ABSTRACT: This elaborates Dey's (1979) proposals for writing an N-specification rule for Bengali by bringing in more data to show that his analysis runs into serious problems, and that one has to formulate a g-deletion rule to take care of the counterexamples. It is also shown that there are stronger arguments in support of blurring the distinction between Lexical Redundancy Rules and Phonological Rules in Bengali than Dey had thought of. A detailed discussion of two redundancy rules (g-specification and # cc-simplification) and seven phonological rules (De-gliding, Metathesis, g-deletion, y/w-assimilation, Stress-displacement-cum-vowel-deletion and others) is undertaken to show that LR rules in Bengali must be crucially ordered with respect to P rules. Finally, the arguments in favour of doing away with the intermediate level of Phonological Representation are presented, and the resultant Revised Generative Phonological model is compared with Generative Semanticists' simplification of the grammatical component.

The problem in Bengali phonology dealt in Dey (1979) is of interest to generative phonologists in general and to phonologists working on Bengali in particular because if one could show that both his data and analysis were adequate (and correct), it would have far-reaching consequences for the theory and organization of generative phonology. In what follows, I would elaborate his proposal bringing in more data from Bengali as well as a few more phonological rules of this language to show that Dey's (1979: 25, 28, 31) analysis of N-Specification and related problems is at best partially correct, that a large amount of data escaped his notice, and that there are stronger arguments for blurring the distinction between Lexical Redundancy Rules (henceforth, LR rules) and Phonological Rules (henceforth, P rules) in Bengali than Dey (1979) had thought of. However, before we go into a detailed discussion of these problems, it may be mentioned here Dey has more or less messed up the transcription of Standard Colloquial Bengali words (probably because of his mother-dialect influence) by putting O and o in wrong places in most of the cases, In about 20 words1, he used O for o, and at least in one case2 he selected o for what should have been O There are other minor mistakes in transcriptions too which we shall not go into detail here because these do not affect the rules we shall be discussing in the following paragraphs.

1. First, we shall look into some sets of words that for some reason or the other do not conform to N-specification rule as formulated by Dey (1979). Notice that all the three versions of hid rule allow N-specification to operate within and across morpheme boundaries. While his (17) which operates on [+nasal, -anterior] can capture the fact that Bengali does have mᶾ or nᶾ combinations where the post-nasal consonant are not homorganic, it cannot explain why in certain cases: a velar nasal plus a consonant may also behave in the same way. Thus, while Dey’s rule (17), and not (7) or (14), can explain the N+ᶾC combinations in ia, none of these versions would take care of the construction in I, as follows:
1. amta falter in speech
   mammog ghost
   chimni chimney
   nimno low
   manke a proper name
   phinki in a spout
   dance camca spoon,
   accomplice ROmjan a
   muslim festival cumki
   spangle khanki a vile
2. There are a number of formative
   affixes that do not serve as ideal
   environments for an N-specification
   rule. Some of these suffixes are
   uncommon and they include: - lano,
   -š e, -ca (~ -ci~-ce), - a (~ ai), - ta,
   - ti, and - ti. But some others such
   as determiners - ta~ - te~ - to~
   , or the verbal suffixes such as –
   be and che are very frequent. All of
   them tend to block N-specification.
   Here again, some combinations
   could be taken care of by the initial
   nasal segment for the feature [-
   anterior] but there are some words
   that could not be explained in this
   way as the combinations in (2)b
   would show:
   3. To this list we may also add
      those words that end in-n. To
      explain these, one has to have a
      rule that would specify a [ + nasal ]
      segment as [ +consonantal, +back ]
      before a word boundary in certain
      cases. Such a rule would be
      applicable only in the following
      lexical items, and not on any –
      environment because in that case it
      would generate a large number of
      absurd and unacceptable forms.
      Thus, it seems that Dey’s rule
      needs to be modified to generate
      the following forms:
   4 The onomatopoetic words and
      similar constructions in Bengali
      seem to violate N-specification rule.
      While the words in 4a below could
      be explained by Dey’s rule 17,
      those in 4b apparently violate this
      rule and its conditions:
gun-gun humming  
phin-phin very fine  
min-mine mischievous  
chim-cham neat and clean  
rOm-rOma affluent  
dOm-dOm a place name  
ṭिम-ṭिम tailor-bird  
ṭुन-ṭुनi tailor-bird  
ghin-ghine fretful  
chin-bhīn torn asunder  
chon-mOne fresh  

b.  
ṭिन-ṭīne lean and thin  
dhOṇ-dhān pretend  
ḥin-ṭīn" asafoetida and other things  
dnC-dn (room around) uselessly  

5. There are a number of words that originated from some kind of compounding at one stage, and now look like single units which could create problems for Dey’s analysis. These are as follows:  
5.  
raṇ-cka lead wort  
cCṇ-dola be lifted by arms and legs  
nOṇ-ramo dirt, filth  
raṇ-ṭhāl soft solder  
aroṇ-dholājār good beating  
gan-dāra at right angles  

6. There seems to be only one way to get rid of the problematic η + C forms, and that would be to assume a – g- in between η and C. This would mean that the words in 1b, 2b, 3, 4b and 5 would all have underlying a NgC-combination. In that case, Dey’s rule 17 would rightly predict that the archisegment η in these cases be rewritten as η as it occurs before a velar stop-g. That would also require that another rule would delete this –g-. One cannot, however delete –g- from all Ng combinations because Ng followed by a vowel is always retained*, and with certain words (and in some dialects, with all the words) both η gC and ηC combinations exit optionally. One can, therefore, write a g- deletion rule tentatively in the following way:  

This rule would say that g is to be deleted i. in between a nasal and a word or a morpheme boundary, and ii. When it is precede by a nasal and followed by another consonant. There are certain words, however, where a NgC combination is never simplified (not even optionally), and at this stage we do not know what to do with them. These include the following:  

7. There are also a few lexical items with η ≠ which differ considerably from the η-ending words in 3 in that the history of Bengali language would show that in the former instance the words ended in –m at one stage, whereas the latter did have a-g after the nasal segment η Consider the following words which were once –m ending:  

8. Dey (1979) has already shown that to explain certain alternations, one has to order a de-gliding rule (one that changes w- to b-word-initially) both before and after an η spec-ification rule. We have seen in the above discussion that to explain a large number of
words, one must have a $g$-deletion rule in Bengali which would in all instances follow an N-specification rule. Therefore, one must order these three rules in two different ways:

9a. i. De-gliding rule  
   ii. N-specification rule  
   iii. $g$-deletion rule  

b. i. N-specification rule  
   ii. De-gliding rule  
   iii. $g$-deletion rule

It may be noted here that the ordering between ii and iii in 9b is not crucial. Now, if N-specification is an LR rule, the ordering of rules in 9a clearly shows that in Bengali, this LR rule must be preceded by a P rule and followed by another P rule. This seems to be a good argument to show that there really is no justifiable distinction between LR and P rules. But we have already seen that we need a $g$-deletion rule to save Dey’s N-specification rule, and that the exact nature of the former rule is not known at this stage as it seems to have a number of counter-examples. Therefore, we have to look into other LR and P rules of Bengali to find out whether there could be a stronger argument in favour of blurring the distinction between LR and P rules. Moreover, N-specification is a rule that does not satisfy the definitions of LR rules as given in Chomsky and Halle (1968:171), and Dey (1979:31-2) himself admits it. It would, therefore, be interesting to find out whether there is a rule in Bengali that would meet the criteria of Chomsky and Halle (1968) for an LR rule, and yet be crucially ordered with respect to some P rules.

9. In this and the following paragraphs, we shall look into a few P rules of Bengali which would contribute substantially to the debate on rule ordering in Bengali phonology in particular, and to the organization of the phonological component of generative grammar in general. First, let us consider the following set of words which apparently look like instances that forced Dey to change his N-specification rule twice (cf. his rules 7, 14 and 17):

10 thOmkanO flaunt  
bilomjo born of a lowly father  
jemni as soon as  
gunkari profitable  
mOholanobiś a title  
ronjit valiant in war  
khamkha unnecessarily  
šOmhano explain  
bhomra honey-bee  
šemlima verdure  
menka Goddess Durga’s mother  
genban knowledgeable  
banprostho taking monkhood

If we look into the alternate forms of these words it becomes clear that these NC combinations result from a rule which deletes in between $N$ and $G$ probably under some kind of stress-displacement. The lexical items in 10 alternate with the following forms:

11 thOmok flauntng  
bilomOj born of a lowly father  
jemoni as soon as  
gunokari profitable  
mOholanobiś a title  
rOnojit valiant in war  
khamokha unnecessarily  
šOmojh understanding  
bhromor honey-bee  
šemol green  
mnoka Goddess Durga’s mother  
genoban knowledgeable  
banprostho taking monkhood

If we compare 11 with 10, it is evident that deletion of $o/O$ gives rise to peculiar $N + C$ combinations. To keep these distinct from the lexical items where $N$-specification rule applies, it is necessary to order such a rule of displacement (which results in vowel after $N$-specification has taken place. Notice that we prefer such an ordering in spite of the fact that these forms can be taken care of by
Dey’s rule 17 since it would rule out basic $nC$ combinations from under the pur-view of $N$-specification because in that case we have to take the forms in 10 as basic, and the forms in 11 as derived from these basic or underlying forms by an o/O-vowel addition rule. Such a vowel addition rule would be completely ad hoc because one cannot explain as to why certain $mC$ or $nC$ combinations have to be interspersed with a particular vowel while others are not. Moreover, when one can explain a set of words with the help of vowel deletion rule, an alternative proposal with a vowel-addition rule looks more suspicious. We have, therefore, no alternative to an ordering of rules such as follows:

10. Bengali also has a fairly general rule of metathesis which change $hN$ combinations into $Nh$. This rule generates the surface $Nh$ combinations such as follows:

12.  
- i. N-specification
- ii. Stress displacement-cum-vowel deletion

If one includes such a metathesis rule in the phonological component of modern Bengali grammar, it should ideally follow $N$-specification rule, because Bengali has not a $nh$ or $mh$ combination which is not a result of metathesis. However, this also means that if one overlooks the history of Bengali language ( it is a different matter whether it is “ethical” for a generative phonologist describing a particular language to do so ), one need not have a metathesis rule in the grammar of Modern Bengali, because these words pose no problem to $N$-specification rule as proposed by Dey.

II. Bengali, has a rule which assimilates $y$ or $w$ with a preceding consonantal segment completely. This rule could be applied only if the preceding segment is fully specified. This rule would take care of the following derivations:

14. a. / onyo / $\longrightarrow$ onno other
   / Onyas / $\longrightarrow$ Onnae\footnote{unjust}
   / sunyo/ $\longrightarrow$ šunno zero
   / OnwOe $\longrightarrow$ OnnOe
   / kOnwo / $\longrightarrow$ kOnno a proper name
b. / Obsyo / $\longrightarrow$ Obosšo
   / besya / $\longrightarrow$ bešša
   / hasyo / $\longrightarrow$ haššo
   / laughth

One may argue here that since all $Cy$ or $Cw$ combinations change to $CC$ invariably why one posit them in the underlying forms at all ? In this case, there seems to be a sound reason for doing so. In more than one dialect of Bengali, these words have the following surface forms:

15. oinno, Oinn, šuinn, oboiššo, beišša, haišša, etc\footnote{2}. In all such cases, the features of semi-vowel $y$ are being copied by a vocalic segment which is introduced by a rule before a $Oy$ combination in these dialects. To write this vowel copying rule, the underlying forms must show these semivowels. For a generative phonologist writing a grammar of dialect differences in Bengali, therefore, such underlying forms as above are inescapable. If this is true, then the $y / w$ - assimilation rule\footnote{3} in Bengali must be ordered after the feature-specificatory rules are applied.

12.0. A very common feature-specification rule of Bengali is $S$-specification which specifies as to where the archisegment /S/ is to become palatal S, and where it would be realised as a dental s. The general conditions are that /S/ would be specified as s i. when it occurs word-initially or morpheme-initially before a { + consonantal }, and ii. when it is followed by a word-medial $t$ or $th$.\footnote{4} In all other places, it is realized as š.\footnote{5} Such a specification rule would predict that the
sibilants in 16a must be palatal while those in 16b have to be dental:

16  

a. šagor sea  
    aša hope  
    bataš air  
    obhipš desire  
    IOškor people  
    aš-len came (3p hon)

b. skOndho shoulder  
    skhOlon fall  
    stOn breast  
    shan place  
    snan bath  
    spOndon throbbing  
    srObon hearing  
    sranb the rains  
    sleš irony, jest  
    slagha eulogy  
    mOsto huge  
    bOsta sack  
    astha faith

If we now look back at 14b, we may come up with two different analyses as to how Sy and Sw become šš in Oboššo, beššoa, and haššo. The first alternative could be to order S-specification and /w/-assimilation rule in this order. This order apparently seems to block sy or sw from becoming *ss in these words. In a different analysis, such an ordering of rules would be unnecessary because one might argue that the assimilation rule would generate forms like OboSSo, beSSa and haSSo which could later be specified as palatal sibilants since they occurred word-medially. If this analysis is correct, then it would claim that a \textit{P} rule (y/w-assimilation) should be applied before an \textit{LR} rule (Chomsky and Halle, 1968:171). S-specification does nothing more than filling in some unspecified squares of phonological matrices for the sibilant sounds in Bengali. Notice that this rule neither changes the feature-values nor does it apply across the formative boundaries. Now coming back to the question of ordering between assimilation and S specification, the second analysis may seem to be superior to the first, but in actually it fails to predict the following forms:

16  

c. /SyOndon/ \rightarrow šOndon  
    oozing  
    /_SYalok/ \rightarrow štolok  
    brother-in-law (-wife’s brother)  
    /Syam/ \rightarrow šem Krishna,  
    dark  
    /SwO/ \rightarrow šO own  
    /SwadhinOta/ \rightarrow šadhinOta  
    independence

If the assimilation rule applies first on these forms, it would change y and w to S, thereby bringing it under the purview of S-specification because the word-initial # S is then followed by a [ + consonantal ]. Then, a rule that does not allow a combination such as # sS would delete the second occurrence of the sibilant thereby generating forms such as *sOndon, *sO and so on and so forth. To make these forms grammatical, one has to formulate an additional feature-switching (\textit{P} rule) rule which would change the word-initial s into š. Thus under this analysis, one has to have the following rules applied in this order:

17  

i. y/w-assimilation rule  
ii. S-specification  
iii. Word-initial sS-simplification  
iv. s \rightarrow š

As is evident, this analysis has several short comings. For instance, a \textit{P} rule such as s \rightarrow š is a completely adhoc rule because it repeats what the \textit{LR} rule of S-specification says (viz., # SV should be # $V$). Secondly, this rule is needed only if one wants to maintain that y/w-assimilation should be ordered before S-specification. Moreover, a rule that simplifies # sS-combination only is superfluous, because Bengali already has a general well-formedness condition that does not tolerate two identical consonants in the word-initial position. The
rule in iii would thus partly repeat what this condition would otherwise say. One cannot apply this condition on # ssS, because they are not identical so far as feature-specification is concerned. Thus, if one had followed the previous analysis whereby specification rule applied in this order that would explain 16c more naturally:

17. i. s-specification
   ii. y/w-assimilation rule
   iii. # CC-simplification ( , where CC are identical )

12.1. The fact that 17’ and not 17, is the correct of rules may suggest that in Bengali LR rules apply before P rules. But notwithstanding the correctness of 17 a second look at 16 a, b, and c would show that such a conclusion. There are several reasons for this, and they are as follows: First, the # CC-specification condition is also an LR rule but it has to be ordered after a p rule such as y/w-assimilation. Thus, 17’ only shows that two LR rules must be interspersed in Bengali by a P rule. This order is required to generate the forms in 16c correctly and most economically. Secondly, so far we have overlooked the fact that the forms in 16c involve another rule which would change a to ε when it is preceded by Cy-. Now, this P rule ( a ε ) must apply before its condition is destroyed. Since y/w-assimilation rule destroys its condition, a ε be ordered before the assimilatory other words, 17’ has to be revised in the following manner:

17. i. S-specification
   ii. a ε
   iii. y / w-assimilation rule
   iv. # CC-simplification

Thirdly, although Dey (1979:25, 28 ) twice interpreted the first part of his N-specification rule ( N → η ) to involve s ( apart from taking y, w, h, r, and l ) and not s and š both, his formulation had the feature (+ continuant ) which leaves it vague whether the sibilant in N-S combination is palatal or dental or un-specified. Now, to generate N → η in the environment of (+) S (among other sounds) one may order the two specification rules in either of the following way:

18 a. i. N-specification
   ii. S-specification
   b. i. S-specification
   ii. N-specification

If N-specification rule is not accepted as an LR rule because it switches feature values and applies across formative boundaries (Dey, 1979:31 ) and if one wants to maintain that LR rules must be applied before P rules, 18b would be identified as the "ideal" order of rules. We would very soon find out that even if one accepts 18b as the order, one cannot save the classical generative phonological distinction between LR and P rules.

13. We have so far discussed two rules that involve semi-vowels y and w. These include assimilation and de-gliding rules. In the first, y and w are assimilated to the preceding consonant, and the second rule generates j and b from y and w, respectively. Although Dey (1979:27 ) described y → j and w → b as "similar phenomena occurring under similar conditions in Bengali", he argued against combining them to take care of the fact that N( + )b combinations in Bengali are realized as both m( + )b and n( + )b in those words where b itself originated from w. If Dey’s assertions regarding the similarity of two de-gliding rules is correct, y → j could be written in the following way:
This rule would generate forms such as \(O\)j\(om\) "self-restraint" and \(O\)nj\(og\) "joining" from /SON-yom/ and /SON-yog/, respectively. But then, this rule would apply on 20 a to generate ungrammatical forms such as 20 b. The correct forms are given in 20 c that follows:

\[
20 \text{ a. } /\text{kam+yo/} \quad \text{b. } *\text{kam+jo} \\
/\text{Sam+yo/} \quad *\text{sam+jo} \\
/\text{haS+yo/} \quad *\text{has+ jo} \\
/\text{bi+yog/} \quad *\text{bi+jog} \\
/\text{pro+yaS/} \quad *\text{pro+jaš} \\
\text{c. } \text{kam+mo desirable} \\
\text{šam+mo equality} \\
\text{haš+šo laughter} \\
\text{bi + yog substraction} \\
\text{pro+yaš effort}
\]

The ungrammatical forms in 20 b show that i. + y undergoes assimilation rule rather than de-gliding rule in the first three words, and that ii + y does not change if it is in an inter-vocalic position. However, there are forms such as kar + jo " work " and dhoir + jo " patience " (instead of *karro and *dhoirro) where the same suffix + yo has been used. And, forms such as upo+ jog "utility" (rather than *upo+ yog) violate the second condition. These create a tricky problem of rule ordering between y \(\rightarrow\) j and y/w-assimilation rule in Bengali which would not be dealt with here. For the time being, we can arbitrarily take it for granted that the former applies before the latter.

14. In the previous sections, the following rules of Bengali phonology were discussed in detail:

\[
21 \text{ a. LR rules (proven) :} \\
\text{s-specification, } # \text{-simplification} \\
\text{b. LR rules (doubtful) :} \quad \text{N}\text{-specification} \\
\text{c. P rules: De-gliding rule I (w \(\rightarrow\) b). De-gliding rule II (y \(\rightarrow\) j), metathesis rule,} \\
\text{g-deletion rule, stress} \\
\text{displacement-cum-vowel} \\
\text{deletion rule, a } \text{lxz} \\
\text{assimilation rule.}
\]

Although the exact formulation of these rules was not undertaken in the paragraphs, a close look at the ordering of rules noted 9, 12, 17" and 18 b and subsequent discussions would suggest that these rules are partially ordered in Bengali phonology. If we forget some of the minor problems of rule ordering noted earlier, the rules in 21 seem to follow the following order:

\[
22 \text{ a. i. S-specification} \\
\text{ii. } j \quad \text{b. } \text{ii. N\text{-specification}} \\
\text{iv. } g\text{-deletion} \\
\text{v. Metathesis (hN \(\rightarrow\) Nh)} \\
\text{vi. Stress- displacement-cum-vowel-deletion} \\
\text{vii. } a \quad \text{e} \\
\text{viii. } y \quad \text{j} \\
\text{xi. y/w-assimilation} \\
\text{x. } \text{lxz}\text{-simplification}
\]

There are obviously some small unresolved problems regarding the order of a few rules but these do not go against the thesis paper. For instance, if 18 a is taken as the ideal order as against 18b, \(S\) and \(N\)-Specifications have to interchange their place in 22. Similarly, at this stage of research, it is known whether the rule viii should be ordered before or after ix. But notice one thing that the ordering between rules iv to vii is not crucial, And, 22 a and b are kept separate to generate mb and \(\eta\) b from Nw-combinations.

15. It must have been evident from the above discussion that if 22 is the ordering of phonological rules in Bengali, and also if the rule of \(N\)-specification is an LR rule as \(S\)-specification and # \text{cc-simplifica}
then this clearly goes against the classical generative phonological claims that i. all \( R \) rules fore the first \( P \) rule applies, and that ii. therefore, the levels of representation in the organization of generative phonology would show three stages: Lexical Representation, Phonological Representation and Phonetic Representation. This is because 22 a would point out that three \( R \) rules in Bengali, \( i \), \( iii \) and \( x \), are interspersed by various \( P \) rules. The point remains even if one describes \( N \)-specification as a \( P \) rule. These observations lead one to either of the following premises:

23 a. LR rules and \( P \) rules may be crucially ordered with respect to each other in particular languages
b. There is no distinction between LR rules and \( P \) rules (and hence in this case, \( i \) to \( x \) in 22 are all instances of \( P \) rules)

It does not matter which of these premises one reaches to, it leads one to an inevitable conclusion such as follows:

24 The intermediate level of phonological representation is superfluous in the theory of generative phonology.

Finally, I may add here that I consider Dey’s (1979:32) Revised GP model as a natural corollary to the Generative Semanticists’ modification of levels of representation in the syntactic-semantic component of grammar. The following diagrams would show the striking parallels between the two simplification processes:

25 a. STANDARD TG GRAMMAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Component</th>
<th>Phonological Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic representations</td>
<td>Lexical representations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projection Rules</td>
<td>Lexical Redundancy Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base ( \rightarrow ) Deep structure Rules</td>
<td>Phonological representations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Rules</td>
<td>Phonological Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface structure</td>
<td>Phonetic representations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. REVISED TG GRAMMAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Component</th>
<th>Phonological Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic representations</td>
<td>Lexical representations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Rules</td>
<td>Phonological Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface structure</td>
<td>Phonetic representations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. To conclude, it has been shown in this work on Bengali phonology that i. Dey's rule of N-specification has to be modified to account for a large number of data that escaped his notice, ii. that the N-specification rule in Bengali has to be ordered crucially with respect to g-deletion rule, iii. Stress-displacement-cum-vowel-deletion rule, Metathesis rule and /w/-assimilation rule have to be ordered after N-specification, iv. that S-specification and #cc-simplification-two LR rules must be intervened by two P rules such as a and /w/-assimilation rule, v. that the ordering between a de-gliding rule changing j to y and /w/-assimilation rule remains an unresolved problem, vi. that certain LR rules in Bengali must be ordered crucially with regards to some P rules in such a way that the former have to be interspersed by the latter, and that it is a better argument for blurring the distinctions between LR rules and P Rules than what Dey (1979) had given, and vii. that there is a striking parallel between the Revised GP model of Dey (1979:32) and the attempts of Generative Semanticists to simplify the grammatical component.

NOTES

*I am grateful to Pradip Dey for giving a detailed comment on an earlier version of this work. Thanks are due to Professor R. N. Srivastava, S. K. Bandyopadhyay and R. C. Garg for their patience in listening to my ideas, and for encouraging me to write this paper.

The following corrections of Dey’s (1979) faulty transactions may be noted (; I have not given his transcriptions here):

bhaṣapakoṣa, bekOron ~ bckoron,
śOyOnbOr ~ śOyombOr,
śOnbOron ~ śOmbbOron, śOṇbolito ~ śOmbolito, (all appear
on p. 24), śOnjlOgno ~ śOṃunker-khon,
tamro, śOnjom (on p. 27), amol, Oboš,
camoc, śOmpromti (on p. 28), śOmpromdae,
śOmbranto, Ontro and Ostro (on p. 29)

2 This happens in case of Omlan which he transcribes as omlan (on p. 27).

3 In this instance, +mn- combination occurs in a loanword.

4 śanki is found mainly in the slang and underworld Bengali, and is borrowed from Hindi sankkii.

5 ghunni has an alternate in ghugni which is more commonly found.

6 It seems to be borrowed from Hindi mang-na with of course, a slight change, a slight change in meaning.

7 The ungrammatical forms could be blocked if we assume that the nasal in (3) come from an N which is [+ nasal, -anterior]. Dey (in a personal communication) has suggested that these examples would dictate him to revise his N-specification rule in such a way that the condition for N being rewritten as a velar nasal also has an environment : -[-], apart from including a segment such as : [+ continuant]. However even this revision has problem because it is not able to capture the fact that optionally in the standard dialect, and quite often in other regional dialects a g does show up after the velar nasal and before the word boundary. It also show up when a vocalice case- or emphatic-suffix is added to – , e.g., dhOng-e “in pretence”; lOng-i “the act of placing one’s leg before someone else’s”. These compel me to think that one should introduce a g-deletion rule rather than trying to revive the N-specification rule.

8 aro alternates with arot in Bengali.

9 hin-ṭ is also appears in a common rhyme where it denotes a particular incantation.

10 While writing the underlying forms in (14), we have ignored the fact that in a number of cases an underlying O should change to o by some kind of stress-placement-cum-vowel-harmony rule.

11 It alternates with Omnca.

12 In certain dialects, ś becomes x, but even in these dialects the vowel copying does occur.
13 \( y/w \)-assimilation rule could tentatively be written in the following way:

\[
\text{If: } W \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\alpha & \text{F} \\
C & \text{vocalic} \\
\text{cons} & \text{} \\
- & X \\
\end{cases} \\
\]

Then:

14 In certain borrowed words such as *muslim, islam* and *Ophisar* ("Officer") the dental *s* is retained even word-medially.

15 Notice that inspite of a *S-t* Combination, *aS-"come (inf)"
before \(-ten\) habitual past + 3p hon" is realized as *aš-ten"he used to come" in careful speech. In a rapid and casual speech, one does come across *as-ten* at times.

16 There are certain across exception which are negligible for instance, \( S \) is realized as *s* word-initially even before \(-m\) (e.g., *smarto* "proficient in argumentation"), but in certain cases \( \# smV-\) sequence gives rise to nasalization thereby making it \( \# šV-, \) e.g., *smOron~šŌron*. However, *s* does not change to *š* if followed by another constant, i.e., if the sequence is \( \# smCV-, \) e.g., *smriti~srīti*. This also suggests that the nasalization rule may be ordered before S-specification in Bengali to generate these form correctly. But this rule of nasalization seems to be lexeme-specific as it does not apply to *smarto* to generate *šārto*.

17 Notice that the redundant features have been put within parantheses in (19)
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