Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics 46(1), 2010, pp. 69–84

doi:10.2478/v10010-010-0004-8

INDIVIDUATING AND ORDERING SITUATIONS IN BANGLA

SAMIR KARMAKAR
Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur
samirk@iitk.ac.in

ABSTRACT

The paper investigates complex predicate and serial verb constructions to explore how the meaning construing capacities of different syntactic categories are determined by the underlying structure of the construal specific communicative intents. In doing so, I have discussed the role of participle in integrating the argument structures and lexical aspects into the resultant construal. It is also shown how the concepts, like sequentiality and simultaneity, remain significant in determining different types of grammatical constraints while construing an interpretation.

KEYWORDS: Aspect; construal; individuating; ordering; situation; temporality.

1. Introduction

This paper seeks to investigate how the participle, in a construal[1] having the following syntactic structure, integrates various contextualities in Bangla (henceforth, Bāŋlā). More specifically, the role of participle, as a control structure, will be discussed here to explore how it regulates the construal specific synchronizations of various contextualities, under the assumption that our understanding of the situations plays a significant role in deciding the control behavior of the participle.

(1) V_i-participle V_j-aspect-$tense_x$-$person_x$[2, 3]

[1] A construal has (i) conceptual content and (ii) syntactic organization. In virtue of having conceptual content, it regulates the inflow of the commonsense knowledge into the interpretation; and because of being construed in a certain way it has a syntactic organization. It is found that the discussion of these two constituents is often done with respect to each other, mainly because of the reason that they are inextricably intertwined with each other in a construal.

[2] Abbreviations used: nominative = nom, accusative = acc, dative = dat, locative = loc, classifier = cl, participle = prt, perfect = perf, imperfect = impf, third person singular = 3, infinitive = inf.

[3] In Bāŋlā, person marker is sensitive to tense. Therefore, tense and person are co-indexed.

The underlying motivation for this study comes from the fact that arrangements of the situations in construal are crucial in scaffolding the various structures of temporality; because temporality, as an ordering principle, is conceived in terms of the relations existing among the situations (Turetzky 1998; Karmakar 2009). Since, language is one among the many other ways of communicating temporality; we seek to explore the problem of representing and processing temporality with a special reference to the aforementioned syntactic structure. Therefore, while investigating the role of the participle in a construal having a syntactic structure like (1), I have approached the problem of languaging various structures of temporality in terms of the following two questions:

(2) How does the act of languaging work in discretizing/individuating the situations?
(3) How is the ordering of situations languaged?

The conceptual complexities involved with the aforementioned syntactic structure are also addressed by the other scholars who are primarily concerned with the formation of complex predicate (Dasgupta 1977; Butt 2003; Samek-Lodovici 2003; Ramchand 2008) and serial verbs (Dasgupta 1977; Baker 1989; Li 1993; Collins 1997; Carsten 2002; Jayaseelan 2004). What remains prevalent in all those studies is their concern about the categorial status of V_i and V_j at the level of syntax in terms of their respective semantic contributions in the resultant construals. They are not concerned about the integrity of different construals; rather they are concerned about the integrity of the aforementioned syntactic structure itself and the way structural constituents are behaving syntactically. For example, Butt (2003) concentrates on object agreement, anaphora and control to establish the monoclausality of the Urdu complex predicate; or, as Jayaseelan (2004) shows – while dealing with Malayalam serial verbs – that the constituent verbs have the freedom to have two distinct objects. Dasgupta (1977) while discussing the pattern of co-occurrences in case of Bāŋlā compound verbs proposes the principle of transitive harmony[4] which remains functional in deciding the selectional biases of vector and polar verbs. But the criterion is still syntacto-centric.

All these insights are significant in proposing the syntactic processes involved in argument sharing; though, the question what governs the syntactic behaviors of the constituencies still remain unanswered. Additionally, most of them restrict themselves in studying the argument structure, while neglecting the situation semantics, which is a crucial component of verb semantics. Viewing the problem form the perspective, which

[4] Dasgupta (1977: 70) argues that in the case of compound verb construction (as against the sequence of pole construction), both the pole (V_i) and vector (V_j) verbs will be either transitive or intransitive; the combination of transitive and intransitive verbs will not result into a compound verb construal. He has given the following example to establish his claim: *likh-e phel-ā* 'to write down' where both the verb forms (i.e. *likh-* 'to write' and *phel-* 'to throw') are transitive; *bas-e paḍ-ā* 'to sit down' where both the verb forms (i.e. *bas-* 'to sit' and *paḍ-* 'to read') are intransitive. But, as per Dasgupta *likh-e paḍ-ā* and *bos-e phelā* are not compound verbs in Bāŋlā. This compound verb internal phenomenon is termed as transitive harmony.

most of the above mentioned studies follows (obviously with various analytical rigor), unfolds only a part of the cognitive processes and structures associated with the aforementioned syntactic composition. If we view it from a conceptual viewpoint – which involves the cognitive capacities of individuating and ordering the situations – more insights can be achieved about the way situations are languaged while producing and comprehending discourses. We will notice that much of our syntactic competence in this context is determined by the very composition of the associated thoughts. The current paper differs from the approaches discussed above on the basis of its emphasis on the communicative intent as the determinant of the meaning, as opposed to viewing meaning generating capacity as the consequence of deeper level of system/structure. Following Rochberg-Halton (1982), I have classified the approach of this paper as "symbolic interactionism", in contrast to "structuralism". This approach views meaning as a communicative process triggered by the interpretive acts. It emphasizes the need of studying uniqueness and variability of construals and also to the way construals reflect habitual attitudes of the minds in an act of communication.

In Section 2, the problem will be addressed in detail to show how the various construals, in spite of sharing the same syntactic structure, exhibit different types of inferential behaviors. Section 3 outlines the theoretical and methodological issues employed in this paper. Section 4 investigates the role of participle in individuating the situation - an attempt to answer question (2). Section 5 discusses the role of the participle in ordering the individuated situation to address the issue raised in question (3). Section 6 contains the concluding remarks.

2. Problem statements

The aforementioned syntactic structure consists of a non-finite verb followed by a finite one. A verbal root being inflected with a participle results into a non-finite verb (V_i-participle). Bāŋlā has two participles, namely *-e* and *-te*. They participate in the construal in consonance with other contextualities to specify the way (i) a situation is individuated and (ii) individuated situations are ordered with respect to one another. Being inflected with tense, aspect and person, a verbal root constitutes the finite verb (V_j-aspect-$tense_x$-$person_x$). Three different meaning construals are projected by this syntactic structure in Bāŋlā. They are exemplified below:

	V_i-participle	V_j-aspect-$tense_x$-$person_x$		
(4a)	rām-Ø	satti-ṭā-Ø	**bal-e**	**phel-ech-il-o**
	Ram-nom	truth-cl-acc	speak-prt	throw-perf-$past_x$-3_x
	'Ram had spoken out/revealed the truth.'			
(4b)	rām-Ø	khabar-ṭā-Ø	**diy-e**	**es-ech-il-o**
	Ram-nom	news-cl-acc	give-prt	come-perf-$past_x$-3_x
	'Ram had come (back), after giving the news (to somebody).'			

(4c) rām-Ø śyām-ke **je-te** **dekh-ech-il-o**
Ram-nom Shyam-acc go-prt see-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$
'Ram had seen Shyam to go.'

To a native speaker of Bāŋlā, (4a) predicates a single situation in contrast to the situation-complexes of (4b) and (4c). Nevertheless, (4b) and (4c) also differs from each other because in case of the former, situations are sequentially ordered in contrast to the simultaneous ordering of the latter construal. These differences in terms of their respective conceptualizations motivate the following classification of the construals: The first major classification rests on the opposition of *monosituational* (traditionally, complex predicate) vs. *disituational* (traditionally, serial verb). Disituational construals are further classified as *sequentially ordered*[5] and *simultaneously ordered*. The validity of the classification can be noticed in the construal specific inferential behaviors. Consider the following examples:

(5) Monosituational Construal
V_i-participle V_j-aspect-tense$_x$-person$_x$
├ V_i-aspect-tense$_x$-person$_x$
├¬ (V_j-aspect-tense$_x$-person$_x$)

rām-Ø satti-ṭā-Ø bal-e phel-ech-il-o
Ram-nom truth-cl-acc speak -prt throw-perf-pastx-3x
├ rām-Ø satti-ṭā-Ø bal-ech-il-o
'(It-is-the-case-that) Ram had spoken out/revealed the truth.'

├¬ (rām-Ø satti-ṭā-Ø phel-ech-il-o)
'(It-is-not-the-case-that) Ram had thrown (the truth).'

In a monosituational construal, the semantics of V_j has no separate predicative capacity apart from that of V_i (Dasgupta 1977; Butt 2003; Ramchand 2008). This fact can be better understood by comparing it with the inferences licensed by the monosituational and disituational construals. Observe the inferential behaviors of the disituational construals in (6):

(6) Disituational Construal
V_i-participle V_j-aspect-tense$_x$-person$_x$
├ V_i-aspect-tense$_x$-person$_x$
├ V_j-aspect-tense$_x$-person$_x$

[5] In most of the cases, the traditional approach to the serial verb construction is concerned primarily with the sequentially ordered construals.

(6a) Sequentially Ordered

rām-Ø	khabar-ṭā-Ø	diy-e	es-ech-il-o
Ram-nom	news-cl-acc	give-prt	come-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$

├ rām-Ø khabar-ṭā-Ø diy-ech-il-o
'(It-is-the-case-that) Ram had given the news (to somebody).'

├ rām-Ø es-ech-il-o
'(It-is-the-case-that) Ram had come (back).'

(6b) Simultaneously Ordered

rām-Ø	śyām-ke	je-te	dekh-ech-il-o
Ram-nom	Shyam-acc	go-prt	see-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$

├ śyām- Ø jāc-ch-il-o
'(It-is-the-case-that) Shyam was going.'

├ rām-Ø dekh-ech-il-o
'(It-is-the-case-that) Ram had seen.'

Unlike monosituational, disituational construals license inferences related to both V_i and V_j forms. The obvious consequence is that the semantics of V_j is not merely of auxiliary type in disituational construals.

Even among the disituational construals, the nature of inferences differs from each other on the basis of the temporal relations holding between the situations. Consider the following examples:

(7a) Sequentially Ordered Construal

rām-Ø	khabar-ṭā-Ø	diy-e	ās-ch-il-o
Ram-nom	news-cl-acc	give-prt	come-impf-past$_x$-3$_x$

├ rām-Ø khabar-ṭā-Ø diy-ech-il-o
'(It-is-the-case-that) Ram had given the news (to somebody).'

├ rām-Ø ās-ch-il-o
'(It-is-the-case-that) Ram was coming (back).'

(7b) Simultaneously Ordered Construal

rām-Ø	śyām-ke	je-te	dekh-ech-il-o
Ram-nom	Shyam-acc	go-prt	see-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$

├ śyām-Ø jāc-ch-il-o
'(It-is-the-case-that) Shyam was going.'

├ rām-Ø dekh-ech-il-o
'(It-is-the-case-that) Ram had seen.'

In the case of sequentially ordered construal, as in (7a), irrespective of the aspectual specification of the finite verb form (V_j), the inference associated with the non-finite verb form (V_i) is marked perfectively. Quite contrarily, in the case of simultaneously ordered construal as in (7b), the inference associated with the non-finite verb form (V_i) is marked imperfectively, irrespective of the aspectual specification of the finite verb form (V_j). In (8), these construal specific peculiarities are summarized to show how the construals constrain the lexical and grammatical behaviors of its constituents.

(8a) A monosituational construal simply blocks the inference associated with Vj verb form.

(8b) While licensing inferences,
(i) sequentially ordered construal always marks Vi as perfective
(ii) simultaneously ordered construal always marks Vi as imperfective.

Why do these construals differ in their meaning construing capacities? Following Langacker (2008: 55), it can be argued that the difference in their respective meaning construing capacities, in spite of sharing the same syntactic structure, is partly due to the conceptual contents (corresponding to V_i, V_j, participle, aspect, tense, person) and partly because of the way respective interpretations are construed through a process of conceptual integration. As a consequence, various degrees of complexities need to be worked out to address the problems involved in individuating situations (e.g. question 2) and ordering the individuated situations (e.g. question 3). More specifically, the observation of (8) suggests two different questions: (i) how do the semantics of V_i and V_j interact in conceptual integration? And, (ii) how do the semantics of V_i and/or V_j interacts with the semantics of perfect and imperfect aspects? Answer to these questions will reveal the role of participle in conceptual integration; which, in turn, will illuminate one among many other ways of languaging temporality (as an ordering principle) in Bāŋlā.

3. Theoretical and methodological requisitions

Investigating the process of conceptual integration in *Bāŋlā* – with a special reference to the construals sharing the syntactic structure of type (1) – involves certain issues of theoretical and methodological significances. The theoretical issues, concerned with the conceptualization of situations, viewpoints, and orderings, will help in understanding what types of conceptual information are invoked and how they are accommodated. While discussing the issues of methodological significance, I will show how underlying conceptualization determines the way various structures are represented in this paper.

3.1. Theoretical issues

By contextualities, the semantics of verb, aspect, tense and participle are meant.[6] Verb semantics consists of argument structure and situation types. The significance of aspect lies in its capacity to fix the viewpoint. Tense is crucial in providing information about the location of the situation with respect to the time of interpretation. I will restrict myself in studying those synchronizations which involve the lexical aspect (situation semantics) and the grammatical aspect (viewpoint aspect) in a construal. I will also discuss the notions of sequentiality and simultaneity, which remain operative in constraining the meaning construing capacities of the grammatical expressions as discussed in Section 2. The intervention of the commonsense understanding in deciding the grammatical usage is so frequent that the production and comprehension of any construal cannot and should not be explained by the semantic meaning alone (Dahl 1985; Smith 1991).

3.1.1. Situation semantics

The first two major classes of situations, as Mourelatos (1978) argues, rest on the static vs. non-static opposition. A static situation is termed as state (e.g. 'love', 'know' etc.), whereas a non-static situation is termed as occurrences/actions. The occurrences or actions are further classified on the basis of transitional vs. non-transitional opposition. If the occurrences or actions are non-transitional then they will be categorized as processes/activities (e.g. 'run', 'play' etc.), otherwise will be termed as events/performances. Events or performances involve telic interpretation. They are of two types. If the events or the performances involve a sense of gradual transition from one stage to another, then they will be classified as developments/accomplishments (e.g. 'draw', 'build' etc.), otherwise will be classified as punctual occurrences/achievements (e.g. 'arrive', 'notice' etc.).

3.1.2. Viewpoint semantics

The viewpoint aspect concerns with the perfective and imperfective interpretation of the situations. The rationale behind the perfective vs. imperfective distinction can be conceptualized as exocentric vs. endocentric viewpoints. The exocentric view describes a situation as an integral whole; on the other hand the endocentric view describes a situation in terms of its internal stages. The exocentric and endocentric viewpoints results into the bounded and unbounded interpretations of the corresponding time interval of a situation (Forsyth 1970; Binnick 1991; Smith1991).

---

[6] In Bāŋlā, person is also significant in construing the context of interpretation. However, keeping the scope of this paper in mind I have decided not to include it in the current discussion.

3.1.3. Semantics of the order

Sequentiality, as an order of succession, presupposes the bounded interpretation of the constituent situations, which in turn results into the expectation of perfective marking. In contrast, simultaneity – as an order of coexistences – concentrates on the internalities of the situation; and therefore imperfective marking of the situation is expected. What follows is the instrumentality of sequential and simultaneous orderings in deciding the use of perfect and imperfect aspect in Bāŋlā: The construal of sequential ordering presumes the succession of bounded situations in contrast to the coexistence of situations while ordering simultaneously: In case of simultaneous ordering, situations are referred with respect to one another's internal expansions.

3.2. Methodological issues

Since monosituational construals – which are popularly known and widely studied as compound verbs – are unstructured whole (situations) in the sense it is discussed in Section 2; they have single event time. The singularity of the event time has no temporal component internal to itself. Compare the temporal structure of (9) with (10).

(9) rām-Ø satti-ṭā-Ø bal-e phel-ech-il-o
Ram-nom truth-cl-acc speak-prt throw-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$
'Ram had spoken out / revealed the truth.'
Temporal structure: E < R < S

Contrariwise, disituational construals are structured whole; and therefore unfolding a complex pattern of macrosituation internal and external times. By the term macrosituation internal time, I intend the relative ordering of the two event times with respect to one another. In contrast, external time emerges due to the ordering of the macrosituation as a unity with respect to speech time and reference time. The structure internal to the macrosituation is circumscribed with solid square (see (10c)): So the time internal to the macrosituation differs from the time external to macrosituation in terms of the circumscription, which is an consequence of individuating. The internal and external temporalities – as the manifestations of lexical and grammatical contextualities – interact and influence each other.

(10) rām-Ø śyam-ke khabar-ṭā-Ø diy-e es-ech-il-o
Ram-nom Shyam-dat news-cl-acc give-prt come-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$
'Ram had come (back), after giving the news to Shyam.'

(10a) rām-Ø śyam-ke khabar-ṭā-Ø diy-ech-il-o
Ram-nom Shyam-dat news-cl-acc give- perf-past$_x$-3$_x$
$E_g < R_g < S_g$

(10b) rām-Ø es-ech-il-o
Ram-nom come-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$
$E_c < R_c < S_c$

(10c) Temporal structure of (9)
$\boxed{\mathbf{E_g < E_c}} < R < S$

In (10), each of the constituents is represented as independent situations in (10a) and (10b). Then, in (10c), both of them are integrated to get the intended temporal description of (10).

I have followed the proposal of Reichenbach (1947) to represent the various temporal structures. As per this proposal tense and aspect are represented in terms of *precedence* (<) and *overlap* (o) relations. In addition, overlap is further categorized as *coextensively simultaneous* (o), and *inclusively simultaneous* (ε) to capture conceptual underpinnings of the language specific data used for this paper.[7] The temporal location of a situation is represented in terms of the relation holding between speech time (S) and reference time (R), whereas the information about the viewpoints are represented in terms of the reference time (R) and event time (E). Moreover, Reichenbach's following proposal on *permanence of reference point* is of interest here:

(11) *Permanence of the reference point:*
Although the events referred to in the clauses may occupy different time points, the reference point should be the same for all clauses.

This proposal remains salient in the process of conceptual integration by simplifying R-times and S-times of the constituent situations in case of disituational construals (cf. (10)).

In case of monosituational construal, as the aforementioned discussion shows, the queries now boil down into the investigation of the way the semantics of V_i and V_j interact with each other. In brief, the problem revolves around the notion of individuating a single situation. However, disituational construal differs in terms of complexities from the monosituational one in virtue of permitting both the predicates, appearing in V_i and V_j positions of (1), to keep their respective existences intact in it. The absolute freedom of the situations in a disituational construal, then in turn, plays a significant role in unfolding the macrosituation internal and external temporalities.

So far, I have discussed the problem in detail in Section 2; and in Section 3, theoretical and methodological requisitions are discussed to set the background for investigating the role of participle in individuating and ordering the situations in a construal

[7] If S_i representing a matrix situation holds at t_i, and S_j representing a embedded situation holds at t_j, then
(a) in case of inclusively simultaneous ordering, $(S_i \varepsilon S_j) \rightarrow t_i \subset t_j$;
(b) in case of coextensively simultaneous ordering, $(S_i \text{ o } S_j) \rightarrow t_i \subseteq t_j$.

having an underlying syntactic structure of type (1). In the following sections, I will outline the way participle controls the various synchronizations while integrating the various constituents into a construal.

4. Individuating situations in monosituational construal

The role of participle in monosituational construction will be discussed to show the role of participle in individuating situation.

(12a) bal-e phel-ā (achievement)
speak-prt throw-inf
'to speak out'

(12b) bal-e cal-ā (activity)
speak-prt move-inf
'to speak continuously'

(12a) represents a situation of achievement type, since the act of speaking out figures a sense of instantaneous transition from one stage to another: Prior to a particular point on time, the spoken information is yet to be revealed; whereas just after that particular point on time, the spoken information has already been revealed. Additionally, it has also a sense of suddenness. In contrast, the situation represented by (12b) is of activity type, since the act of speaking figures a sense of continuity; though in both the cases *bal-* 'to speak' is of activity type. The meaning of the verb appearing in V_i position remains dominant in a monosituational construal, whereas V_j provides only the grammatical information relevant to tense and aspect (Dasgupta 1977; Abbi and Gopalakrishnan 1992; Bhattacharyya et al. 2006). If so, why is there a difference in the interpretations of (12a) and (12b)? A similar situation can also be noticed in the following example:

(13) phel-e cal-ā (activity)
throw-prt move-inf
'to throw continuously'

The verb form *phel-* 'to throw' appearing in the V_i position figures a sense of achievement due to the dislocation of an entity; whereas the verb form *cal-* 'to move' appearing in the V_j position profiles a sense of activity. However, the resultant situation projected by the construal is of activity type – figuring a sense of continuity. If V_j is lexically empty, why does the situation referred by *phel-e cal-ā* in (13) differ from the situation type of its V_i verb form, that is *phel-*? This anomaly can be solved in two ways, following either the thesis of grammaticalized light verb or the thesis of lexical polysemy.

4.1. Grammaticalized light verb

Grammaticalized light verb is considered as a major arial feature of south Asian languages (Masica 1976; Abbi and Gopalakrishnan 1992; Bhattacharyya et al. 2006). The studies on compound verb claim that the role of light verb (V_j) is rather operational, because of lacking substantial contribution in the lexical make up of the resultant construction. As operator, light verbs bear information about tense, aspect, person etc. (Burton-Page 1957). Specifically, the grammaticalized light verb does not contribute in the thematic inventory of the complex predicate. The thematic inventory of the compound verb is determined by the heavy verb (V_i).

According to this view a distinction between *phel-* of (12a) and *phel-* of (13) needs to be drawn. *Phel-* appears at the light verb position in (12a); whereas (13) exemplifies the heavy use of it. Is it the case that *phel-*, as heavy verb, is completely different than *phel-* as light verb? If they are indeed different, then they need to be mentioned separately in the lexicon. In such a situation, the achievement reading of the resultant construal of (12a) is coming from out of the blue.

To what extent does the solution outlined above seem to be plausible; particularly when it is found that light verbs always have corresponding full/heavy counterparts in all languages where they are found (Ramchand 2008: 124)? Consider the following example, which instantiates the heavy use of the verb *phel-*.

(14) rām-Ø phel-ech-il-o
Ram-nom throw-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$
'Ram had thrown.'

This particular fact provokes to look for an alternative solution which is conceptualized as the thesis of lexical polysemy.

4.2. Lexical polysemy

The thesis of lexical polysemy upholds the view that the difference in the meaning construing capacities of finite and non-finite uses of a verb form are determined by the contextual interactions within which they are embedded. It asserts that language is polysemous by nature. Because of being polysemic, the particular interpretation of an expression is context specific (Pustejovsky 1995: 5). Significance of this view lies in its emphasis on how meaning is construed due to the synchronization of various contextualities within a construal. As per this approach, the formation of any construal seeks to be examined in terms of conceptual integration, which is a dynamic process blocking and unblocking the polysemic possibilities in context. Therefore, a verb can have either a light use or a heavy use. The motivation for this sort of solution comes from a theoretical background where the grammatical function (light use) is taken at per with the lexi-

cal function (heavy use) (Brugman 2001). As a consequence, the light or heavy use of the same lexical item needs to be discerned with respect to the various synchronizations taking shape at the time of integrating contextualities. It is a process, as Wurff (1989: 384) argues, taking shape in the lexicon.

I will explain the anomaly discussed in Section 4 in terms of blocking and unblocking of possibilities in a construal. A construal, therefore, is conceived in this paper as the projection of underlying various synchronizations taking shape at the time of integrating the constituent concepts. In a monosituational construal the underlying control structure of the participle marker blocks the situation type of V_i and the argument structure of V_j to percolate to the resultant interpretation. This control structure remains salient in determining the inferential behavior of the monosituational construals.

This way of viewing the role of the participial marker in a monosituational construal contradicts the suggestions made by Ramchand (2008: 124–125). While discussing the monosituational constructions, like *bheŋ-e jāoy-ā* 'to be broken', *kar-e phel-ā* 'to be done' and *hes-e oṭh-ā* 'to burst out in sudden laughter', Ramchand argues that participial marker imposes the telic interpretation to the semantics of V_i. How does her claim explain the role of participle in the construals like (12b) and (13)? Since the examples she has cited are in line with the inferential patterns of the monosituational construal as shown in (5),[8] the issue is not of imposing the telic interpretation; rather I suggest it is about the conceptual fusion of V_i and V_j into the resultant construction, probably just in the fashion conceptual blending is discussed by Fauconnier and Turner (2002).

5. Ordering and individuating situations in disituational construal

In this section, I will investigate the role of participles in individuating and ordering the situations in a disituational construal. In doing so, the same imperative – set in Section 3 – will be followed.

5.1. Sequentially ordered construal

While ordering two situations sequentially, Bāŋlā participial marker *-e* licenses identity relation to the subjects of the constituent sentences containing V_i and V_j. In (15a), Ram

[8] Consider the following example:

rām-Ø hes-e uṭh-ech-il-o
Ram-nom laugh-prt rise-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$
'Ram had burst out in sudden laughter.'
⊢ rām-Ø hes-ech-il-o
'(It-is-the-case-that) Ram had laughed.'
⊢ ¬ (rām-Ø uṭh-ech-il-o)
'(It-is-not-the-case-that) Ram had risen.'

as the subject of the sentence containing V_i is identical with the subject of the sentence containing V_j. If the constituent sentences containing V_i and V_j have two non-identical subjects, as is shown in (15b), the resultant construal becomes conceptually ill-formed.

(15a) rām-Ø śyām-ke khabar-ṭā-Ø diy-e es-ech-il-o
Ram-nom Shyam-dat news-cl-acc give-prt come-perf-pastx-3_x
'Ram had come back after he had given the news to Shyam.'
Situation$_g$: **rām-Ø** śyām-ke khabar-ṭā-Ø diy-ech-il-o
'Ram had given the news to Shyam.'
$E_g < R_g < S_g$
Situation$_c$: **rām-Ø** es-ech-il-o
'Ram had come (back).'
$E_c < R_c < S_c$
Therefore, Situation$_g$ < Situation$_c$ → $\boxed{E_g < E_c}$ < R < S

(12b) *rām-Ø diy-e śyām-Ø es-ech-il-o
Ram-nom give-prt Shyam-nom come-perf-past$_x$-3_x

Since the notion of sequentiality emerges out of the succession of bounded situations (Section 3.1.3), the situation represented by V_i is always viewed exocentrically, irrespective of the tense specification associated with V_j. Consider the following example:

(16) rām-Ø boi-ṭā-Ø kin-e phir-ch-il-o
Ram-nom book-cl-acc buy-prt return-impf-past$_x$-3_x
Ram was returning back after he had bought the book.
├ ¬ (rām-Ø boi-ṭā-Ø kin-**ch**-il-o)

In (16), V_j is viewed endocentrically, because of being marked with imperfective. However, the situation corresponding to V_i is viewed as exocentrically; since the conceptual underpinning of the sequential ordering requires an exocentric view or the bounded reading of the preceding situation. The exocentric interpretation of V_i is triggered by the participial marker *-e*.

5.2. Simultaneously ordered construal

In the case of the simultaneously ordered construals, connectives behave differently. The constituent situations differ from each other not in terms of the subjects of V_i and V_j, but in terms of their respective situations.

(17) rām-Ø śyām-ke je-te dekh-ech-il-o
Ram-nom Shyam-acc go-prt see-perf-past$_x$-3_x
'Ram had seen Shyam to go.'

Situation$_g$: śyām-Ø jāc-ch-il-o
Shyam-nom go-impf-past$_x$-3$_x$
'Shyam was going.'
$(R_g \varepsilon E_g) < S_g$

Situation$_s$: rām-Ø śyām-ke dekh-ech-il-o
Ram-nom Shyam-acc see-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$
'Ram had seen Shyam.'
$E_s < R_s < S_s$

Therefore, Situation$_g$ o Situation$_s$ → $\boxed{E_s \varepsilon E_g} < R < S$

In the case of simultaneously ordered construals, the constituent situation represented by V_i is viewed endocentrically, irrespective of the perfective/imperfective marking of V_j. The imposition of endocentricity and the blocking of the grammatical aspect, as I have already mentioned earlier, is controlled by the semantics of the participle.

Bāŋlā follows different strategy while interpreting the situations, appearing in V_i and V_j positions, endocentrically (Wurff 1989: 385–386). Consider the following example:

(18) rām-Ø śyām-ke je-te je-te dekh-ech-il-o
Ram-nom Shyam-acc go-prt go-prt see-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$
'Ram, while going, had seen Shyam.'

Situation$_g$: rām-Ø jāc-ch-il-o
Ram-nom go-impf-past$_x$-3$_x$
'Ram was going.'
$(R_g \varepsilon E_g) < S_g$

Situation$_s$: rām-Ø śyām-ke dekh-ech-il-o
Ram-nom Shyam-acc see-perf-past$_x$-3$_x$
Ram had seen Shyam.
$E_s < R_s < S_s$

Therefore, Situation$_g$ o Situation$_s$ → $\boxed{E_s \text{ o } E_g} < R < S$

However, in the construction like (18), both V_i and V_j have the identical subject, which is unlikely to happen in the construction like (17).

The participle used in disituational construals differs from the participle used in monosituational construals by virtue of having viewpoint aspect as its semantic necessity. In case of the monosituational construal, the scope of the participle is limited to the integration of the lexical concepts appearing in V_i and V_j positions; whereas in case of

disituational construals, the scope of the participle is not limited to the domain of lexical concepts rather it facilitate the mutual influence of lexical and grammatical on one another.

6. Conclusion

The constitutional aspects of different grammatical categories in the syntactic structure, mentioned in (1), are determined by the underlying conceptual organization of the communicative intent. The construal specific interpretations are taking shape in the lexicon through the interactions holding among different concepts – related with individuating, ordering (sequential and simultaneous) and aspectual specifications (lexical and grammatical). The study shows while individuating monosituational and disituational construals how participle works in controlling the inflow of our semantic knowledge about the situations, viewpoints, and other contextualities. In addition, it points out what are the explicit linguistic cues on the basis of which the narrated situations are individuated and ordered in Bāŋlā.

REFERENCES

Abbi, A. and D. Gopalakrishnan. 1992. "Semantic typology of explicator compound verbs in the south Asian languages". *Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on Language and Linguistics*, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok. 687–701.

Baker, M. 1989. "Object sharing and projection in serial verb constructions". *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(4). 513–553.

Bhattacharyya, P., D. Chakrabarty and V.M. Sharma. 2006. "Complex predicates in Indian languages and wordnets". *Language Resources and Evaluation* 40. 331–355.

Binnick, R.I. 1991. *Time and the verb: A guide to tense and aspect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brugman, C., 2001. "Light verbs and polysemy". *Language Sciences* 23. 551–578.

Burton-Page, J. 1957. "Compound and conjunct verbs in Hindi". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 19(3). 469–478.

Butt, M. 2003. "The light verb jungle". *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics* 9. 1–49.

Carsten, V. 2002. "Antisymmetry and word order in serial constructions". *Language* 78(1). 3–50.

Collins, C. 2002. "Argument sharing in serial verb constructions". *Linguistic Inquiry* 28(3). 461–497.

Dahl, O. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dasgupta, P. 1977. "The internal grammar of compound verbs in Bengali". *Indian Linguistics* 38. 68–85.

Fauconnier, G. and M. Turner 2002. *The way we think*. New York: Basic Books.

Forsyth, J. 1970. *A grammar of aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jayaseelan, K.A. 2004. "The serial verb construction in Malayalam". In: Dayal, V. and K. Mahajan (eds.), *Clause Structure in South Asian Languages*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 67–92.

Karmakar, S. 2009. Temporal Ordering in Discourse: A Study of Bāŋlā. (Unpublished PhD dissertation, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur.)
Langacker, R.W. 2008. *Cognitive grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Li, Y. 1993. "Structural head and aspectuality". *Language* 69(3). 480–504.
Masica, C. 1976. *Defining a linguistic area: South Asia*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Mourelatos, A.P.D. 1978. "Events, processes, and states". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2. 415–434.
Paul, S. 2003. "Composition of compound verbs in Bangla". In: Beermann, D. and L. Hellan (eds.), *Proceedings of the workshop on Multi-verb constructions*, Trondheim Summer School 2003.
Pustejovsky, J. 1995. *The generative lexicon*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Ramchand, G. 2008. "Lexical items in complex predications: Selection as underassociation". *Nordlyd* 35(1). 115–141.
Reichenbach, H. 1947. *Elements of symbolic logic*. New York: The Free Press.
Rochberg-Halton, E. 1982. "Situation, structure, and the context of meaning". *The Sociological Quarterly* 23(4). 455–476.
Samek-Lodovici, V. 2003. "The internal structure of arguments and its role in complex predicate formation". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21. 835–881.
Smith, C.S. 1991. *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Turetzky, P. 1998. *Time*. London: Routledge.
Wurff, W. van der. 1989. "The syntax of participial adjuncts in eastern Bengali". *Journal of Linguistics* 25(2). 373–416.

Address correspondence to:
Samir Karmakar
Humanities and Social Sciences Department
Indian Institute of Technology
Kanpur 208 016
India
samirk@iitk.ac.in