Borrowing and disappearance of light verbs: Loan-verb integration in Indian languages

AADITYA KULKARNI, *Independent Researcher*

ABSTRACT

In this paper, I discuss patterns of loan-verb integration attested in Indian languages and show that certain English verbal borrowings in languages like Hindi and Marathi can either be accommodated into the host language using a supporting light verb or be directly integrated to carry the host language's verb morphology without needing to undergo any means of verbalization. I argue that syntactic analyses which assume the existence of a common (or identical) verbal functional structure between the donor and recipient (or host) languages to be a prerequisite for direct integration of loan verbs fail to adequately explain this optionality of direct integration. Instead, I show that it is the degree of bilingualism of speakers which makes direct integration of loan verbs into the target language possible; and propose that verbal borrowings are borrowed with an understanding that they are verbs – irrespective of whether they are accommodated using a light verb construction or not.

1 Borrowing and bilingual compound verbs

English verbs, when borrowed into Indian languages, cannot directly take the host language's inflection and need to be accompanied by a light verb which carries the necessary verbal inflections – thus forming what has been termed as a bilingual compound verb (Romaine 1995, Bhatia & Ritchie 2016, Muysken 2016)[1]. This is consistent with observations made in the typological literature (Moravcsik 1975, Muysken 2000, Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008) which demonstrates the accommodation of loan verbs using a supporting light verb to be a widely attested strategy of loan-verb integration.

Patterns of English borrowings in Kannada observed by Amritavalli (2017: 9) also fall into this pattern, where a borrowed English verb needs the support of a light verb to appear felicitously in a Kannada sentence (1-2).[2]

(1) *nanu   i: post-ige   **apply**-idd-i:ni*
    I   this   post-DAT   apply-AUX.PST-1.SG
    (intended) 'I have applied to this post.'

(2) *nanu   i: post-ige   **apply** maḍ   -idd-i:ni*
    I   this   post-DAT   apply make/do   -AUX.PST-1.SG
    'I have applied to this post.'

Amritavalli (2017) also brings to our attention some interesting patterns of borrowings observed elsewhere in the literature. In Bangla, it seems that borrowed English verbs need a

---

[1] A bilingual compound verb consists of a loan verb and a 'supporting' light verb from the host language.
[2] For the sake of uniformity, minor changes have been made in the transcription of data cited from previous literature. In the transcribed data from Indian languages, [t] and [d] refer to dental plosives, and [y] refers to the palatal approximant. The original glossing has been largely retained for cited examples.

supporting light verb (3) – just like Kannada; however, Hindi verbs can appear directly in Bangla without needing the support of a light verb (4). Rather, adding a light verb into the mix yields an ungrammatical structure (5).

(3) *ami*   **celebrate** *kor-l-am /*   ***celebrate**-*l-am*
  I   celebrate do-PST-1 /   celebrate-PST-1
  'I celebrated.'   (Amritavalli 2017: 12)

(4) **ɖʰunɖ**-*e-che*
  find-PRF-AUX
  'has found'   (Amritavalli 2017: 12)

(5) ***ɖʰunɖ**   *kor-be*
  find   do-FUT
  (intended) 'will find'   (Amritavalli 2017: 12)

Further, like the Bangla-Hindi borrowings, English verbs can also be integrated directly into American Norwegian (6).

(6) *jeg* **celebrate**-*a*
  I   celebrate-PST
  'I celebrated.'   (Amritavalli 2017: 12)

Given that the direct borrowing of verbs is grammatical only in certain language pairs but not in others, this begs the question as to what dictates the grammaticality of these borrowings. Amritavalli (2017: 11) makes the following claim about such cases: "a verb – borrowed or otherwise – needs licensing (i.e., verbalizing) by the verbal functional structure of the particular language". This analysis further assumes the verbal functional structures to be non-identical between languages and thus to be the locus of parametric variation. Therefore, it follows that there must be a verbal functional structure common between the languages where direct integration of a loan-verb (sans the light verb that is) is possible. On the other hand, whenever there is a mismatch between the verbal functional structures of the donor and recipient languages, the need for licensing (or verbalizing) is satisfied by introducing the light verb. From Amritavalli's analysis, it follows that language pairs Bangla & Hindi and English & American Norwegian must have identical verbal functional structures, whereas there must be a mismatch between the verbal functional structures of English and Indian languages such as Bangla, Hindi, and Kannada. This analysis explains as to why a light verb is needed to accommodate the borrowed English verbs in these Indian languages, but borrowing of English verbs in American Norwegian is felicitous without one.

2 Borrowing and disappearance of light verbs

Amritavalli (2017) shows that English verbal borrowings in Indian languages cannot occur with the host language's morphology given the mismatch between their verbal functional structures and thus need to be verbalized using a supporting light verb. In this section, I present some intriguing cases which pose a challenge to this account – where verbs bor-

rowed into Indian languages can appear straightforwardly with the host language's morphology, and hence exhibit optionality in terms of the appearance of a supporting light verb which has been deemed a necessity for borrowing under Amritavalli's licensing analysis.

2.1 Optional direct integration of English verbs in Indian languages

Like in other Indian languages such as Bangla, Hindi, and Kannada, English verbal borrowings in Marathi also appear in a bilingual compound verb (7-8). Under Amritavalli's analysis, this entails a mismatch between the verbal functional structures of Marathi and English.

(7) utpadəne **tag** ke-li gelya-nəntər deal pah-ta yeil[3]
products tag do-PRF went-after deal see-IMPRF come.FUT
'The deal can be seen after the products are tagged.'

(8) social media-wər sərwə kahi **post** kərŋe t͡saŋgle ahe ka[4]
social media-on everything post do.INF good be.AUX Q
'Is it okay to post everything on social media?'

However, I will now present cases where English verbs can be borrowed and directly integrated in Indian languages such as Marathi (9-10) and Hindi (11-13). Such cases, though attested largely in the writings in Indian languages on various social media platforms and blogs, are not entirely uncommon in other domains (see 11). That English loan-verbs can appear in these languages without needing a licensing light verb and can take the host language's verb morphology provides clear empirical evidence against Amritavalli's (2017) analysis which rules out this possibility on the grounds of apparent mismatch between the verbal functional structures of English and Hindi & Marathi.

(9) mi ʃodʰ-ət hoto kuŋi mə-la **tag**-le ahe ka[5]
I find-IMPRF was anyone 1-dat tag-PRF be.PRS Q
'I was trying to check if anyone had tagged me.'

(10) kəwite-la prətisad mʰəŋun dusri kəwita **post**-u nəye[6]
poem-ACC response as second poem post-INF NEG.AUX
'One shouldn't post a(nother) poem in response to one.'

(11) any time mood-wa ko **upset**-ao nəhĩ mu:ra[7]
any time mood-CLF DAT upset-IMP NEG.AUX naïve/innocent
'O innocent one, don't get upset.' (lit. Don't let your mood get upset)

(12) məntri d͡ʒi d͡zəra aram se itna kahe **frəst**-iya
minister HON little easy with this much why frustrate-INF
rəhe hɛ[8]
be.prog be.prs

---

[3] https://support.google.com/youtube/answer/13202713?hl=mr
[4] https://www-quora-com.translate.goog/Is-it-good-to-post-everything-on-social-media?_x_tr_sl=en&_x_tr_tl=mr&_x_tr_hl=mr&_x_tr_pto=tc
[5] https://manaatale.wordpress.com/2009/12/25/टॅगला/
[6] https://www.maayboli.com/node/35244
[7] From Hindi movie Gangs of Wasseypur 2
[8] https://twitter.com/kislay_official/status/1651923507641749504

'Take it easy, Minister sir. Why are you getting so frustrated?'

(13)   *ɛsa*   *hi*   *kəl*   *həm*   *bʰi*   **speak**-*enge*
        like this EMPH tomorrow   1.HON too   speak-will
        'I will also speak like that tomorrow.'   (Poonam 2020: 140)

See also (14), where a Hindi verb *cun(ə)na* 'choose' can appear in English with English verb morphology, and without needing any overt verbalization or licensing.

(14)   *my wife will be **cun**-ing some Sarees.*
                     choose
        'My wife will be choosing some Sarees.'   (Bhatia & Ritchie 2016: 11)

Given that English verbs can be directly accommodated in Hindi (11-13) and Hindi verbs can be accommodated directly in Indian English (14), it establishes that direct integration of loan-verbs can occur in either or both languages that are in a contact situation.

2.2 Direct integration of verbal borrowings within Indian languages

In this subsection, I present some cases of direct integration of verbal borrowings within some Indian language pairs.

    In a variety of Hindi spoken in Mumbai often referred to as Bambaiya Hindi, certain Marathi verbs like *wapərŋe* 'use' and *pərwədɖe* 'afford' seem to have been borrowed directly (15-16).

(15)   *zyada kər ke*   *log*   *yahi*   **wapər-***te*   *hɛ*
        most   people this   use-IMPRF   be.PRS
        'Most people also prefer to use this one.'   (from 1982 Hindi film '*Angoor*')[9]

(16)   *company ke*   *bosses ko*   **pərwəɖ**-*ega*   *nəhĩ*[10]
        company of   bosses DAT   afford-FUT   NEG.AUX
        'The company leadership won't be able to afford that.'

Miranda (1977: 262) points out that Konkani has borrowed numerous verbs from Dravidian languages such as Kannada and Tulu:

(17)   Konkani borrowings from Dravidian
     a)   Konkani *kuʈʈi* from Kannada *kuʈʈu* 'knock'
     b)   Konkani *təɭɭi* from Kannada/Tulu *təɭɭu* 'push away'
     c)   Konkani *ɔppa* from Kannada *oppu* 'agree'

---

[9] The full dialogue and its translation for context:

A: ye rassi kitne ki hai? [how much is this rope for?]

B: kya karni hai? [what do you want it for?]

A: khudkushi karni hai [suicide]

B: thehro, dusri deta hun [wait, I'll give you another one]

    mazboot bhi hai, sasti bhi hai [it is strong and cheap]

    *zyada kar ke log yahi **wapar**-te hai* [and most people also prefer to use this one]

[10] https://twitter.com/JayshreePT/status/1459941152660996100

Note that the changes seen in the Konkani verb forms in (17a-c) are to accommodate the Konkani pattern where intransitive verbs are '-a' ending and transitive verbs are '-i' ending. That is, the changes seen Kannada or Tulu verbs borrowed into Kannada are not motivated by morphosyntax but rather are phonological in nature.

2.3 Some more cases of direct integration of loan-verbs

In this subsection, I present some more instances of direct integration of loan-verbs.

Certain Farsi verbs have made their way into the lexicon of many Indo-Aryan languages and can occur in these languages with the host language's verb morphology, e.g. Farsi *xəridæn* 'buy' or have been borrowed into Hindi as *kʰəri:d(ə)na*. Madrikar (1954: 207) points out that Marathi verbs such as *nawad͡z(ə)ɳe* 'be famous', *fərmaw(ə)ɳe* 'order', and *bəd͡ʒaw(ə)ɳe* 'warn' have been borrowed from their Farsi counterparts. There are also numerous other cases of Farsi verbal borrowings in these Indian languages where it can be slightly tricky to argue for direct integration to have taken place since both – the Persian verb and their borrowed counterparts – almost obligatorily occur with a light verb in the form of a N+V construction, e.g. *xærd͡ʒ kərdan* as *kʰərt͡sə kərɳe* 'spend' (lit. spend do), *xərid kərdan* as *kʰəredi kərɳe* 'buy' (lit. buy do) in Marathi.[11,12]

Several other cases of direct integration of loan-verbs have also been attested in the broader typological literature on loan-verb integration:

(18)   Tukano (Tukanoan) loan-verb *yuu* 'wait' in Hip (Maku)

     Ɂam-ǎn   Ɂãh   **yu**-té-h

     you-ABS   I   wait-FUT-DECL

  'I will wait for you.'   (Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008: 100)

(19)   French loan-verb *gonfler* 'swell' in Figuig Berber (Berber)

     *i-**gõfla***

     3.SG.M-be.swollen

  'He is swollen up.'   (Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008: 100)

This shows that direct integration of loan-verbs is common even outside of languages and language families of India and is found across languages of the world. That is, direct integration of borrowed verbs is an accommodation strategy used far and wide in the languages of the world and is not a marginal phenomenon in any sense.

2.4 A note on the usage of loan-verbs

Before delving into the issues that arise from data presented in §2.1-2.3 for a licensing analysis, I would like to provide a brief note about the usage of directly integrated English loan-verbs in Indian languages, focusing largely on Marathi.

Direct integration of English loan-verbs in Marathi as an accommodation strategy is

---

[11] Wichmann & Wohlgemuth (2008: 107) also point out the same and affirm that both direct insertion and light verb strategy are common when it comes to Farsi borrowings in (Hindi-)Urdu.

[12] For discussion regarding the influence of Farsi N+V constructions on Hindi and Marathi and the similarities between them, see Hook & Pardeshi (2009) and chapter 2 of Kulkarni (2017).

both well-attested and well-accepted within its sphere of influence. That is, though extended to a small set of verbs[13] and attested only in certain domains on a regular basis – largely in Marathi writings on social media, blogs, and such related platforms – direct integration of English loan-verbs in Marathi is omnipresent in these domains. Contrary to Poonam (2020: 119) who opines the usage of English loan-verbs in the Hindi Twitter discourse to be for humorous or amusement purposes, usage of directly integrated English loan-verbs in the domain of Marathi blogging is rather communicative in nature and does not come across as 'marked'.

Dharurkar's (2019: 251) observations regarding the pragmatics and aesthetics of English borrowings in Indian languages are worth pointing out in this regard. He notes that '… the recent large-scale English borrowings that happen in Indian languages are a result of the changing native-sensibility or native-understanding of the usage labels that reflect attitudes of the speakers', and points out that '… English words stand for an informal, associating, communicative attitude' rather than '… erudition, literacy, and education' (Dharurkar 2019: 249) as it was the case for speakers of previous generation(s). [14]

2.5 Issues with a licensing analysis

Despite Amritavalli's (2017) licensing analysis being seemingly adequate to explain the data presented in §1, the patterns of borrowings presented in §2.1-2.3 present some puzzles for the same. This section outlines why that is the case.

2.5.1 Multiple strategies of loan-verb integration

That English loan-verbs can either appear with the help of a supporting light verb or can be directly integrated in the host language (9-13) indicates that certain languages can employ more than one strategy to accommodate verbal borrowings. A number of other languages also permit multiple strategies of loan-verb integration. For example, Nepali (Indo-Aryan) loan-verbs like *hai* 'call' and *bolai* 'call' in Manange (Tibeto-Burman) can appear either with a supporting light verb (20a) and with a verbal suffix (20b) respectively.

(20) Nepali loan-verbs in Manange
  a) **[1]hai**   [1]*la-pa*
      yawn   do-NOM
      'to yawn'   (Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008: 93)
  b) **bolai**-*ti*   [1]*mi*   *ro*
      call-SUFFIX   EVID   REP
      'He called (for the frog)'   (Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008: 97)

In such cases, there is not necessarily any correlation between a particular loan-verb and

---

[13] Most notable among these being 'tag', 'post', 'paste', 'type', 'google', among others.

[14] However, it is important to keep in mind that such usages can have different acceptability status and usage frequencies in different varieties of the same language. For example, Sakshi Bhatia (p.c.) points out that direct integration English loan verbs in Hindi (such as in examples 11-13) is much more frequent in eastern varieties of Hindi than its standard counterpart.

the strategy being used for its accommodation, and a single loan-verb can be accommodated using more than one strategy: e.g. English verbs like 'click' can appear in Spanish either as *clicar* or as *hacer clic*. Such patterns of loan-verb integration are incompatible with Amritavalli's (2017) licensing analysis.

2.5.2 Locus of borrowability of loan-verbs

Amritavalli (2017: 11) assumes the verbal functional structure to be 'the locus of parametric variation'. This idea, however, is not without its problems. First, it is unclear what the nature of the 'verbal functional structure' that Amritavalli refers to is, and whether it is a genealogical feature pertaining to a specific language family or sub-family, an areal phenomenon, or a wider typological feature. Secondly, there is no clear evidence in the broader typological literature (Moravcsik 1975, Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008) that could support either of these alternatives. As Moravcsik (1975) points out:

> 'The set of languages whose verb borrowing patterns have been illustrated above is clearly not characterizable as a genetic group or as a group of spatially adjacent languages; there is similarly no obvious typological property, either, that would define this group.' (Moravcsik 1975: 16)

Decades later, the typological accounts of loan-verb integration still concur with this opinion:

> '… the choice in a given language of one of the four major loan-verb-accommodation patterns cannot be predicted absolutely from structural properties of the languages involved.' (Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008: 108)

Given that patterns of direct integration of verbs transcend boundaries of language families or sub-families, geographical or linguistic areas, as well as properties of donor and recipient languages, it is imperative to seek an explanation of this phenomenon elsewhere. I return to this issue in §3.

2.5.3 Issue with optionality of direct integration of loan-verbs

The final issue faced by Amritavalli's (2017) analysis too is concerned with the verbal functional structure of languages. Under her analysis, the ability of a loan-verb to take the host language's inflection indicates the presence of a common verbal functional structure for the concerned languages. However, extending this analysis to the data from §2.1-2.3 leads to some contradictory results. At the end of §1, we already established that language pairs such as Hindi & Bangla and English & American Norwegian must have identical verbal functional structures given that borrowing of a verb within the given pairs result in direct borrowing without the need for verbal licensing. However, as seen in §2.1-2.2, at least some English verbs can directly appear in languages such as Hindi, and Marathi without needing a light verb (9-13); whereas some Marathi verbs have been borrowed into (Bambaiya) Hindi (15-16). Given the licensing analysis, we must then assume that there is a verbal functional structure common to these languages. However, if that is indeed the case, then why does the 'default' strategy of accommodating the English verbal borrowings

in Indian languages involve introducing a supporting light verb? It is also noteworthy that for all cases where direct integration of English verbs into Indian languages is possible, the direct integration of loan-verbs is entirely optional; and that each case of direct integration of a loan-verb can be substituted by a corresponding bilingual compound verb (9-10). However, Amritavalli's (2017) analysis does not allow us to entertain this duality where a licensing light verb is needed for some cases of borrowing but is rather optional for others. This raises the following question: what dictates the need, and more importantly the optionality of verbal licensing? I will address this issue in §3.

3 Accounting for optionality of direct integration of English loan-verbs

It turns out that key to the issues of the locus of borrowability and optionality of direct integration lies in the intensity of language contact and the degree of bilingualism of the speakers.

3.1 Borrowability of verbs and typology of loan-verb integration

Given that certain word classes or morpheme types can be more easily borrowed than others, several works have tried to capture this ease of borrowability leading to postulations of hierarchies of borrowing (Moravcsik 1978) and borrowing scale (Thomason & Kaufmann 1988), among others. According to Matras (2011: 204-205), that a particular word class or morpheme type is easier to borrow simply means that its '… borrowing will occur earlier in the history of contact and hence that it will require less intensive contact'. Works as early as Moravcsik (1975) have discussed the general difficulty of borrowing verbs where she shows that borrowed verbs are always accommodated in the host language by undergoing at least some mechanism of verbal derivation native to the host language. This begs the question as to why is borrowing of verbs difficult and why do verbs, once borrowed, require so many efforts to be integrated into the host language. Matras (2007: 47) thinks that their borrowing is '… made cumbersome in some languages due to the widespread tendency of verbs to be morphologically complex'. According to him:

> '… the difficulty lies in the conceptual complexity of the verb, and the fact that when borrowed and integrated, the verb is expected to perform two operations: the first is to serve as a referential lexical item – a context word, not dissimilar to a noun, adjective, or descriptive adverb. The second is to initiate the predication and so to serve as the principal anchor point for the entire proposition of the utterance. This latter function constitutes its verbness.' (Matras 2007: 48-49)

Under this view, a borrowed verb can serve its referential function immediately upon entering the host language's system. This, however,

> '… is not always sufficient in order to assume the role of predication-initiator. A great number of languages therefore require this additional, crucial function to be explicitly marked out in the verbal expression: in other words, they need to transform the strictly "lexical" depiction of an action/event into

a predicate.' (Matras 2007: 49)

Establishing why verbs are comparatively harder to borrow still leaves us with the following question: how do we make sense of the variation in the morphosyntactic means employed by languages (or by a single language in some cases) to accommodate a borrowed verb? Wichmann & Wohlgemuth (2008: 108) advance an explanation based on intensity of contact and degree of bilingualism of the speakers; and propose that '… if a language has different patterns, these could correlate with the degrees to which speakers of the target language are exposed to the source language(s)'. Taking this idea one step further, they propose the following:

> 'The degree to which a loan verb is integrated into the target language may be considered inversely proportional to the amount of formal mechanics expended by the target language on accommodating the loan verb.' (Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008: 109)

That is, the higher the proficiency of a speaker is in the concerned languages, lesser would be the morphosyntactic means that they need to employ in accommodating a loan-verb. In turn, usage of a particular accommodation strategy is also indicative of the speaker's proficiency in the language's concerned. This allowed Wichmann & Wohlgemuth (2008: 109) to place the strategies of loan-verb integration on a 'loan-verb integration hierarchy':

(21)   Light verb strategy < indirect insertion < direct insertion < paradigm transfer

Such a hierarchy – proposed 'as an idea to be tested in future research' – not only provides a window into understanding the possible nature and intensity of the contact situation and/or the degree of bilingualism of speakers involved, but also allows us to make predictions about the same. As Wichmann & Wohlgemuth point out, '… if a language already has a strategy and changes this or adds another one, then the new strategy's placement in the hierarchy relative to the earlier strategy would be determined by the relative degree of bilingualism in the source language or languages.' This is evident from the cases of English loan-verbs in Marathi and Hindi where in addition to the light-verb strategy – which has been the default – at least some speakers can and do allow direct integration of English verbs in these languages. This isn't surprising given that each generation of Indian language speakers has an increased exposure to English and could said to be more proficient in English than the previous one – including cases where younger generations from Indian metro cities are being brought up bi/multilingual with English being one of the languages.

Thus, characterizing the different strategies of loan-verb integration as correlates of their degree of bilingualism provides an explanation for the presence of one or more strategies of loan-verb integration as well for some strategies of loan-verb integration being entirely optional.

3.2 Strategies of loan-verb integration and Indian languages

In this subsection, I will briefly review each of the loan-verb integration strategies, with a focus on their attestation in Indian languages.

In the 'light verb strategy', the loan-verb is accommodated using a light verb which

carries the necessary verbal morphology. This is perhaps the default strategy for Indian languages when adapting English loan-verbs, as seen in Kannada (2), Bangla (3), Marathi (7-8), as well as Manange (20a) spoken in neighbouring Nepal.

In 'indirect insertion strategy', the loan-verb is accommodated using an affix. Apart from Nepali loan-verbs in Manange (seen in 20b), certain cases of Hindi verbs appearing in what Bhatia (1989) calls 'Filmi English' seem to be cases like indirect insertion, where the addition of morpheme '-o-' to a Hindi verb *g^herna* 'encircle' allows the resulting stem to appear with English past tense morphology. Bhatia thus calls '-o-' stem forming vowel.[15]

(22)   He was ***g^hera***-o-ed by more girls than he could handle.

　　　　　encircle-o-PST

'He was encircled by more girls than he could handle.'   (Bhatia 1989: 269)

The indirect insertion strategy is similar to the light verb strategy in the sense that in both the strategies, a borrowed verb needs to undergo licensing but differs in terms of the licensing element involved. In the light verb strategy, it is the light verb which acts as a licensing verbalizer; whereas the loan-verb is verbalized by an affix in the indirect insertion strategy. Since a loan-verb still needs to be licensed in the indirect insertion strategy, it should not appear without the verbalizing affix. This prediction is well borne out as Bhatia points out that the borrowed Hindi verbs cannot appear in English without the '-o-' morpheme which acts as a verbalizer (23).

(23)   *He was ***g^hera***-ed by more girls than he could handle.

　　　　　encircle-PST

(Intended) 'He was encircled by more girls than he could handle.' (Bhatia 1989: 269)

The 'direct insertion' strategy (seen in 4, 6, 9-19) refers to the cases where a loan-verb can take the host language's inflectional morphology without having to undergo any overt morphosyntactic changes.

When '… the loan verb is not adapted to the recipient language's morphology at all but is borrowed along with significant parts of the donor language's verbal morphology which maintains its function' (Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008: 102), it constitutes a case of 'paradigm transfer'. Such scenarios are much rarer than other strategies of loan-verb integration and are seen only in intensive contact situations. In the Indian context, certain Kannada borrowings in Konkani pointed out by Miranda (1977: 263) constitute cases of paradigm transfer. He points out that Kannada employs suffix '-isu' to 'foreign' nouns to derive denominal verbs. Many of such denominal verbs have been borrowed into Konkani along with the '-isu' suffix which maintains its denominative status in Konkani.

(24)   Paradigm transfer in Kannada-Konkani borrowings
　　a) Sanskrit *ad^har* (assistance) → Kannada *ad^harisu* → Konkani *ədərʃi* (help)
　　b) Sanskrit *upəyogə* (utilization) → Kannada *upəyogisu* → Konkani *upyogʃi* (use)

Thus, it is evident that all four strategies of loan-verb integration are attested in Indian

---

[15] For arguments against '-o-' being introduced for purely phonological reasons, see Bhatia (1989: 271)

languages, albeit to differing extents. The light verb strategy – associated with least proficiency of speakers – has been the 'default' one when it comes to borrowing English verbs in Indian languages. There is also comparatively recent tendency, however, of English loan-verbs getting directly integrated in some Indian languages, albeit in limited domains which likely reflects the usage of highly proficient bilinguals (as discussed briefly in §3.1). Cases of indirect insertion are attested in Nepali loan-verbs in Manange – where the two languages have been in long-term contact and many Manange speakers have been educated with Nepali being the medium of instructions[16]; as well as Hindi verbs appearing in Filmi English – a variety spoken by highly proficient Hindi-English bilinguals. Lastly, paradigm transfer is observed in Kannada loan-verbs in Konkani, where the two languages have been in an intense contact situation for centuries.

Each of these instances thus seem consistent with Wichmann & Wohlgemuth's proposal that the usage of strategies roughly correlate with the degree of bilingualism of speakers, and in turn, the intensity of language contact; and thus, provide evidence in support of the loan-verb integration hierarchy itself.

3.3 On grammatical category of borrowed verbs

The next question I deal with is of the syntactic category of borrowed verbs. More precisely, I look at whether the borrowed verbs retain their syntactic category once they have been borrowed. The literature on loan-verb typology is not in agreement about whether borrowed verbs retain their 'verb hood' in the host language. Moravcsik (1975) claims that verbs are borrowed as nouns[17], whereas Wichmann and Wohlgemuth (2008) opine that there is no clear evidence of verbs being borrowed as nouns but think that they are borrowed as non-verbs. On the other hand, usage of the term 'bilingual compound verb' in the literature suggests presence of two verbs, each from a different language. Considering the patterns of borrowing and loan-verb integration attested in the previous literature and the novel data presented in this paper, as well as given the role degree of bilingualism of speakers plays in optionality of direct integration of loan-verbs, I would like to propose the following:

> During the process of borrowing, speakers with a high degree of bilingualism retain the information about the syntactic identity of the borrowed item, irrespective of whether its syntactic category is preserved in the recipient language. That is, a verb, when borrowed, is borrowed with an understanding that it is a verb, even though it may not function like one in the recipient language immediately upon entering its system.

The evidence in support of this comes from various counts:

Annamalai (1989: 50-51) points out that balanced and imbalanced Tamil-English bilinguals differ in terms of how they borrow English verbs. In Tamil, verbs can be formed from nouns by the addition of verb *pəɳɳu* 'do', as in *kəlyaɳəm pəɳɳu* 'marry' (lit. 'marriage

---

[16] For more on Nepali-Manange contact, see Hildebrandt 2009
[17] '… the class of borrowed constituents in a language does not include lexically homolingual constituents that are verbs in both languages' (Moravcsik 1975: 4)

do'). In case of English borrowings in Tamil, imbalanced bilinguals follow the Tamil pattern and use English nominals with *pəɳɳu* to form a verb (25a), whereas balanced bilinguals use the English verbal forms to do the same (25b).

(25)   English borrowings in Tamil

    a) *əvən*   *enne*   ***confusion****-pəɳɳiʈʈan*
         he   me   confusion-did

    b) *əvən*   *enne*   ***confuse****-pəɳɳiʈʈan*
         he   me   confuse-did

    'He confused me.'

A case parallel to the one above is of how verbal and nominal borrowings behave once borrowed into the host language. If we assume that verbs are borrowed as nouns, then they should be treated on par with the nominal borrowings by the speakers. That is, once borrowed into the host language, borrowed nouns as well as verbs should behave the same way, and should be subjected to similar morphosyntactic processes. This prediction is not borne out, for direct integration of a borrowed English verb is possible in Marathi (26b), but an English noun cannot take the host language's verb morphology (26a). Similarly, borrowed English verbs cannot take host language's nominal morphology, only borrowed nouns can.

(26)   Direct integration borrowed English verbs and nouns in Marathi

    a) *mad͡zʰə* ***confusion***   *d͡zʰa-lə / *****confusion****-lə*
         I.GEN   confusion   be-PRF / confusion-PRF

    b) *mi*   ***confuse***   *d͡zʰa-lo /* ***confuse****-lo*
         I   confuse   be-PRF / confuse-PRF

    'I got confused.'

Another argument in support of this comes from instances of bilingual children's accidental or inadvertent language usage. Bilingual children, including cases where they have been exposed to more than one language but aren't necessarily equally proficient in both, often accidentally infuse verbs from one language in the sentence from another along with the host language's morphology (27a-c).

(27)   Inadvertent language mixing by children

    a) *to*   *mə-la*   ***gʰur****-toy*   (Hindi verb *gʰurna* 'stare' in Marathi)
         he   1-DAT   stare-PROG
    'He is staring at me.'   (Chinmay Dharurkar, p.c.)

    b) *mi*   *ata*   ***bʰag****-te*   (Hindi verb *bʰagna* 'run' in Marathi)
         I   now   run-IMPRF
    'I will run now.'

    c) I   am   ***zop****-ing*   (Marathi verb *zopɳe* 'sleep' in English)
                        sleep
    'I am sleeping.'

Though such cases where bilinguals accidentally 'misuse' words from one language by

using them in another aren't exactly surprising[18], what is remarkable here is the children's ability to insert the verb stem from one language into the frame of another while the inserted verb takes on the verbal inflections of the host language – something that only highly proficient bilinguals can do. This perhaps reflects children's implicit knowledge of syntactic categories of lexical items in both languages, and hints at such knowledge being acquired rather early on. Milton & Donzelli (2013: 443), for example, mention that certain theories of (early) second language acquisition make a distinction between forms – which contain information about morphophonogical forms of words, and lemmas – which contain information about the meaning and syntactic categories of words, and that the L2 learners grasp the idea of lemma very early on in their learning process. Haznedar & Garuseva (2013: 346) also mention 'Lexical Learning Hypothesis' which predicts the knowledge of lexical categories to be acquired early on[19].

This provides evidence in support of the idea that bilinguals with a higher degree of proficiency in both languages retain the information about the syntactic category of the lexical item they are borrowing.

4 Summary

In this paper, I have a provided an overview of loan-verb integration strategies attested in Indian languages, with a focus on English verbal borrowings in Hindi and Marathi. Such borrowings can either be accommodated using a supporting light verb or be directly integrated to appear with the host language's morphology. This optionality of loan-verb integration cannot be adequately explained by syntactic analyses of verbal borrowings such as the one proposed by Amritavalli (2017) which posits common verbal functional structure to be a prerequisite to the direct integration of verbs. Following Matras (2007, 2011) and Wichmann et. al. (2008), I argue that it is the degree of bilingualism of speakers which makes direct integration of loan verbs into the target language possible. Further, I propose that proficient bilinguals retain the information about the syntactic identity of the borrowed elements which allows for their direct integration in the host language. In doing so, I provide evidence from verbal borrowings in Indian languages in support of Wichmann & Wohlgemuth's (2008) loan-verb integration hierarchy which posits a causal relationship between the degree of bilingualism of speakers and morphosyntactic complexity of loan-verb integration strategy used.

Acknowledgements

---

[18] See for example, Bialystok (2003: 108-109) on accidental/inadvertent 'mixing' by bilingual children: '… children's linguistic representations are organized according to the two languages, but terms and structures from the other language are selected if they are required to fill a gap in the language the child is attempting to use. Just as young monolinguals will use a close but incorrect label for an object they want to talk about, so too will bilingual children use an item from their other language when it is necessary to express their current meaning.'

[19] As opposed to functional categories which are acquired later sequentially.

References

Amritavalli, R. 2017. Application *diya*, apply *kiya*: borrowings and the light verb. *Indian Linguistics,* 78:1-2, pp. 9-23.

Annamalai, E. 1989. The language factor in code mixing. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 75, pp. 47 – 54. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1989.75.47

Bhatia, T. 1989. Bilinguals' creativity and syntactic theory: evidence for emerging grammar. *World Englishes,* 8:3, pp. 265-276. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1989.tb00668.x

Bhatia, T. & W. Ritchie. 2016. Multilingual Language Mixing and Creativity. *Languages*, *1(1)*, 6; https://doi.org/10.3390/languages1010006

Bialystok, E. 2003. *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511605963

Dharurkar, C. 2019. Borrowed words make it *informal*! The pragmatics and aesthetics of code-mixing of English in Indian languages. In A. Rath, C. Chatterjee, & S. Ganapathy (Eds.), *Critical Essays in Literature, Language, & Aesthetics: A Volume in Honour of Milind Malshe*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 249-261.

Haznedar, B. & Gavruseva, E. (2013). Childhood second language acquisition. In J. Herschensohn & M. Young-Scholten (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 338-352. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139051729.021

Hildebrandt, K. A. 2009. Loanwords in Manange, a Tibeto-Burman language of Nepal. In M. Haspelmath & U. Tadmoor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the World's Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 447-470. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110218442.447

Hook, P. E. & Pardeshi, P. 2009. The semantic evolution of Eat-expressions. In J. Newman (Ed.), *Linguistics of Eating and Drinking*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 153-172. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.84.08hoo

Kulkarni, A. 2017. Syntax and semantics of HIT-Expressions in Marathi. Unpublished master's dissertation. Deccan College Post-Graduate & Research Institute.

Madrikar, K. S. 1954. A linguistics study of Marathi language in the 17th century with special reference to Dasbodh. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Savitribai Phule Pune University.

Matras, Y. 2007. Borrowability of structural categories. In: Y. Matras & J. Sakel (Eds.), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 31-74. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199192.31

Matras, Y. 2011. Universals of structural borrowing. In: P. Siemund (Ed.), *Linguistic Universals and Language Variation*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 200-229. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110238068.204

Milton, J. & Donzelli, G. 2013. The lexicon. Herschensohn & M. Young-Scholten

(Haz.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 441-460. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139051729.027

Miranda, R. 1977. The assimilation of Dravidian loans to Konkani phonological and morphological patterns. Indo-Iranian Journal 19, pp. 247-265. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00183519

Moravcsik, E. 1975. Verb borrowing. *Wiener Linguistische Gazette*, 8, pp. 3-30.

Moravcsik, E. 1978. Language contact. In: Greenberg, J. (Ed.), C. A. Ferguson, & E. A. Moravcsik (Ass. Eds.), *Universals of Human Language 1*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 93-122.

Muysken, P. 2000. *Bilingual speech: a typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press.

Muysken, P. 2016. From Colombo to Athens: Areal and Universalist Perspectives on Bilingual Compound Verbs. *Languages, 1(1), 2*. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages1010002

Poonam. 2020. A case study of Hindi-English hybridized verbs on Twitter. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Punjab.

Romaine, S. 1995. *Bilingualism.* Blackwell: Oxford, UK.

Wichmann, S. and Wohlgemuth, J. 2008. Loan verbs in a typological perspective. In: Stolz T., R. S. Palomo & D. Bakker (eds.): *Aspects of Language Contact. New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romancisation Processes*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 89-121. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110206043.89