

Markers of Definiteness in Indo-Aryan

Author(s): Indira Y. Junghare

Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1983), pp. 116-127

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Markers of Definiteness in Indo-Aryan
 Indira Y. Junghare
 University of Minnesota

Introduction

It is a known fact that Indo-Aryan languages do not have articles comparable to English article the and indefinite article a(an). Is the absence of overt markers in any way an indication of the absence of definiteness/indefiniteness? Definiteness is a semantic notion which is conveyed not only through morphological and syntactical markings but also through discourse mechanisms. Now that we can study the grammar beyond the sentence level, we find explanations for some linguistic phenomena that were previously unclear. Definiteness is such a phenomenon. This paper focuses on the linguistic means by which definiteness is expressed in Indo-Aryan. It deals with definiteness from two viewpoints: formal and functional. It seeks to state the distribution of definiteness and the functional conditions which govern its distribution.

The literature on definiteness in Indian languages is scarce. The recent paper by Masica (1980) is perhaps the only study that deals directly with the subject. The article compares the definiteness marking in South Asian languages including Dravidian and Munda and suggests its marking on direct objects as a feature for the areal typology of South Asian and Central Asian languages. His analysis includes more languages but is less unified.

Before turning to analysis let us clarify the concept of definiteness. How does it differ from indefiniteness semantically? It seems that the speaker, when using a definite noun phrase, issues a form of instruction to the hearer to "locate" or place the referent of the definite NP within one of a number of pragmatically defined sets of objects. He locates the referent in the sense that he understands that the object-referred to is a member of this set. Thus the primary function of definiteness is to identify a particular referent of the definite NP. Identity of the noun phrase may be established on the basis of (1) linguistic context; (2) spatio-temporal context of the speech act, i.e. non-linguistic; or (3) previous shared experience of speaker and addressee.

- (1) (Marathi) ekā gāvāt ek ũetkarī hotā. tyālā ek mulgī hotī
 one village-in one farmer was. to-him one girl was
 eke divũi ũetkaryāne mulilā ũetāt paũhville.
 one day farmer(agent) the daughter farm-in sent
- (Hindi) ek gāvmē ek kiũān thā. Uskī ek larķī thī.
 one village-in one farmer was his one daughter was
 ek din kiũāne larkī ko khet mē bhejā.
 one day farmer the daughter farm in sent
- (Bengali) æk grāme æk ũaũa chilo. tār ekũi meye chilo
 one village-in one farmer was his one daughter was
 æk din ũāũā meye ke khetē pāũhālo.
 one day farmer the daughter farm-in sent.
- "There was a farmer in a village. He had a daughter."
 One day the farmer sent the daughter to the farm."

- (2) (Marathi) sitāna kāl ek āmbā khāllā. āmbā cavdār hotā.
 (Hindi) sitāne kāl ek ām khāyā. ām svādiṣṭha thā.
 (Bengali) ṣitā kāl ækṭā ām khelo. āmṭā ṣuṣṣādu chilo.
 Sita yesterday one mango ate. mango tasty was.
 "Sita ate a mango yesterday. The mango was tasty."

Notice the second occurrence of farmer, daughter and mango in Hindi and Marathi. Though these noun phrases are without determiners they are definite. The hearer can identify these noun phrases because they have been referred to in earlier sentences. Bengali, however, uses ṭā (ṭi) to mark specificity as in amṭā and ækṭā.

- (3) (Marathi) āj tu devlāt jāṣil ?
 (Hindi) āj tu māndīr jāyegī?
 (Bengali) āj tumi māndīre jābe?
 today you temple go(fut.)?
 "Will you go to the temple today?"

The temple refers to the unique temple within the village that speaker and hearer are in or come from. The hearer can locate the referent using his knowledge about the situation, i.e. extralinguistic context.

- (4) (Marathi) sinemā caṅglā hotā?
 (Hindi) sinemā acchā thā?
 (Bengali) sinemāṭā bhālo chilo?
 the movie good was
 "Was the movie good?"

The appropriateness of the first mention of the definite noun sinemā depends basically on speaker and hearer sharing knowledge about its referent. The speaker knows that the hearer has seen a movie and assumes that the hearer can identify the movie he is referring to.

Thus interpretation of definite reference for the hearer consists in the task of identifying the correct set which the speaker intends and in locating the referent in it (Hawkins 1976). On the other hand, indefinite descriptions are pragmatically neutral with respect to the set of identification and referent location aspects of definiteness. In fact indefinite mention may function to mark a nonidentifiable referent. But its positive function is to establish a new "file" in the hearer's consciousness (Du Bois 1980:220). In the examples (1) and (2) the indefinite ek serves both to assure the hearer that he need not look elsewhere to identify the referents (as they are nonidentifiable) and to encourage him to establish new cognitive files for a particular village, for a particular farmer, for a particular girl and for a particular mango.

When the speaker assumes that the hearer knows the referent (when in fact he does not) and hence does not specify or somehow fails to provide the hearer with information necessary for establishing a new file, the ambiguity occurs. This specifically happens

Definiteness through morphological marking:

	<u>Direct object NP's without definite markers</u>	<u>Direct object NP's with definite markers</u>
(6)	(M.) mi āj <u>ku</u> trā vikat ghetlā. (H.) mainē āj <u>ku</u> ttā xaridā. (B.) āmi āj ekṭā kukur kinechi. I today one dog bought "I bought a dog today."	mi āj <u>ku</u> tryālā vikat ghetla. mainē āj <u>ku</u> tteko xaridā. āmi āj <u>ku</u> kurṭā kinechi. I today the dog bought "I bought the dog today."
(7)	(M.) mi āj dhobī pāhilā. (H.) mainē āj dhobī dekhā. (B.) āmi āj dhopā dekhechi. I today washerman saw "I saw a washerman today."	mi āj <u>dhob</u> yālā pāhila. mainē āj <u>dhob</u> īko dekhā. āmi āj <u>dhop</u> ākē dekhechi. I today the washerman saw "I saw the washerman today."
(8)	(M.) mi āj āj pustak vācla. (H.) mainē āj kitāb parī. (B.) āmī āj boi poṛechi. I today book read "I read { ^{*a} { ^{*the} } book today." (I did the act of reading.)	*mi āj <u>pustak</u> ālā vācla. ? mainē āj <u>kitāb</u> ko paṛā. āmi āj <u>boitā</u> poṛechi. I today the book read "I read the book today."

The underlined NP's in column (2) with the definite object marker are identifiable and therefore definite. However, there seems to be a constraint on the use of the marker. The inanimate object nouns in Hindi and Marathi do not use the marker and become nonspecific in their interpretation as in (8). The nonspecific object noun with its verb constitutes a unitary predicate concept, what may be called an object conflation (Du Bois, 259). The object nouns of this type are generally bound to verbs and form a complex idea which is essentially verbal (Masica 1980). Because of the compound verb formation this category of nouns is quite important in Indo-Aryan.

The rules regarding compound verb formation or object conflation seem to be language particular. There may occur differences in the usage of the marker. Some nouns with the marker may be more easily acceptable in one Indo-Aryan language than in another, as in example (8). On the other hand, animate and human nouns in most Indo-Aryan languages seem to use the marker regularly. In Bengali only human objects take ke. This is perhaps due to the fact that they are not often made part of object conflation or compound verbs. Humans are generally too independently salient to be conflated with a verb (Du Bois, 220). This can be seen in example (9).

- (9) (Marathi) ? mi dukāndar āṅlā.
(Hindi) ? mainē dukāndār lāyā.
(Bengali) ? āmi dokāndār enechi.
I shopkeeper brought
"I brought the shopkeeper here."

- (10) (Marathi) *mi sitā pāhīlī.
 (Hindi) *mainē sitā dekhī.
 (Bengali) *āmi ṣitā dekhechi.
 I Sita saw
 "I saw Sita."

In Bengali the sentence is all right if Sita is taken to refer to the Goddess, where the reference is to the concept of god.

Proper nouns as in (10), being always definite, use the marker obligatorily.

We have seen that the nouns in the second column are definite. That does not mean the nouns in the first column are indefinite. They seem to mark nonreferentiality rather than nonidentifiability, and they open up new files in the hearer's consciousness.

The use of the marker is obligatory for Indirect Objects. Between the Indirect Object and the Direct Object, the former has the first claim to the marker. Once the Indirect Object is marked, the Direct Object remains unmarked. The object-NP does not make reference to the definite or indefinite nouns. They rather become part of the predicate conflation.

- (11) (Marathi) mi dhobyālā sādī dilī.
 (Hindi) mainē dhobiko sārī di.
 (Bengali) āmi dhopāke sārī diechi.
 I the washerman sari gave
 "I gave {^{*a}
 *the} sari to the washerman."

Indirect objects are likely to be personal nouns and personal nouns as we have seen before demand overt marking.

Thus from the above examples and their discussion, it seems that the use of the marker is more dependent on semantic consideration of the nouns such as human, animate, inanimate, etc., rather than on the syntactic form of the noun phrase. In other words, the use of the marker is not incompatible with unidentified or indefinite noun phrases. See examples (12) and (13).

- (12) (Marathi) *tithā mi ekā pustakālā pāhila.
 (Hindi) *vahā mainē ek kitābko dekhā.
 (Bengali) *okhāne āmi ekṭā boiṭā dekhechi.
 there I one book saw
 "I saw a book there."
 (13) (Marathi) tithā mi ekā māṅsālā baghitla.
 (Hindi) vahā mainē ek ādmiko dekhā.
 (Bengali) okhāne āmi ekṭā lokke dekhechi.
 there I one man saw
 "I saw a man there."

In Bengali ke is a human object marker; and since tā is specificity marker, as mentioned earlier, ekṭā and lokṭā together are impossible.

In the absence of the marker, some Direct Object nouns (with appropriate verbs) have generic interpretation. This is consistent with the fact that both definite and generic nouns are identified. "A plural generic mention provides access to a concept in the interlocutor's mind which is representative of the whole class and since there is only one such concept, any mention which is understood as generic will be "identified" with this concept." (Du Bois, 225). Notice, the generic subject nouns are also without determiners, as in (15).

- (14) (Marathi) tu vāgh pahilās?
 (Hindi) tune bāgh dekhā?
 (Bengali) tumi bāgh dekhecho?
 you tiger saw
 "Have you seen a tiger?"
- (15) (Marathi) whel stanpayī prāṇi āhe.
 (Hindi) whel stanpāyī prāṇi hai.
 (Bengali) ṭimi stānopāyī prāṇi.
 whale mammal (is)
 "A whale is a mammal."

Unmarked preverbal NP's as in (16) are ambiguous between definite and indefinite. They are disambiguated by marking indefiniteness with *ek* as in (17), and definite with the demonstrative pronouns comparable to English 'that' or 'those', as in (18). Bengali, however, prefers to use the specificity marker tā.

- (16) (Marathi) mi santra khālla.
 (Hindi) mainē santrā khāyā.
 (Bengali) āmi lebu kheyechi.
 I orange ate
 "I have eaten an orange."
 "I ate the orange."
- (17) (Marathi) mi ek santra khālla.
 (Hindi) mainē ek santrā khāyā.
 (Bengali) āmi æktā lebu kheyechi.
 I one orange ate
 "I ate an orange."
- (18) (Marathi) mi te santra khālla.
 (Hindi) mainē vah santrā khāyā.
 (Bengali) āmi lebuṭā kheyechi.
 I the orange ate
 "I ate {that
 the} orange."

Definiteness through Syntactic Processes

Besides the morphological marking, some syntactic processes also convey Definiteness. In this paper I will discuss two such processes: 1. Relativization and 2. Topicalization.

Relativization

Indo-Aryan has both restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses. I will discuss only the restrictive relative clauses. The relative clause occurs in two dominant positions: (A) preceding the main clause and (B) following the main clause.

A. Relative clause precedes the main clause:

- (19) (Marathi) jo māṇus titha ubhā āhe to majhā bhāu āhe.
 (Hindi) jo ādmī vahā khaḍā hai vah merā bhāī hai.
 (Bengali) Je loktā okhāne dāriye āche še āmār bhāī.
 who man there standing is that/he my brother
 "The man who is standing there is my brother."

B. Relative Clause follows the main clause:

- (20) (Marathi) to māṇus majhā bhāu āhe jo titha ubhā āhe.
 (Hindi) vah ādmī merā bhāī hai. Jo vahā khaḍā hai.
 (Bengali) ?? oi loktā āmār bhāī Je okhāne dāriye āche.
 that man my brother who there standing is
 "That man is my brother who is standing there."

As seen in (20) the construction where the relative clause follows the main clause is unnatural in Bengali.

These restrictive relative clauses have quite a few variants depending on the application of the rules, Relativization, NP-deletion, Pronominalization, and also on the permutation of the elements in both the clauses, relative and main. The variants are not semantically equivalent and they fulfill different discourse functions depending on the presuppositions, linguistic context, and pragmatic considerations. Here I will discuss considerations only for the order of clauses. The function of the S-initial relative clauses is to establish the identity of the noun to which they refer. An individual or a thing is mentioned for the first time.

The absence of the NP in the relative clause but its presence in the main clause violates the function of the relative clause (21), which is to identify an NP. One has to introduce the noun in the first clause, then talk about it in the second clause.

- (21) (Marathi) ? jo titha ubhā āhe to māṇus majhā bhāu āhe.
 (Hindi) ? Jo vahā khaḍā hai vah ādmī merā bhāī hai.
 (Bengali) ? Je okhāne dāriye āche še loktā āmār bhāī
 who there standing is that man my brother
 "The one who is standing there (that man) is my brother."

The function of jo is not that of a relative pronoun. It simply marks a topic in a conversation (Junghare 1980). The speaker assumes that the hearer does not know about the standing man (the information in the first jo-clause) and, furthermore, does not know that he is the speaker's brother. Since the identity of the referent described by the S-initial relative clause is not presupposed, NP's in these clauses are [-definite] unless specifically marked.

The function of the Main-Rel. construction seems to be assertive. The relative clause asserts some attribute of an individual who is already identified. Notice the following sentence is questionable in the light of discourse.

- (22) (Marathi) ? to mājhā bhāu āhe jo māṅus titha ubhā āhe.
 (Hindi) ?? vah merā bhāi hai jo ādmī vahā khaṛā hai.
 (Bengali) * Se āmār bhāi je loktā okhāne dāṅiye āche.
 he my brother who man there standing is
 "He is my brother (the man) who is standing there."

In (22) the occurrence of the anaphoric pronouns (to, vah and se) in the sentence initial position implies that the discourse is quite advanced and the NP has been specified a long time before, hence it is redundant to introduce the antecedent nouns with the topic markers in the relative clause that occurs after the main clause, because the function of such a relative clause is to give more information about a specified noun. The Relative Clause construction in which a relative clause follows the main clause contains information which is presupposed. Notice for example (20) can answer the following two Marathi questions but (19) cannot.

- (23) to māṅus koṅ āhe ?
 that man who is
 "Who is that man?"
 (24) to māṅus koṅ āhe jo titha ubhā āhe?
 that man who is who there standing is
 "Who is that man who is standing there?"

Since the second type of Relative Clause construction in which the relative clause follows the main clause has presuppositions: (1) someone is there, and (2) someone is in the standing position, the construction is surely [+definite].

It seems that the relation between Relative Clause constructions and definiteness can be described in terms of a continuum, the Rel.-Main clause sequence being on the left, Main-Rel. sequence somewhere in the middle, and non-restrictive relative clauses on the right.

Correlative (jo--to)-----Restrictive (to--jo)-----Non-Rest.
 least definite → most definite

Definiteness through Topicalization and Word Order

The notion of dividing a sentence in two parts for the study of information structure is well known in linguistics. The topic refers to what the speaker is talking about in the structure, while comment refers to what the speaker has to say about the topic. This distinction of topic and comment is parallel to Clark's (1977) "Given" and "New" contract. Clark has pointed out that when speakers-hearers engage in talk, they abide by this contract, that is, the speaker is responsible for making syntactically as "Given" that information that he thinks the listener already knows, and makes as "New" that which he thinks the listener does not know. English with

its fixed word order uses syntactic devices such as definite articles, cleft constructions and anaphoric pronouns to mark given elements. Indefinite articles and pseudo cleft constructions mark the information that is new to the listener. Indo-Aryan languages use different devices such as topicalization of relative clauses and other elements at the sentence level as well as word-order variation to fulfill similar communicative purposes.

Topicalization is an important process in Indo-Aryan languages in which the topicalized element is brought into sentence initial position. The underlined noun phrases in (25) are indefinite. But when they are topicalized as in (26), they can have the definite interpretation.

- (25) (Marathi) bāget phula hotī.
 (Hindi) bagiḥemē phul the.
 (Bengali) bāgāne phul chilo.
 garden-in flowers were
 "There were flowers in the garden."
- (26) (Marathi) phula hoti bāget.
 (Hindi) phul the bagiḥeme.
 (Bengali) phul chilo bāgāne.
 flowers were garden-in
 "The flowers were in the garden."

But the NP in (27) seems to be problematic. It can be interpreted as definite as well as indefinite.

- (27) (Marathi) pakṣi uḍālā.
 (Hindi) pakṣī uḍā.
 (Bengali) pākhī ureche.
 bird flew
- {A }
 {The } bird flew."

This dual status of the NP is due to the fact that it can be subject as well as topic. As the subject of the sentence it can be indefinite but as the topic it must be an identified NP whose referent can be found in linguistic, situational or universal context of discourse. Initial NP's are not always topics. As non-topic subjects they can be definite or indefinite.

Masica (1980:6) mentions the following example (from Khanna 1971:29) as an exception of the topicalized NP that is not definite.

- (Hindi) ek bāt māī ne noṭ kī -- "One thing I noted"

The NP ek bāt is not really indefinite in the sense of 'any thing'. Rather it makes a reference to 'one particular thing.' Note the meaning of the NP in the non-topicalized construction. mainē ek bāt noṭ kī means "I noted one particular thing" rather than "I noted a thing." In the above sentence the NP is topicalized for emphasis. Object NP's that are overtly marked for indefiniteness occur in sentence initial position only for marking specificity. The meaning of ek 'a' changes to 'one' as in (28).

- (28) (Marathi) ek pustak wācla tyāna.
 (Hindi) ek kitāb paṭī usne.
 (Bengali) ekṭā boi poṛeche ṣe.
 one book read he
- "He read one book."

The statement in (28) answers the question: "How many books did he read?"

Definiteness and Word Order Variation

Indo-Aryan languages are identified as SOV type since their favored unmarked order is SOV. Many SOV languages such as Dravidian have what appears to be a rather free word order. There is greater freedom in the positioning of elements and the order in which they are placed. In these languages, where there is a great deal of word order variation, word order is not strictly required to serve a grammatical function. That is to say a change in the order of nominal constituents does not signal a change in the relationship between the predicate and its arguments. In these languages, the word order rather serves a pragmatic function and the word-order variation is used for communicative purposes and discourse strategies. Appropriate mention of the noun phrases on the part of the speaker and the correct identification of those NP's on the part of the hearer is necessary for the discourse continuity. The word order variation may provide such a clue to the identification of NP's. Let us examine the six possible variants of SOV in which the object is not specified for its definiteness.

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| (a) mi santra khālla. | [what did you eat?] |
| (b) mi khālla santra. | [who ate the orange?] |
| (c) santra mi khālla. | [who ate the orange?] |
| (d) santra khālla mi. | [who ate the orange?] |
| (e) khālla mi santra. | |
| (f) khālla santra mi. | |

"I ate $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{an} \\ \text{the} \end{array} \right\}$ orange."

It seems that the focus falls on the preverbal element. The noun unspecified for definiteness occurs only in preverbal position. In any other position it is definite. Let us examine the sentence with four constituents.

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| (a) mi rāmlā pustak dila. | (g) pustak mi rāmlā dila. |
| (b) mi pustak rāmlā dila. | (h) pustak rāmlā mi dila. |
| (c) mi dila rāmlā pustak. | (i) pustak dila mi rāmlā. |
| (d) rāmlā mi pustak dila. | (j) dila mi rāmlā pustak. |
| (e) rāmlā mi dila pustak. | (k) dila rāmlā mi pustak. |
| (f) rāmlā pustak mi dila. | (l) dila pustak mi rāmlā. |

"I gave $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{a} \\ \text{the} \end{array} \right\}$ book to Ram."

All the variants except one (a) have presuppositions. The variants with presuppositions are definite constructions. Therefore the nouns in these variants though unmarked, are definite. The exception is the unmarked or normal word order of the form: Subj.-Ind.Obj.-Dir.Obj.-Verb, as in (a). A sentence with this order of elements does not have any presuppositions. It is this order which is normally used to begin a discourse. And during the initial stage of a discourse, if the noun is not marked for indefiniteness, it can be interpreted as definite or indefinite.

The non-marked noun in preverbal position, because of its conflatory nature with the verb, can be interpreted as part of the compound verb. In other positions there can be no possibility of the noun conflating with other elements, subject, indirect object, or adverbs. Therefore the unmarked nouns in other positions are interpreted as definite whose referents are known to the addressee.

Summary and Conclusion

On the basis of the comparative study of these three languages, the following general comments can be made. In Indo-Aryan languages Definiteness seems to be an unmarked category and Indefiniteness seems to be a marked one. All singular nouns not overtly marked as Indefinite are interpreted as Definite, except in preverbal position where they may be Indefinite because of compounding. The unmarked nature of Definiteness is perhaps a universal phenomenon. Definiteness is an unmarked category in English, as has been suggested by Du Bois (1980:254). From a discourse point of view, it seems reasonable that a speaker would not repeat the referent if the hearer can identify it easily.

Indo-Aryan languages seem to mark definite objects obligatorily if they are animate. On the other hand, the marking of definite inanimate objects is not so strict and the inanimate object nouns are therefore subject to various interpretations: Generic (Indefinite) Specific (Unidentified or Indefinite), Definite or Non-specific (not making reference to any object, but just a part of compound verb category). For clarity, these nouns have to be specifically marked as Indefinite (with ek-) or Definite (with the proper demonstrative).

In terms of the marking of definite objects, these languages seem to take three positions. Bengali seems to mark definiteness much more than Hindi and Marathi. Its use of the marker tā, (ti) is almost like the English article 'the'. Marathi seems to be the most relaxed one, marking definiteness least. Hindi stands somewhere in between. With regards to Topicalization of relative clauses and of other elements within a sentence, Marathi makes more use of the topicalization process than Hindi and Bengali. Bengali seems to be strict and does not allow these processes as freely as Marathi. Hindi again falls in between. Similarly, Marathi allows more word order variation than both Hindi and Bengali. The relationship between definiteness, topicalization, and word order variation in Indo-Aryan languages suggests the following generalization.

The more topicalization and word order variation a language allows, the less restricted its marking of definiteness.

If a language can use already available devices (such as topicalization and word order variation) for marking definiteness, there is no need for that language to invent new ones (such as markers or articles). On the marking scale of definiteness, Marathi stands at the low end, Bengali at the upper end (marking the definite status most) and Hindi near the middle.

This study raises several questions which are worth pursuing. Does the strict marking of Definiteness in Bengali and not so strict marking in Marathi represent two different stages in the development of Indo-Aryan? Does Marathi represent an earlier stage and Bengali the advanced one? We know that Sanskrit allows a great deal of word

order variation and seems to be relaxed in its marking of definiteness, i.e. does not use particles or articles for marking definiteness. Or is it the case that relaxed marking of definiteness in Marathi is due to the areal influence of Dravidian? And if it is the case, how is the Definiteness marked in Dravidian? Do Dravidian languages use markers or do they use other devices? Does Indo-Aryan as a whole, the Eastern branch of Indo-European, represent an earlier stage and the Western Indo-European languages (English, French, etc.) the advanced stage in the development of Definite marking in Indo-European? Homeric Greek did not have definite articles, as has been mentioned by Hawkins (1976).

There are many other stones left unturned in this study. We know that the genericness or specificity of a noun is related to the kind of verb it occurs with, and furthermore on the tense and aspect of the verb (Chafe 1970) (ex.: hattyālā šengdāne āvaḍtāt vs. hattyālā šengdāne āvaḍle or hattyāna mājhī gāḍi toḍli). Therefore the study of Definite marking requires a detailed examination of the verbs, tenses and aspect and their relationship with nouns. Also, an extensive study of noun status in discourse of all the Indo-Aryan languages is needed before we can come up with solid generalizations.¹

1. I am grateful to Jeanette Gundel for her comments and suggestions on the earlier version of this paper. Thanks are due to Soumya Chakrabarty for providing me with the Bengali data.

REFERENCES

- Chafe, Wallace L. 1970. Meaning and the Structure of Language. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Clark, Herbert H. and Susan Haviland. 1977. "Comprehension and the Given-New Contract." In Discourse Production and Comprehension, ed. Roy O. Freedle. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.
- Du Bois, John W. 1980. "Beyond Definiteness: The Trace of Identity in Discourse." In The Pear Stories, Vol. III in the Series Advances in Discourse Processes, ed. Wallace L. Chafe. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Hawkins, John. 1976. "On Explaining Some Ungrammatical Sequences of Article and Modifier in English." In Papers from the Twelfth Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago.
- Junghare, Indira. 1980. "Relative Clauses in Indo-Aryan." paper presented at the 6th Annual Minnesota Regional Conference on Linguistics. Minneapolis.
- Khanna, Navin. 1971. "Ji, āp kyā bannā cāhte hai?" Sāptāhik Hindustān. 26 March 1971.
- Masica, Colin P. 1980. "Definiteness-Marking in South Asian Languages." unpublished paper.