

Tendency towards co-occurrence of negative sentences with *lena* TAKE as a V2: a corpus-based case study of Hindi

Miki Nishioka
Osaka University

This paper aims at using a Hindi web corpus to investigate the restrictions on the co-occurrence in Hindi of the STEM form of the main verb (V1) plus the vector, auxiliary, or light verb *lena* TAKE together with negative markers (*nahil*, *na*, and *mat* for imperative forms). There have been numerous studies on certain special V2s in V1 + V2 concatenations, that is, so-called compound verbs. Masica (1991: 326-30) has called such V2s intensifiers, operators, explicators, or vectors, the list mainly including GO, COME, GIVE, TAKE, etc. All of these express ‘manner-specification’. Masica labeled the manner-specification expressed by TAKE as ‘affective’ or ‘reflective’. Snell (2010: 189) ascribes a benefit function to TAKE in Hindi, as well as to *denaa* GIVE, the opposite vector verb. He states that *lena* suggests the benefit of an action “flows *towards* the doer” and that such V2s as *denaa* and *lena* when specifying manner are used much less frequently with negated verbs. Jagannathan (1981) claims that *jaanaa* GO, *lena* TAKE, or *denaa* GIVE used as a V2 rarely co-occur with negative markers in Hindi. Liperovskii (1984: 182-1) has also pointed out a certain limitation in the V1+V2 with negative particles, which mainly occurs in colloquial speech. Following is an illustrative example in Hindi, quoted from Snell (2014: 210):

- | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
| (1) Raju: | <i>mal=ne</i> | <i>khaanaa</i> | <i>khaa</i> | <i>liyaa</i> | <i>hai.</i> |
| | I=ERG | food | eat.STEM | TAKE.PFV | COP.PRST |
| | ‘I’ve had my meal.’ | | | | |
| Gita: | <i>acchaa?</i> | <i>mal=ne</i> | <i>to nahil</i> | <i>khaayaa</i> | <i>hai.</i> |
| | well | I=ERG | PTCL NEG | eat.PFV | COP.PRST |
| | ‘Really? I haven’t.’ | | | | |

As we see in Gita’s answer in (1), *khaa liyaa* (eat + TAKE) cannot occur due to a semantic and pragmatic restriction with negation, and thus it is hard for non-native speakers to understand what exactly the V2 means, especially if the native language lacks a similar device to express such a manner-specification. In any event, this fact supports Jagannathan’s earlier claims. However, we often find counter-examples, like the one below, illustrating Liperovskii’s (ibid.) claims:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|
| (2) <i>tum=ne</i> | <i>pukaar</i> | <i>kyO</i> | <i>na</i> | <i>liyaa</i> | <i>beTaa?</i> |
| you=ERG | call.STEM | why | NEG | TAKE.PAST | son |
| ‘Why did not you call (me), (my dear) son?’ | | | | | |

These examples again often confuse non-native speakers of Hindi. Liperovskii has claimed that this kind of limitation occurs in utterances expressing apprehension, surprise, denial of a supposed possibility, rhetorical question, etc. To examine the type of circumstances under which V1+TAKE with negations really occurs in Hindi, I searched a web corpus using the criterion of co-occurrence of V2 TAKE with a negative marker: *nahil*, *na*, *mat*, checking for the same situation with two patterns (P1: NEG + V1 + TAKE) and (P2: V1 + NEG + TAKE). Since this yielded a great number of search results, only unmarked declarative sentences regarding assertion were targeted. Exclamatory results with ‘!’, interrogative results with ‘?’, results with an interrogative word and imperative sentences were excluded from the investigation, as were passive sentences and embedded noun phrases.

The overall results of this study suggest three main findings:

1. Sentences in the indicative mood are found both in P1 and P2. They constitute over half of the total results - nearly half of P1 and a third of P2 results; and similarly, declarative sentences in the indicative mood constitute half of P1 and a third of P2 results, again accounting for half of the total results (See Table 1 and 2).
2. In most of the indicative sentences, a particle such as *to*, *hii*, *bhii*, etc has shown up along with a negative marker. This means that the negative marker does not negate an affirmative proposition or verbal predicate in itself, but rather negates part of the proposition (i.e., a partial negation), as in ex. (3).

- | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| (3) <i>tum=ne</i> | <i>akele hii</i> | <i>sab kuch</i> | <i>nahil</i> | <i>kar</i> | <i>liyaa</i> | <i>hai.</i> |
| you=ERG | alone | PTCL all | NEG | do.STEM | TAKE.PFV | COP.PAST |
| ‘You have not done everything only by yourself (to get this crop).’ | | | | | | |

Here, adding the particle (PTCL) *hii* ‘only, just’ to *akele* topicalizes ‘by yourself, alone’, thus implying ‘All the crop is not yours.’;

3. The tendency towards the co-occurrence of *lenaa* with a negative marker and this combination’s behavior in the context of pragmatics is quite similar to that of *jaanaa* GO and *denaa* GIVE.

Tables

Table 1: P1. [NEG + V1 + TAKE]

(1) Type of Sentence	
Exclamatory	44
Interrogative	448
Declarative	1366
Imperative	191
Total	2049

(2) Mood	
Indicative	928
Subjunctive	926
Imperative (infinitive usage included)	195
Total	2049

(3) Declarative Sentences	
Indicative	592
Subjunctive	774
Total	1366

Table 2: P2. [V1 + NEG + TAKE]

(1) Type of Sentence	
Exclamatory	13
Interrogative	15
Declarative	281
Imperative	17
Total	326

(2) Mood	
Indicative	108
Subjunctive	199
Imperative (infinitive usage included)	19
Total	326

(3) Declarative Sentences	
Indicative	97
Subjunctive	184
Total	281

Source: Data compiled from the *Corpus of Spoken Hindi*

Main references

- Hook, P.E. (1974) *The Compound Verb in Hindi*. Michigan: University of Michigan, Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies.
- Jagannaathan, V. R. (1981) *Prayog aur prayog*. Dillii: Oxford University Pres.
- Kachru, Yamuna. (1980) *Aspects of Hindi Grammar*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Liperovskii, Vladimir P. (1984) *Glagol v iazyke khindi (Hindi language – Verb)*. Moscow : Institut vostokovedeniia (Akademiia nauk SSSR).
- Masica, Colin. P. (1976) *Defining a Linguistic Area: South Asia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (1991) *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGregor, R.S. (1995) *Outline of Hindi Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nishioka, Miki and Lago Language Institute (2016-2017). *Corpus of Spoken Hindi (COSH) and COSH Conc* [Software]. Available from <http://www.cosh.site>.
- Snell, Rupert and Weightman, Simon. (2010) *Complete Hindi: A Teach Yourself Guide*. Teach Yourself.
- Snell, Rupert, Kern, Florence and Paul, Bruno (eds.) (2014) *Get started in Hindi*. Teach Yourself.