generate (50) as well as (51).

- (48) *rām_i rāmke_i khun korechilo.*
Ram Ram killed
“Ram killed Ram”.
- (49) *rām rāmer dārā khun hoechilo.*
- (50) *rām nijer dārā khun hoechilo.*
- (51) **nije rāmer dārā khun hoechilo.*

2.4. In Bengali, as well as in Hindi, there is a transformation called the pronominal subject deletion transformation, which optionally deletes any personal pronoun from the surface of a sentence. Thus, (52) can be transformed into (53):

- (52) *āmi šekhāne jābo.*
I there will go.
“I will go there”.
- (53) *šekhāne jābo*
“(I) will go there”.

A similar transformation deletes the subject pronoun ‘you’ in English obligatory and is called the Imperative subject deletion transformation. In Bengali, *tui/tumi/ āpni* “you” can be retained

on the surface optionally, as in (52) *āmi* has been kept. This Pronominal Subject Deletion transformation must be ordered after the reflexivization transformation, because otherwise one would not be able to transform (54) to (55), because the structural description for such transformation would not be fulfilled.

- (54) *tumi tomāke bhālobāšo.*
you you love
“you love you”

- (55) *nijeke bhālobāšo.*
(you) yourself love.
“(you) love yourself”.

Therefore the cycle of application for reflexivization and other related transformation in Bengali is :

- i. Relative Reduction.
- ii. Passivization.
- iii. Pronominalization.
- iv. Reflexivization.
- v. Pronominal Subject Deletion.

2.5 The possessive constructions in 2.2. have shown that the application of a rule like (37) is optional not only in case the NP_i is a 1st or 2nd personal pronoun, but also in all other cases if NP₂ is in possessive. Thus, both (43) and (44) are permissible. Interestingly, although sentences like (35) have double meanings due to the indefiniteness of the 3rd personal pronoun, (43) shows no such ambiguity. Therefore, (37) can be revised and reformulated as:

(56) Reflexivization Transformation (Partly obligatory);

SD :	X	NP _i	-	Y	-	NP _j	(+Possessive)	-	Z
SI :	1	2	3	4	5	6	=>		
SC :	1	2	3	nija	5	6			

- Conditions :
- (i) NP_i = NP_j
 - (ii) 2 and 4 are clause-mates
 - (iii) The rule is optional, if :

$$(a) NP_i = \left[\begin{array}{l} + \text{Pro} \\ - \text{III person} \end{array} \right]$$

Or (b) 5 is present on the surface.

3.1. Causative constructions in some NIA languages give rise to ambiguities if one of the NPs participating in an act of causation is repeated in the sentence in the form of possessives or with adverbs of purpose. Thus, following sentences are ambiguous in Hindi:

- (57) *hōm - ne bāce - ko āpne kārpe pahnāye.*
I child-to self cloth wear + CAUSE
“I made the child wear $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{my} \\ \text{his} \end{array} \right\}$ own clothes”.

- (58) hām - ne mā - se əpne - liye.
I mother-to self for.
Khānā pākane ko kāha.
Food cook – for asked.
“I asked mother to cook food for { her }
me”.

The direct object is ordered after the indirect object in these two sentences. Their positions can be interchanged in a sentence by an optional transformation called Object NP inversion rule. If by applying this rule, one can form (59) and (60) from (57) and (58) respectively, the ambiguity is removed from these structures and reflexive əpnā would invariably refer to the subject NP here:

(59) hām – ne əpne kəpṛe bəcce-ko pehnāye.

(60) hām – ne əpne-liye mā-se khānā pākāne ko kəhā,

Subbarao (1967: 7) pointed out that in certain other cases, əpnā refers unambiguously to the subject NP and not to the indirect object NP, eg.

- (61) əšok ne lelitā se əpne ko īmāndār kəhā.
Ashok Lalita to himself trustworthy said.
“Ashok said to Lalita that he is trustworthy.

The reason behind this, he says, is in the deep structure of (58) and (61), where the former has turn ‘you’ as the subject of the embedded sentence (imperative) and the latter has me ‘I’ as the same.

3.2. The sentences with double objects create a similar problem of ambiguity in Bengali. To locate the particular permutations and combinations that create confusions regarding the interpretation of the sentences, the Bengali equivalents of the ambiguous Hindi constructions, described in 3.1. were presented before thirteen informants for elicitation. Before we go into the results of this small experiment, something more about the reflexivization transformation (as formulated in 2.5.) must be said. A rule (56) applies only after a pronominalization rule in Bengali, which replaces the identical NP_i in the forward direction by a pronoun *še*, *tini*, *e*, *ini*, *o*, *uni*, or their appropriate casual forms. A reflexivization rule, in many languages, then applies on the structure, provided all other conditions are fulfilled, and replaces the co-referential pronouns by a reflexive pronoun *nija*.

However, in some languages, the reflexive pronoun is placed after the personal pronoun. Again, many of these languages delete the personal pronouns before the reflexive marker optionally, while many languages do not do that. Thus, while English has my-, our-, your-, him-, her-, and them- before a reflexive self many languages like Bengali permit both PRON + REFL and REFL structure. For example:

- (62) *Sumitā_i nijer_i māke bhālobāše.*
Sumita self-of mother loves.
“Sumita loves h-r mother”.

- (63) *Sumitā_i tār nijer_i māke bhālobāše.*
Sumita her self-of mother loves.

“Sumita loves her own mother”.

We have already seen that a sentence such as (64) is permissible in Bengali, where reflexivization does not apply:

- (64) *Sumitā_i tār_i māke bhālobāše.*
Sumita her mother loves.
“Sumita loves her mother”.

In the light of these possibilities, one must reformulate the reflexivization transformation, (that was proposed in 2.5.) that would optionally delete the pronouns from the structure PRON + REFL. The latter can be named the optional pronominal deletion transformation. These two rules can now be written in the following way :

(65) **Reflexivization transformation** (Partly Obligatory):

SD: X - NP _i - Y - [PRO] - (+ POSSESSIVE) - Z	
	NP _j NP _j
SI : 1 2 3 4 5 6 =>	
SC : 1 2 3 4+nija 5 6 6	

- Conditions: (i) NP_i = NP_j
(ii) 2 and 4 are clause-mates
(iii) the rule applies optionally, if
(a) NP_i = [-III person]
or (b) 5 is present on the structure

(66) **Pronominal Deletion Transformation** (Optional):

SD: X - NP _i - Y - PRO + REFL (+ POSS) - Z	
SI : 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 =>	
SC : 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	

3.3. A set of sixteen sentences were played, with the help of a tape recorder, before thirteen native speakers of Bengali in Delhi, all of them are students of postgraduate or higher courses. All of these informants were multilingual, knowing English and one more neighboring Indian language, such as Hindi, Maithili, Assamese or Oriya, Among the sentences, which were played, those which had an order of NPs like that of (59) or (60), almost all of the informants pointed out that the reflexive *nija*- or the PRON + REFL *tār* + *nija* – referred always to the adjacent subject NP. Thus, the following constructions are unambiguous to all of these informants:

- (67) *rəmeš_i tār_i kəpṛə cheleṭike pəṛālo.*
Ramesh his clothes the boy wear +CAUSE
“Ramesh made the boy wear his (= Ramesh) clothes”.
- (68) *rəmeš_i nijer_i kəpṛə cheleṭike pəṛālo.*
- (69) *rəmeš_i tār nijer_i kəpṛə cheleṭike pəṛālo.*

But when the order of these NPs are changed and made like that of (57) and (58) in 3.1., there seems to be confusion regarding the pronominal reference among the informants. Thus, while all of them agreed that *nijer* in (71) refers unambiguously to *rəmeš*, in (72), the pronominal combination *tār nijer* would

refer to the Indirect object NP *cheleṭike*. However, 23% of the informants held that with *tār nijer*, said that the same thing happens, when only tar is used.

- (70) *rōmeṣ cheleṭike tār kāpoṛ pōrālo*.
 (71) *rōmeṣ cheleṭike nijer kāpoṛ pōrālo*.
 (72) *rōmeṣ cheleṭike tār nijer kāpoṛ pōrālo*.

It must be noted here that no ambiguity arises, when the subject NP is a non-third personal pronoun *āmi* "I" or *tumi* "you", e.g.,

- (73) *āmi cheleṭike nijer; kāpoṛ pōrālām*.
 I the boy self clothes wear +CAUSE
 "I made the boy wear my clothes".
 (74) *tumi cheleṭike nijer; kāpoṛ pōrāle*.
 You the boy self clothes wear +CAUSE
 "You made the boy wear your clothes".

Expect one informant, all others pointed out that even if the subject NP is a third person, in case of pronouns, *nijer* refers only to the subject pronoun. Thus (75) is also unambiguous:

- (75) *ṣe cheleṭike nijer; kāpoṛ pōrālo*.
 He the boy self clothes wear + CAUSE
 "He made the boy wear his (=He) clothes".

Notice that when the subject pronoun is in the 1st or 2nd person, *tār* and *tār nijer* would obviously refer to the indirect object NP *cheleṭike*, because tar is a third personal pronoun. Interestingly, in the conduction related to (75) such as (76) that follows, 69% of the informants opined that tar *nijer* refers to the subject pronoun se. For the rest, such constructions are ambiguous:

- (76) *ṣe cheleṭike tār nijer kāpoṛ pōrālo*.
 He the boy his own clothes wear +CAUSE
 "He made the boy wear his own clothes".

3.4. In adverbial constructions, the informant elicitation shows two types of judgments about the same type of structure. Thus, while 39% of the informants thought that (77) and (78) were ambiguous, (79) and (80) were unambiguous to all of them – the reasons for which are not clear.

- (77) *āmi māke nijer jonno jāega rākhte bollām*.
 I mother-to-self-of for place to keep asked.
 "I asked (my) mother to keep a place for self".
 (78) *āmi māke nijer jonno cā bānāte bollām*.
 I mother-to self-of for tea to make asked.
 "I asked (my) mother to make tea for self".
 (79) *āmi māke nijer jonno bhābte bhāron korlām*.
 I mother-to self-of for to think forbid did.

"I asked (my) mother not to think of self".

- (80) *āmi māke nijer jonno bhābte onurodh korlām*.
 I mother-to self-of for to think request did.
 "I requested (my) mother not to think about self".

It may be mentioned here that when we altered the structure of (78) a little bit, by adding a verb *ne* 'to take' with the verb *bānā* of the embedded sentence a compound verb *bānie+ne* "to make", everybody agreed that there, *nijer jonno* refers only to *māke* "(to) mother". Again, if one replaces *bānie+ne* by *bānie+de* "to make", *nijer jonno* would unambiguously refer to *āmi* "I". Consider the following sentences:

- (81) *āmi māke; nijer jonno; cā bānie nite bollām*.
 I mother self-of for tea to make asked.
 "I asked (my) mother to make tea for herself".
 (82) *āmi; māke nijer jonno; cā bānie dite bollām*.
 I mother self of for tea to make asked.
 "I asked (my) mother to make tea for myself".

This unambiguity stems from the semantics of these two sets of compound verbs- V +ne would always refer to the subject of an imperative construction, while V+ de would refer to the speaker of an imperative sentence. Two simple imperative sentences would show this difference:

- (83) *tumi tomār jonno jāmā bānie nāQ*.
 You you-of for shirt make
 "You make a shirt for yourself".
 (84) *tumi amār jonno jāmā bānie dāQ*.
 You me for shirt make
 "You make a shirt for me".

If *ne* is used with (84), and *de* with (83), these sentences would become ungrammatical:

- (85) * *tumi tamār jonno jāmā bānie dāQ*.
 (86) * *tumi amār jonno jāmā bānie nāQ*.

3.5. It has been shown in this paper that in course of time Bengali has developed a unidirection (that too, forward) system of pronominalization and reflexivization and that these transformations are applied cyclically. The details of a reflexivization transformation have been worked out and a new transformation called the pronominal deletion transformation has been proposed for Bengali to account for certain typical constructions Hindi and Bengali reflexivization processes have been compared with each other and the similarities and differences have been shown. Lastly, informant elicitations on some types of ambiguous reflexive constructions have been presented to show the nature of ambiguity of the reflexives in the causatives.

COLOPHON

I would like to thank Dr. K.V. Subbarao, from whom I have known the nature and the problem of Hindi reflexives, and who has kindly read and commented upon an earlier version of this paper. I would also like to thank the informants who participated in the experiment on the ambiguity caused by the reflexives in certain types of constructions.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Chatterji, S.K. (1926) The origin and the development of the Bengali language (George Allen and Unwin Co.)
- [2]. Kachru, Y. (1966) Introduction to Hindi syntax (Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois).
- [3]. Kashi Wali (1975) "Two Marathi Reflexives and their implications for the causatives" (Unpublished MSS).
- [4]. Kuno, S. (1972) "Pronominalization, reflexivization, and direct discourse" (Linguistic Inquiry, Vol 3 No.2.)
- [5]. Less, R.B. (1963) The Grammar of English Nominalizations (Indiana University, Bloomington).

- [6]. McCawley, N. (1972) A study of Japanese Reflexivization (Unpublished Thesis, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio).
- [7]. Mey, J (1969) "Is reflexivization always a cyclical process?" (Paper presented at the 1969 winter Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, San Francisco, December 29-31, 1969).
- [8]. Ross, J. R. (1967) "On the cyclic nature of English pronominalization" (in To Honor Roman Jakobson, Vol. 3, pp 1669-1682; Mouton & Co.).
- [9]. Singh, U.N. (1974) "Diglossia in Bengali: A study of Attitudes" (Paper presented at the Vth All India Conference of Linguists, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, on December 30-31, 1974).
- [10]. Subbarao, K.V. (1967) "Some aspects of pronominalization and reflexivization in Hindi" (Paper presented at the conference in Hindi Syntax, at the Inter-University Rotating Summer Programme in South Asia Studies, University of Illinois, August 4-5, 1967).

NOTE: A paper read at the VIth All India Conference of Linguists, Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati (A.P), on January 13-14, 1976.