Benglish verbs: a case of Code-mixing in Bengali*

Shishir Bhattacharja

In this article, we show how grammar can account for Benglish verbs, a particular type of complex predicate, which are constituted of an English word and a Bengali verb (e.g. /EksiDenT kOra/ 'to have an accident', /in kOra/ 'to get/come/put in' or /kOnfuz kOra/ 'to confuse'). We analyze these verbs in the light of a couple of models (Kageyama 1991, Lieber 1992, Matsumoto 1996) which claim that complex predicates are necessarily formed in syntax. However, Benglish verbs like /in kOra/ or /kOnfuz kOra/ are problematic for these approaches because it is unclear how a preposition (e.g. in or off) or a verb (e.g. confuse or justify) can appear as the argument of the verb /kOra/ 'to do' in an underlying syntactic structure. We claim that all Benglish verbs can be satisfactorily handled in Morphology in the light of Whole Word Morphology (elaborated in Ford et al. 1997 and Singh 2006).

1. Priliminaries

As in many other languages (see Moravcsik 1975, 1978 and Wohlgemuth 2009 among others) there exists a particular type of complex predicates in Bengali constituted of two items, one chosen from among various categories of words: *noun, verbal forms, adjective, preposition, adverb, onomatopoeic word*, etc., and the other, a duly inflected verb. The first item is usually called a **pole** and the second one a **vector.** Complex predicates are generally put into two different groups on the basis of the syntactic category of their pole: i) **Compound** verbs (1) that categorically involve a verb (usually a non-inflectional verbal form such as infinitive, participle, absolutive or past gerund), and ii) **Conjunct** verbs (2) that involve categories other than the verb. The main characteristic of compound and conjunct verbs is that they must denote one single action.[1]

1. *Rik eSe poreche*
   Rik having come has fallen
   'Rik has just come.'
2. *Rik bajar kore*

Rik market does
'Rik does shopping.'

As in other South Asian languages (see Butt 1995, 2010, Dasgupta 1977, 2003, Hook 1974, Masica 2005 [1976], Mohanan 1993, 1994 among others) there is a particular type of conjunct (3-9) and compound (10-11) verbs in Bengali in which the pole is an English word chosen from among various types of nouns (3-6), adverbs (7), adjectives (8), prepositions (9) and verbs (10-11) while the vector is chosen from among a closed set of Bengali verbs consisting mainly of /kOra/ 'to do', /hOwa/ 'to be/to happen/to become', /dewa/ 'to give', /newa/ 'to take' and a few others. In this article, we will call these particular instances of code-mixing **Benglish verbs**, and we will try to show how grammar can account for them. We presume that most of these verbs are used by a particular group of more or less urbanized Bengali speakers who are at different stages of bilingualism (in the sense of Singh and Backus 2000:83).[2]

3a. *EksiDenT kOra*
accident do
'to have an accident'

3b. *EksiDenT hOwa*
accident be
'to have an accident'

4. *ribhEnj newa*
revenge take
'to take revenge'

5. *grup kOra*
group do
'to put (things/persons) in a group'

6. *OfiS* (or *Ofis*) *kOra*
office do
'to work in an office'

7. *slow kOra*

slow do
'to make slow'

8. *kOmpaTibOl hOwa*
compatible be
'to be compatible'

9. *in kOra*
in do
'to get/come/put in'

10. *kOnfuz kOra*
confuse do
'to confuse'

11. *jasTify kOra*
justify do
'to justify'

We note that not all words can appear as pole with all vectors.[3] For example, /newa/ and /dewa/ cannot appear as vector in Benglish compound verbs. Hence we can have /pripEar kora/ (prepare-do) and /priparEshOn newa/ (preparation-take) 'to prepare', but ?/priparEshOn kora/ (preparation-do) and */pripEar newa/ (prepare-take) are unacceptable (however, there is no such ban on Bengali compound verbs: *kore newa* (having done-take) 'to have something done' or *kore dewa* (having done-give) 'to do something for somebody as a service'). As with any other simple or complex predicates in Bengali each Benglish verb has its own subcategorical features. For example, /EksiDEnT kOra/ (3a) and /EksiDEnT hOwa/ (3b), both denoting 'to have an accident' require their agent nouns to be case-marked differently, the former with nominative (marked with zero affix) (12), and the latter with genitive (13).[4]

12. *Kawsar EksiDEnT koreche*
Kawsar accident has done
'Kawsar had an accident.'

13. *Kawsarer EksiDEnT hoyeche*

Kawsar-Gen accident has been
'Kawsar had an accident.'

In some cases, speakers can alternate between a Bengali conjunct verb (e.g. /obhijog kOra/ (14)) and its Benglish counterpart (e.g. /kOmplEin kOra/ (15)). However, many Benglish verbs (e.g. /ofish kOra/ (6) and /kOmpaTibOl hOwa/ (7)) do not have a verbatim Bengali conjunct verb counterpart. In some cases the English pole cannot alternate with its Bengali counterpart, for instance, /durghOTona/ cannot replace the pole *accident* in (3a) (*/durghOTona kora/, but /durghOTona hOwa/ is acceptable) although /accident/ is frequently used as one of the synonyms of /durghOTona/. These examples show that not all Benglish verbs can be obtained by simply replacing the Bengali pole (of a conjunct verb) with its English counterpart.

14. *Rik Fahimer kache Gargir biruddhe obhijog koreche*
Rik Fahim-Gen near Gargi-Gen against complain did
'Rik has complained to Fahim against Gargi.'

15. *Rik Fahimer kache Gargir biruddhe kOmplEin koreche*
Rik Fahim-Gen near Gargi Gen against complain did
'Rik has complained to Fahim against Gargi.'

This article is organized as follows. In section 2 we demonstrate how Benglish verbs can be handled in the light of different models of morphology of our time which claim that complex predicates must be handled in syntax, and then we point out some examples that would be problematic for theses approaches. In section 3, after a brief description of W(hole) W(ord) M(orphology), we try to demonstrate how this model can account for all types of Benglish verbs in morphology. In section 4 we discuss whether Benglish verbs are words or not, and finally, we draw conclusions.

2. Benglish verbs in the light of different models of morphology

In this section we will analyze Benglish verbs in the light of a couple of models that have been used to account for word formation in other languages. In Lieber (1983, 1992 and 2004), compound formation is constrained by the A(rgument) L(inking) P(rinciple) according to which a verb or a preposition

must be able to link its internal arguments which she (1983:257) defines as follows: "all obligatory (i.e. lexically specified) arguments with the exception of the subject are internal." For instance, the verbs /kOra/ 'to do' in (15) and /newa/ 'to take' in (16) link their *theme* /kOmplEin/ and /ribhEnj/ respectively. Equally, the predicates in (5-6) link their respective arguments.

16. *Rik Gargir upOr ribhEnj niyeche*
Rik Gargi-Gen on revenge has taken
'Rik has taken revenge on Gargi.'

It is unclear how ALP can be satisfied in (7-11) because in these examples the pole is represented by categories that cannot usually function as arguments of some predicate – adverb (7), adjective (8), preposition (9) and verb (10-11). If the nominal forms of the verbs in (10-11) appeared as poles, for instance, */kOnfuSOn/ (<confusion) kOra/ or */jasTifikeSOn (<justification) kOra/, then it would be easier to handle these examples under Lieber's models. This said, one may argue that English words that appear as pole are categorically listed as nouns in Bengali because some of them (e.g. /in/ (17) and /complain/ (18)) can be immediatley followed by the Cl(assifier) /Ta/. We note that a noun must be able to take a Cl in Bengali notwithstanding that all words that can take Cl must be a noun.[5] However, there are English poles (19-20) that shun Cl, which shows that they are not nouns.[6] One may also argue that English words that appear as pole are underspecified in Bengali, or as Wolgemuth (2009:102) mentions, they are 'neutral with regard to part-of-speech membership', but in that case too, how ALP can be satisfied with non-nouns remains a mystery.

17. *plEin ranoEte in/inTa kokhOn korbe?*
aeroplane runway-loc in/in-Cl when will do
'When will the plane enter the runway?'

18. *Gargi Riker biruddhe kOmplEin/kOmplEinTa korlo keno?*
Gargi Rik-Gen against complaint/complaint-Cl did why
'Why did Gargi complain against Rik?'

19. **Rikke kOnfuz/*kOnfuzTa korbenna*
Rik-Acc confuse/confuse-Cl do not
'Don't confuse Rik.'

20. **Rik ei utSObe parTisipEiT/*parTisipEiTTa korbena*
Rik this festival-Loc participate/participate-Cl do not

'Rik will not participate in this festival.'

On the basis of an analysis of Japanese conjunct verbs (such as /keikoku suru/ (warning-do) 'to warn') (21), Kageyama (1991:196), following Baker (1988), claims that such verbs are formed through a process called A(bstract) I(ncorporation) which he defines as "an instance of Incorporation that does not manifest any physical sign of movement but only gives abstract co-indexes to an incorporating host and an incorporated element". Hence the V(erbal) N(oun) head (e.g. /keikoku/ 'warning') appears, in an underlying syntactic structure, as the argument of the verb head /suru/, and then, the latter incorporates the former. According to Kageyama (1991:196) AI is "basically a word-formation process, though it takes place in the syntax."

21. [*John-wa*$_i$ *[murabito-ni ookami-ga kuru-to-no*
John-Top$_i$ villager-to wolf-Nom come-Comp-Gen
(Pro$_i$) *keikoku o*] *suru*]
warn-Acc does)
'John warns the villagers that the wolf is coming.'

Benglish verbs like (3-6) can be can satisfactorily handled in the light of Kageyama (1991). However, it is difficult to account for (7-11) in the light of this model because, as we have aready mentioned, it is unclear how non-nouns can appear as the argument of the predicate /kOra/ in an underlying syntactic structure (we note that unlike *keikoku* in (21) the pole *confuse* or *justify* in (10-11) are not VNs but verbs).

According to Matsumoto (1996) Japanese conjunct verbs are bi-clausal constructions in which one predicate functions as the complement of the other while the subject of one predicate controls or binds (+ c-command, + co-indexation) the covert subject (Pro) of the other predicate. Hence, in (21) the flexional verb /suru /and the VN /keikoku/ are two independent predicates, where the subject (John) of /suru/ controls the covert subject (Pro) of /keikoku/. Similarly, in (22), the subject (Rik) of the vector /kOra/ controls the covert subject (Pro) of the pole /kOnfuz/. However, Benglish verbs like (6-9) are not bi-clausal constructions and it is unclear how they can be handled in the light of Matsumoto (1996). It is also unclear how all these models that involve syntax in word-formation can account for the fact that Benglish verbs like /ofish kOra/ (6) or /skul kOra/ does not mean 'to make an office' or 'to build a school' but 'to work in an office' and 'to attend a school' respectively.

22. [*Rik*$_i$ [*tar bondhu-der* (Pro$_i$) *kOnfuz*] *kore*]
Rik his friend-Acc+Plu confuse does
'Rik confuses his friends.'

For Wohlgemuth (2009:102) constructions like Benglish verb would represent a particular way of L(oan) V(erb) A(ccommodation) which he calls, following Grimshaw and Mester (1988), 'Light Verb Strategy' in which the *borrowed verbs* (that's how he calls them) which appear as pole remain mostly uninflected and (as we have mentioned) 'neutral with regard to part-of-speech membership.'[7] According to Wohlgemuth the vector verb has an auxiliary-like function and bears the inflection, while the semantic information is by and large associated with the pole. He (2009) mentions two other important strategies of loan verb accommodation: i) Direct insertion (23) and ii) Indirect insertion (24-25). In the former, the borrowed verbs remains more or less unchanged, whereas in latter, they undergo morpho-syntactic adaptation.

23. English *Download* > German *downloaden*

24. English *Download* > Indonesian *downloadin*

25. English realize > Hungarian *realiz-ál*

Whether Wohlgemuth's (2009) LVA strategies are really different from each other is debatable. In the following section we will try to demonstrate that the whole phenomenon of LVA can be handled with one single strategy in the light of W(hole) W(ord) M(orphology).

3. Benglish verbs in the light of WWM

In what follows, after a brief description of WWM (elaborated in Ford et al. 1997 and Singh 2006) we will try to demonstrate how Benglish verbs can be handled in this model. According to Singh (2006:578):

> "All that needs to be said about word structure in any language (of any type whatsoever) can and must be said by instantiations of the schema in (S1). These instantiations are referred to as Word Formation Strategies (WFSs) because, as generalizations drawn from known particular facts, they can be activated in the production and understanding of new words. WFSs must be for-

> mulated as generally as possible, but – and this is crucial – only as generally as the facts of the matter permit**.**
>
> S1. $/X/_a \leftrightarrow /X'/_b$ where
>
> 1. $/X/_a$ and $/X'/_b$ are words and X and X' are abbreviations of the forms of classes of words belonging to categories a and b (with which specific words belonging to the right category can be unified or on to which they can be mapped).
> 2. ' represents (all the) form-related differences between /X/ and /X'/ that fall outside of automatic phonology.
> 3. a and b are categories that may be represented as feature bundles.
> 4. The $\leftrightarrow$ represents a bidirectional implication (if /X/ then /X'/, and if /X'/, then /X/).
> 5. The interpretation of $/X/_a$ is a semantic function of $/X'/_b$ and vice versa.
> 6. ' can be null iff $\alpha \neq \beta$."

Singh (2006:578) states that

> "S1 offers a unified account of what have sometimes been seen as different types of morphologies and encapsulates the rejection of multipartite analysis of words into 'roots', 'affixes', 'stems', and so on, entries that are hard to define and harder to tell apart."

For WWM, words have no internal (non-phonological) hierarchical structure. According to this model (cf. Singh 2006:578):

> "Morphological complexity is a matter of analyzability (# segmentability) of a word into a variable and a constant component with respect to a WFS."

According to Singh (2006:578) WWM sees 'morphology'

> "not as a combinatorics of morphs or morphemes but as a system of generalized and abstract bidirectional correspondence among patterns instantiated by sets of whole words that exploit the same contrast."

For example, on the basis of morphologically related sets of words like (26) and (27), one can obviously set up a WFS like (28). We note that (28) is licensed by a set of semantically related word-pairs that manifest the same i) formal contrast: X/Xli on the one hand, and ii) categorical affiliation:

Noun/Adjective on the other. According to (28) *bad, kind, famous* etc. provide the differing values for the variable X in (26-27) while the phonemic representation /li/, which remains constant throughout (27), provides the particular value of the prime (') in the schema (S1).

26.		27.
kind	↔	kindly
famous	↔	famously
bad	↔	badly
etc.		etc.

28. $/X/_{N} \leftrightarrow /Xli/_{Adj}$

We will now move onto demonstrate how WWM can account for Benglish verbs. We assume that the lexicon of a bilingual Bengali speaker contains sets of word-pairs constituted of English verbs like *confuse* or *complain* and Benglish verbs like /kOnfuzkOra/ or /kOmplEinkOra/ (29a-b). Such pairs license (29) which can be used to form, analyze and retrieve other Benglish verbs like /EnalaizkOra/ 'to analyze' or /jasTifykOra/ 'to justify'. Benglish verbs such as (9) can be obtained through (30).

29. $/X/_{V, Inf} \leftrightarrow /XkOra/_{V, Inf}$
a. */confuse/* ↔ */kOnfuzkOra/* 'to confuse'
b. */complain/* ↔ */kOmplEinkOra/* 'to complain'
c. */insult/* ↔ */insalTkOra/* 'to insult'
d. */group/* ↔ */grupkOra/* 'to put (things/persons) in a group'

30. $/X/_{P} \leftrightarrow /XkOra/_{V, Inf}$
a. */in/* ↔ */inkOra/* 'to put (something) in'
b. */off/* ↔ */OfkOra/* 'to put (something) off'

We note that pairs manifesting the same formal difference but different categorical affiliations (e.g. (29-31)) must license different WFSs. WFSs also differ from each other on the question of semantic relatedness manifested in the pairs licensing them. For example, although the formal difference and categorical affiliations are the same in (31-32) they are different WFSs because they are licensed by pairs that manifest different semantic relatednesses.

31. /X/$_{N}$ ↔ /XkOra/$_{V, Inf}$
a. */EksiDEnT/* 'accident' ↔ */EksiDEnTkOra/* 'to have an accident'
b. */insalT/* 'insult' ↔ */insalTkOra/* 'to insult'
c. */obhijog/* 'complaint' ↔ */obhijogkOra/* 'to complain'
d. */kOmplEin/* 'complaint' ↔ */kOmplEinkOra/* 'to complain'
e. */group/* ↔ */grupkOra/* 'to put (things/persons) in a group'

32. /X/$_{N}$ ↔ /XkOra/$_{V, Inf}$
/OfiS/ 'office' ↔ */OfiSkOra/* 'to work in some office'
/kOlEj/ 'college' ↔ */kOlEjkOra/* 'to attend some college'

The same Benglish verbs can be output with different WFSs. For instance, /kOmplEinkOra/ 'to complain' can be obtained with (29) and/or (31). Some Benglish verbs and their Bengali conjunct verb counterparts can be formed with the same WFS. Hence, Benglish /kOmplEinkOra/ and Bengali /obhijogkOra/ can be obtained by mapping the nouns /kOmplEin/ (< English *Complaint*) and /obhijog/ respectively onto (31).[8] We also note that some of the left-hand inputs of (29) (e.g. *insult*, *group*) have double categorical affiliation– they can be used either as a noun or as a verb in English and hence, they can be mapped onto (31) as well.[9]

We mentioned in section 2 that according to Wohlgemuth (2009) there are three different strategies of LVA. We claim that most of the cases of LVA mentioned in his voluminous work (about hundred languages belonging to about seventy language families) can be handled with relevant WFSs instantiating (S1). These 'code-mixed' words can be analyzed into the *variable* instantiated by loan words and the *constant* by sequences like *kOra* (*kOmplEinkOra* in Bengali) ((29) or (31)), *en* (*downloaden* in German) (23) *in* (*downloadin* in Indonesian) (24) or *ál* (*realizal* in Hungarian) (25) if we map them onto relevant WFSs.

Finally, we claim that there is no need to treat Benglish verbs in syntax, or to list each one of them in the lexicon of individual speakers because they can be handled in morphology in the light of WWM. In this approach, the so-called vector verbs are supplied by relevant WFSs, and therefore, they do not need to be listed separately either. However, some Benglish verbs (but, not necessarily the same ones for all speakers) must be listed in different individual lexicons, which together with relevant English words form adequate pairs that license different WFSs which can be activated, in case of need, to form, retrieve or understand other Benglish verbs.

4. Benglish verbs: are they words?

As with many compound and conjunct verbs in Bengali, one may argue that Benglish verbs are not words but phrasal constructions because some of them (e.g. 34-35) lack formal cohesion in the sense that their pole and the vector part can be interrupted with some other words.

34. *EksiDEnT Kawsar kOkhon koreche?*
accident Kawsar when did
'When did Kawsar have an accident?'

35. *kEarful Rikke OboSSoi thakte hObe*
careful Rik-Acc certainly remain will be
'Rik has to be careful.'

Linguists generally tend to agree that i) a large number of compounds derive from phrases, and ii) many affixes derive from words that used to appear in compounds (see Dressler 2006). We may divide this whole process of grammaticalization into four consecutive stages: i) Loose compounds (see Dasgupta 2003 and Dressler 2006) > ii) Tight or normal compounds > iii) Affixoidal words > iv) Affixal words. In the first stage, the two components of the compound in question may be interrupted by some other words, which is no more possible in the second stage. In the third stage, one of the components of the compounds undergoes phonological modification and becomes *affixoid* (see Booij 2004, Bauer 2005) (such as *Africa>Afro*, *India>Indo*, etc.) before finally becoming an affix (such as *like>ly* in English).

In some dialects of Bengali (e.g. Chittagonian (36) and Kishoreganj dialect (37)) there are examples of compound verbs that have been fused into simple verbs. We claim, on the basis of examples like (36-37), that verbs that appear as vector in Benglish verbs (and also in other compound and conjunct verbs) have already stepped into the process of grammaticalization and are heading towards becoming something that are generally described as affixes (such as *dom* in *kingdom* and *hood* in *boyhood* which were regular words at some point of diachrony), which however does not mean that all vector verbs must cease to be used as regular verbs in the long run.

36. *khai phalai* (having eaten-I have thrown off) > *khaialai* "I have finished eating'

37. *khaia phalaichi* (having eaten-I have thrown off) > *khaialchi* "I have finished eating'

We are aware of the fact that (36-37) are neither Benglish verbs, nor are they words of the standard dialect of Bengali with which we are concerned here. However, (38-39) point to fact that not all Benglish verbs can be interrupted, which means that some of them have already acquired some sort of formal integrity. It is possible that the Benglish verbs that lack cohesiveness are in their first stage of grammaticalisation and those which cannot be interrupted are in the second stage. Hence, although some Benglish verbs lack formal integrity it is likely that most of them will acquire it in the course of time.

38. **Rik kOnfuz bondhuder kore*
Rik confuse friend-Acc/Plu does
'Rik confuses his friends'

39.? *plEin ranoEte in kOkhon korbe?*
aeroplane runway-Loc in when will do
'When will the aeroplane enter the runway?

As with other compound and conjunct verbs, Benglish verbs are semantically opaque in the sense that they denote one single action. For example, /EksiDEnT kOra/ does not mean two simultaneous or consecutive actions such as 'to have an accident' and 'to do something'. Equally /kOnfuz kOra/ either means i) 'to mix up things (or persons) in the speaker's mind which are otherwise distinct', or ii) 'to make someone else to mix up things (or persons)', the agent performing in both cases nothing but one single 'action of confusing'. In our view, semantic opacity is a more reliable and (probably) more universal criterion for word-hood as compared to formal integrity because some languages have been reported (Sadock 1998) to have words that allow insertion of lexical and grammatical elements. As Benglish verbs categorically lack semantic compositionality, they are more likely to be words and can be handled in morphology with WFSs *à la* WWM.

Save a few exceptions (e.g. Grimshaw and Mester 1988), linguists generally agree that complex predicates are not phrases.[10] If one takes this stand as valid, then Benglish verbs can be but words. However, one can also propose some intermediate category between *phrase* and *word* such as Word^{+} (word plus) (cf. Kageyama 2001), or, following Mohanan (1994), put words

into different subcategories such as 'morphological word' (e.g. complex predicates) and 'phonological word'. But, as long as the word-hood of the Benglish verbs is not seriously challenged we do not see why they should be a challenge for WWM.

5. Conclusions

In this article we have studied Benglish verbs, a particular type of complex predicates in Bengali which are constituted of an English word and a Bengali verb, in the light of different models of morphology of our time. We have tried to demonstrate that some of these verbs are problematic for models that usually account for word formation in syntax and that all of them can be satisfactorily handled in morphology in the light of WWM.

Finally, it needs to be said that although we have used traditional terms like *compound*, *compound verb*, *conjunct verb*, *complex predicate*, *pole*, *vector*, *light verbs*, etc. throughout this article to ease discussion, there will, in fact, be no need of this if we adopt the WWM framework. Benglish verbs are verbs and like any other verb (or any other word) they can be formed, analyzed or retrieved with relevant WFSs that instantiate the schema: $/X/_a \leftrightarrow /X'/_b$, and therefore, neither they nor their subcomponents require different names.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Professor Peter Hook and anonymous reviewers of this paper for their comments and suggestions. I thank Professor Taro Kageyama, my post-doctorate research supervisor in Japan for the thought-provoking discussions I had with him concerning complex predicates and word formation. I thank my senior colleague Dr. Dil Afroze Quader who read several versions of this paper, gave comments, and tightened up my prose. Usual disclaimers apply. For financial support, I gratefully acknowledge the beneficence of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) and University of Dhaka, Bangladesh, while for logistic support, I am indebted to the National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics, Tokyo, Japan.

Notes:

*An earlier version of this article was presented in the 27th Pacific Asia conference on language, information and computation (PACLIC), 4-7 November, 2010, Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan.

1. One of our reviewers mentions a major finding by Dasgupta (no year is mentioned, supposedly Dasgupta 1977) – 'complex predicates may carry a serial verb interpretation goes unnoticed' in our paper. S/he also states that our conclusion 'CPs denote one single meaning' is not true. Neither Dasgupta (1977) nor this writer has made any such claims or come to such conclusions. Dasgupta (1977) has shown that some complex predicates are serial verbs, we have tried to show that all compound and conjunct verbs must denote one single meaning. In fact, compound and conjunct verbs should not be confused with two other types of predicates which are also known to be complex: i) **Phrasal verbs** (e.g. *put out* or *lie down* in English) and ii) **Serial verbs (**in Bengali: *potrika kine, phon kore, bajar niye hente chole asho* (newspaper-having bought-phone-having done, market-having taken-having walked-having moved-come) 'buy the newspaper, make a phone call, do your shopping and then come on foot'). Unlike Compound and Conjunct verbs Serial verbs denote more than one action. Serial verbs and phrasal verbs are not the concerns of the present article.

2. Singh and Backus (2000:83) put bilinguals into two different groups: i) Perfect or true bilinguals and ii) less than perfect bilinguals. The latter are further divided into four subgroups: a. Very competent, b. Competent, c. Weak and d. Apparent. How these weak and apparent bilinguals become aware of the subcategorical features of English verbs is a question left unanswered in the pesent paper.

3. One of the reviewers states that we must "look at the class of the verb that vector belongs to, e.g., unacccustives will have different argument taking properties than transitives. Within intransitives, internally caused verbs, non-volitional changes of state verbs and existence, apperance and disappearance will show different behavior, further within transitives, one would expect considering change of state, manner of motion, inherently directed motion, externally caused emission, etc." Dasgupta (1977:78-79) also states that "there might be transitive stems which, when vectors, occur exclusively with tansitive poles. This phenomenon, 'transitiviy harmony', does indeed appear over a surprisingly wide range of data." However, intransitive verbs like /aSa/ 'come', /boSa/ 'sit', /mOra/ 'die', etc. randomly appear as vector with transitive poles, such as /Suna/ 'to listen/ hear', /likha/ 'to write', /bOla/ 'to say/speak/tell': /Sune aSchi/ 'we have been hearing', /likhe boSbe/ 'all of a sudden he will write (something that he should not have)', /bole mOrchi/ 'I continue to say in vain'. In our view, it is hard to propose 'transitivity harmony' (or any other type of harmony between the pole and the vector) as a general tendency in the formation

of Bengali compound and conjunct verbs, and therefore, we do not see what can be gained by looking at the class of verb that the vectors and poles belong to.

4. According to one of our reviewers Benglish verbs with transitive verbs as vectors must function intransitively because, as s/he mentions, their pole which is in fact the internal argument of their vector is linked inside the compound. However, for another reviewer "It is extremely unlikely that they are all intransitive." Be that as it may, in examples like */Daktar rogi OparESonkOreche/* (Doctor-patient-operation-did) 'the doctor did an operation on the patient' */Ami khata karekSon kOrechi/* (I-answer script-correction-did) 'I have corrected the answer scripts' Benglish verbs are used transitively. Similar examples abound in the language.

5. In examples like */tumi khabeTa ki/* (you-will eat-Ta-what) 'What (the hell) will you eat?' or */she geloTa kothay/* (she/he-went-Ta-where) 'Where (the hell) has she gone!' [Ta] is concatenated to a flexional verb.

6. Words like */kOnfuz/* 'confuse' cannot be considered as adjectives because sequences like **/ek kOnfuz lok/* (a-confused-person) 'a confused person' or **/uni kOnfuz/* (he-confused) 'he is confused' are not acceptable. One has to say instead */ek kOnfuzd lok/* and */uni kOnfuzd/* respectively.

7. According to Wohlgemuth (2009) light verb strategy is the second most frequently used strategy in world's languages, and it can be found in languages spoken in all regions of the world and in most language families.

8. One of our reviewers has complained that our article "cannot take into account the extreme productivity of /kora/ compounds in Bangla, an indication that it is likely to be dealt satisfactorily in the syntax rather than morphology." In our view, a WFS like (29) is productive because any verb can be mapped onto it. Equally, any noun can be mapped onto (31). The fact that the righthand outputs of these WFSs end in /kOra/ can be seen to be a coincidence.

9. English nouns like *'insult* or *'import* differ from the verbs *in'sult* and *im'port* as regards the placement of stress. However, */insalT/* is usually pronounced unstressed by bilingual Bengalis irrespective of whether it is a noun or a verb.

10. Grimshaw and Mester (1988:213) claim that the formation of Japanese conjunct verbs can be "assimilated to a more general theory of phrasal constructions, which governs the behavior of idioms (like *kick the bucket*) and other lexical expressions that do not constitute single words."

Abbreviations: **Acc**: *Accusative*; **Adj**: *Adjective*; **AI**: *Abstract incorporation*; **ALP**: *Argument linking principle*; **Cl**: *Classifier*; **Gen**: *Genitive*; **Inf**: *Infinitive*; **LVA**: *Loan*

verb accommodation; **N**: *Noun*; **P**: *Preposition*; **Plu**: *Plural*; **pro**: *covert subject pronoun*; **Top**: *Topicalizer*; **Nom**: *Nominative*; **V**: *Verb*; **VN**: *Verbal noun*; **WFS**: *Word formation strategy*; **WWM**: *Whole word morphology*.

References

Baker, Mark

1988 *Incorporation: a Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago press.

Bauer, Laurie

2005 The Borderline between Derivation and Compounding. In *Morphology and its Demarcations*, W. U. Dressler, D. Kastovsky, Oslar E. Pfeiffer, and Franz Rainer (eds.), 97-107. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Booij, Geert

2004 Compounding and derivation, evidence from construction morphology. In *Morphology and its Demarcations*,Wolfgang U. Dressler, Dieter Kastovsky, Oslar E. Pfeiffer, and Franz Rainer (eds.), 109-131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing company.

Butt, Miriam

1995 *The Structure of Complex Predicate in Urdu*. Stanford: CSLI.

2010 The Light Verb Jungle: Still Hacking Away. In *Complex Predicates:Cross Linguistic Perspectives on Event Structure*, Mengitsu Amberber, Brett Baker and Mark Harvey (eds.),49-78.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dasgupta, Probal

1977 The Internal Grammar of Compound Verbs in Bangla. *Indian linguistics*, 38, 68-77.

2003 Bangla. In *The Indo-Aryan Languages*, G. Cardona and D. Jain, (eds.), 351-390. London:Routeledge.

Dressler, Wolfgang. U.

2006 Compound Types. In *The Representation and Processing of Compound Words*, Gary Libben, and Gonia Jarema (eds.), 23-44. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ford, Alan, Rajendra Singh and Gita. Martohardjono

1997 *Pace Panini, towards a Word-based Theory of Morphology*. New York: Peter Lang.

Grimshaw, Jane and Armin Mester

1988 Light verbs and θ-marking. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19(2):205-232.

Hook, Peter Edwin.

1974 *The Compound Verb in Hindi*. Michigan: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan.

Kageyama, Taro
1991 Light Verb Constructions and the Syntax-Morphology Interface. In *Current English Linguistics in Japan* H. Nakazima (ed.),169-203. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
2001 Word Plus: The Interaction of Words and Phrase. In *Issues in Japanese Phonology and Morphology*, J. V. D. Weijer and T. Nishihara (eds.), 245-270. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lieber, Rochelle
1983 Argument Linking and Compounds in English. *Linguistic Inquiry*14 (2):251-285.
1992 *Deconstructing Morphology: Word Formation in Syntactic Theory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
2004 *Morphology and Lexical Semantics*. Cambidge: Cambridge University Press.

Masica, Colin. P.
2005 Reprint. *Defining a Linguistic Area: South Asia*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Original edition: 1976.

Matsumoto, Yo
1996 *Complex Predicates in Japanese, a Syntactic and Semantic Study of the Notion 'Word'*. California: CSLI Publications and Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Mohanan, Tara
1993 Verb Agreement in Complex Predicates in Hindi. In *Complex Predicates in South Asian languages*, M. K.Verma (ed.), 163-175. New Delhi: Manohar publishers.
1994 *Argument Structure in Hindi*. Stanford: CSLI.

Moravcsik, Edith, A.
1975 Verb Borrowing. *Wiener Linguistiche Gazette*, 8:3-30.
1978 Language Contact. In *Method and Theory*, J. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Human Languages, Vol. 1*., 93-122. Stanford: Stanford University Press

Sadock, Jerald. M.
1998 On the Autonomy of Compounding Morphology. In *Morphology and its Relation to Phonology and Syntax* Steven G. Lapointe, Diane K. Brentari, Patrick M. Farrel (eds.),161-187. California: CSLI Publications.

Singh, Rajendra
2006 Whole Word Morphology. *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, 2nd edition, pp. 578-579.

Singh Rajendra and A. Backus
2000 Code-Mixing and Bilingual Proficiency. *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2000*, 61-92.

Wohlgemuth, Jan
2009 *A Typology of Verbal Borrowings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.