A STRUCTURAL ACCOUNT OF HINDI-URDU 'AGAIN' ADVERBS

INTRODUCTION In this paper, I will present novel data to show that a structural ambiguity account on the lines of von Stechow (1996) is required to explain the repetitive and non-repetitive readings of Hindi-Urdu (HU) adverb *phir-se*. I show that the Fabricius-Hansen (2001) lexical ambiguity analysis is not required for *phir*-se. Rather, the structural account needs to be extended to account for word-order patterns shown by counterdirectional adverb *vaapas* as well. HU differs from Kutchi Gujarati (KG) in having two lexical items, not one (*pacho*), and therefore does not fit exactly with the Patel-Grosz&Beck (2014) approach which combines the other two approaches.

DATA English *again* and German *wieder* lexicalize both repetitive and non-repetitive readings. Hindi-Urdu has two adverbs corresponding to these readings: *phir-se* is basically repetitive (REP) (1), and *vaapas* is basically counterdirectional (COUNT) (2). Both are acceptable in the restitutive (RES) case (3).

(1) basanti   phir-se   / #vaapas   naacegi
     Basanti   again   / #VAAPAS   dance.FUT.3SF
     'Basanti will dance again.'

(2) basanti   raamgaRh   #phir-se   / vaapas   aayegi
     Basanti   Ramgarh   #PHIR-SE   / back   come.FUT.3FS
     'Basanti will come back to Ramgarh.' [CONTEXT: Basanti has left Ramgarh for the first time.]

(3) DoctroN-ne   anguuThe-ko   phir-se/vaapas   joRaa
     doctor.PL.OBL-ERG   thumb-ACC   PHIR-SE/VAAPAS   attach.PFV.3MS
     'The doctors re-attached the thumb.' [PRESUPPOSITION: there exists a preceding state where it had been attached/there exists a preceding counterdirectional event of it becoming un-attached.]

PHIR-SE IS TRUE RES I argue that *phir-se* (not *vaapas*) marks true RES. Evidence for this comes from contexts where a counterdirectional presupposition is impossible. In such cases, *vaapas* is not licit, but *phir-se* is, even if REP is ruled out. In (4), Veeru accidentally fried potatoes that had already been fried by someone else. A presupposition of 'unfrying' is implausible, 'someone else' rules out high REP.

(4) viiru-ne   anjaane meiN   aalu-ko   phir-se/*vaapas   bhune
     Veeru-ERG   unknowingly   potatoes-ACC   PHIR-SE/*VAAPAS   fry.PFV.3MS
     'Veeru accidentally re-fried the potatoes.'

The acceptability of either adverb in (3) is then because the COUNT presupposition contributed by *vaapas* entails RES – the reversing event restores whatever state held before. The LEXICAL AMBIGUITY approach (Fabricius-Hansen 2001) names COUNT as the source of the RES-type of meaning. This is clearly not the *only* route to restitution, given (4). Thus, this approach does not work for Hindi-Urdu.

WORD ORDER ARGUMENT In fact, HU shows evidence in support of the STRUCTURAL AMBIGUITY approach (von Stechow 1996), under which the restitutive (RES) reading comes about when the adverb is base-generated modifying not the entire VP but only its result state-denoting small clause. If the adverb is generated in a position higher than VP, only the repetitive (REP) reading obtains. The argument behind this account was from German word order constraining the readings. The word order behaviour of *phir-se* (RES available only when it is closest to the verb) is best captured by this kind of approach.

(5) phir-se   DoctroN-ne   anguuThe-ko   joRaa   *RES   ✓REP
(6) DoctroN-ne   phir-se   anguuThe-ko   joRaa   *RES   ✓REP
(7) DoctroN-ne   anguuThe-ko   phir-se   joRaa   ✓RES   ✓REP

I assume this structure of a basic transitive with a verbal root, following Bhatt&Embick (2003).

(8) [TP [AspP [vP DP [vP [RootP DP Root]   v[AG]   ]   ] Asp] T]

1

The structure for (3) without the adverb is therefore as below:

(9)   [TP [AspP [vP DoctroN-ne [vP [RootP anguuThe-ko   joR]   v[AG]   ]   ] Pfv] ∅]

Under the von Stechow model, *phir-se* would need to modify a very small substructure. I propose this to be as low as RootP. This structure is the same as von Stechow, but without needing a CAUSE head.

(10)   [TP DoctroN-ne [TP [AspP [vP tSUBJ anguuThe-ko [vP phir-se [vP [RootP tOBJ joR] v[AG]]]] Pfv] ∅]]

This predicts correctly that the word order in (7) above can have the RES reading. However, REP is also available for (7). In keeping with this model, the REP reading is due to a higher attachment site for the adverb (I assume vP). The surface order (7) is compatible with the structure in (11), so (7) is ambiguous.

(11)   [TP DoctroN-ne [TP [AspP [vP tSUBJ anguuThe-ko [vP phir-se [vP [RootP tOBJ joR] v[AG]]]] Pfv] ∅]]

The word orders in (5) and (6) can be explained by TP attachment of the adverb with or without movement of the subject over it, respectively.

SENSITIVITY TO PREDICATE STRUCTURE   Notably, with simplex double object verbs (12), *phir-se* has only the REP reading – RES is blocked. With derived (causative) versions of the same verb, RES becomes available.

#REP, ✓RES context*:* Charu had a flag on her roof but a storm destroyed it.

(12)   # benu-ne   charu-ko   phir-se   jhanDaa   diya/bheja   (*SIMPLEX*)
        Benu-ERG   Charu-ACC   PHIR-SE   flag   give/send.PFV.3MS
        'Benu gave/sent Charu a flag a second time.' [≠ RES: Benu caused Charu to repossess a flag.]

(13)   benu-ne   charu-ko   phir-se   jhanDaa   dil/bhij-aa-ya   (*DERIVED*)
        Benu-ERG   Charu-ACC   PHIR-SE   flag   give/send-cause-PFV.3MS
        'Benu caused someone to give/send Charu a flag, and thus Charu has one again.'

Most ditransitives in Hindi-Urdu are derived as well (Bhatt&Embick 2003). In example (3), the alternation is *joR* (transitive) is built from *juR* (unaccusative). The sensitivity of *phir-se* to structure as low as the derivation of the verb, lends support to an attachment site as low as RootP.

EXTENDING THE STRUCTURAL ACCOUNT   The key criticism of the structural account by Fabricius-Hansen is that it fails to capture the anaphoric nature of the repeated event, which causes identity of the state-holders. In HU, this (non-)identity, is signalled by word order in the case of COUNT (identity only when *vaapas* is closest to the verb – paralleling the distribution of *phir-se* in (5)–(7)).

(14)   benu-ne   charu-ko   jhanDaa   vaapas   diya
        Benu-ERG   Charu-ACC   flag   VAAPAS   give.PFV.3MS
        'Benu gave Charu the flag back.' [PRESUPPOSITION: There exists a prior event of Charu giving the same flag to Benu.]

All other orders of (14) have the reading, 'Benu gave Charu a flag in return.', and presuppose that there exists a prior event of Charu giving something to Benu. There is no identity requirement.

CONCLUSION   The structural account works for HU, but the decomposition of the predicate is more fine-grained than proposed by von Stechow (and adopted as is by Patel-Grosz&Beck for KG). Additionally, it extends successfully to the counterdirectional *vaapas*.

REFERENCES

BHATT, R., D. EMBICK. 2003. "Causative derivations in Hindi-Urdu and the question of directionality".
FABRICIUS-HANSEN, CATHRINE. 2001. Wi(e)der and again(st). In Audiatur Vox Sapientiae.
PATEL-GROSZ, PRITTY AND SIGRID BECK. 2014. "Revisiting again: The view from Kutchi Gujarati."
VON STECHOW, ARNIM. 1996. "The different readings of wieder 'again': A structural account."