TOWARD A DEFINITIVE
GRAMMAR OF BENGALI -
A PRACTICAL STUDY AND CRITIQUE
OF RESEARCH ON
SELECTED GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES

HANNE-RUTH THOMPSON

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of PhD

SOUTH ASIA DEPARTMENT
SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES
LONDON

October 2003—2004
ABSTRACT
This thesis is a contribution to a deeper understanding of selected Bengali grammatical structures as far as their syntactic and semantic properties are concerned. It questions traditional interpretations and takes a practical approach in the detailed investigation of actual language use. My methodology is based on the belief that clarity and inquisitiveness should take precedence over alliance to particular grammar theories and that there is still much to discover about the way the Bengali language works.

Chapter 1
This chapter on non-finite verb forms discusses the occurrences and functions of Bengali non-finite verb forms and concentrates particularly on the overlap of infinitives and verbal nouns, the distinguishing features between infinitives and present participles, the semantic properties of verbal adjectives and the syntactic restrictions of perfective participles.

Chapter 2
In the attempt to define Bengali compound verbs I question the appropriateness of purely semantic criteria, which have prevailed in previous analyses. If syntactic criteria are taken into account we arrive at a more diverse and more accurate picture of the relationship between the two combined verb forms.

Chapter 3
The majority of Bengali so-called postpositions are locative noun forms (spatial postpositions) or non-finite verb forms, which can function as postpositions. I have tried to develop some syntactic and semantic criteria in order to define the 'wordclass' of postpositions.

Chapter 4
Bengali tenses are remarkably flexible in their uses. In order to gain a clearer picture of their parameters I have examined the co-occurrence of tenses and of tense restrictions in sentences with particular time adverbials.

Chapter 5
Verbs of being and having (আছি, zero verb, হওয়া and থাকা) are analysed according to their syntactic uses, restrictions, semantic features and overlap with one another, taking into account negative and non-present tense sentences. The chapter also establishes the importance of the zero verb as the main copula in Bengali.

Chapter 6
This chapter looks at word order and selected sentence structures. The discussion focusses on the features and parameters of Bengali passive and impersonal structures. Findings from previous chapters have been taken into account.

All chapters suggest areas of further research.
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INTRODUCTION

The theory - a framework for linguistic research

In the introduction to his paper On Bangla Nouns Probal Dasgupta writes: 'It is my view that a large number of linguistic research traditions today are valuable and worth pursuing, and that their concerns are complementary in such a way that no one research tradition in its present amplitude can hope for paradigmatic acceptance if only because no single tradition is ambitious enough to try to tackle the kinds of problems that interest workers in most or all of the other traditions put together. In a situation like this, it is necessary that each individual piece of research (article or book) relate itself to some particular tradition so as to achieve some measure of coherence and readability, although it remains possible for an individual researcher to attempt to work in several traditions, one at a time, one tradition per paper.'

I acknowledge the validity of this view but make no apologies for not aligning myself with a particular linguistic research tradition in this thesis. This decision is based on a variety of factors which can be summed up under the following three headings:

- the present state of research on Bengali language structures

Bengali linguistics has, in recent years, taken a gigantic leap from prescriptive schoolbook type grammars to complex analyses of individual grammatical structures following the methods of one or another transformational grammar model. In the course of my research I have read numerous articles, PhD theses and books on Bengali grammatical structures written by authors who follow a variety of research traditions. Dasgupta himself has done research (on number and case) within the framework mainly of GB (Government and Binding) Theory. Humayun Azad has done a transformational generative analysis of pronominalization in Bengali, Abul Manzur Morshed on relativization. More recently there have been the works of Rashida Begum on postpositions (GB theory) and Tanmoy Bhattacharya on the structure of 'Determiner Phrases in Bangla' along the lines of Chomsky's minimalism theory and Kayne's Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA). Though all of these contribute some valuable knowledge about Bengali language structures, their main concern is to prove or disprove particular theoretical axioms. The language used in these works tends to be very specialized, stringent and difficult to understand. I see it as part of the purpose of my work to extract from these somewhat theory-ridden theses the information on Bengali that will be relevant to a new Bengali grammar and make it accessible to other linguists who may not have the same theoretical background.
Alongside these academic writings there are a number of course books, grammars and introductions aimed at learners of Bengali. These present - this is oversimplified - a different kind of problem. Rather than offering a systematic, if limited, overview of Bengali language structures, they are often incomplete, arbitrary and faulty. I was first struck by this in McLeod’s *Colloquial Grammar*, which I benefited from greatly when I started to learn Bengali. In his index, McLeod goes from ‘causative verbs’ to ‘passive voice’ to ‘purpose, cause and consequence’. This constitutes a jump from syntactic to semantic criteria and must be confusing to the reader who will be looking at the index to find, most likely, particular grammatical categories. Similarly, M. L. Das’s short and much-used *Present Day Colloquial Bengali for Foreign Students* is a happy jumble of syntactic and semantic points of interest, as also is Brother James’ *Bengali for Foreigners*, which was one of my essentials but which is distinctly lacking in any kind of systematic approach. These kinds of books (and I count my own *Essential Everyday Bengali*, though perhaps a bit more systematic, among them) are quick-fix solutions, that is, they are very much geared towards helping people to learn Bengali and so cannot afford to delve too deeply into grammatical structures for fear of creating more chaos than order.

**the overall aim of this thesis**

As stated in the title of this thesis, my main aim is to pave the way for a new, comprehensive and comprehensible Bengali grammar. W. L. Smith has taken an important step in this direction with his *Bengali Reference Grammar*, which unfortunately is not as widely known as it should be. Bengali linguists, at least we of the foreign contingent, tend to work in isolation from one another when we could all benefit so much more by working together.

It seems desirable in this situation and with a view towards a new Bengali grammar to take a step back from recent high-flying linguistic enterprises and aim first and foremost for a descriptive analysis of grammatical structures. This is a step from theoretical to practical linguistics: learning to walk before we try to run! If, in taking this step, we abandon the aim to prove that linguistics is an exact science then, on the other hand, we gain an increase in clarity and the opportunity to include linguists of all persuasions. This is not an attempt to give up on theoretical grammar but is an acknowledgement that no one grammar model is capable of explaining the whole of one language.

Linguistic rigour and clarity are not confined to transformational computations, and in this thesis I have tried to develop a methodology which is consistent but at the same time transparent, so that the research is accessible to all Bengali linguists and a discussion of our interpretations of Bengali grammatical structures can be triggered.
Probal Dasgupta writes: 'Rigorous phonology and morphology are still in their infancy as far as
Bangla is concerned.' The same is true for Bengali syntax and semantics, which are the areas that I
have been concerned with in this thesis. Dasgupta continues: 'Therefore it becomes necessary to
make tentative proposals in those areas, and to develop a conception of word structure related to
these proposals. Feedback from each wing of the enterprise makes it possible to find and correct
errors in the other, enabling knowledge to grow in a non-vicious spiral' (The Word in Bangla)

There is still a lot of confusion and disagreement on Bengali linguistic structures, with regards to
terminology, which is perhaps less important, but also with regards to actual usage, eg which case
endings does the postposition এতে follow? Equally there is a need for defining categories such as
compound makers or even the 'word class' of postpositions. This may be seen as linguistics on
quite a basic level, but, in my view, this is actually the level where questions need to be asked and
answers sought in order for 'knowledge to grow in a non-vicious spiral' (see above).

- personal views

My decision to stay clear of particular grammatical theories and to restrict my research to
descriptive analysis within a more traditional framework was almost inevitable given the divergent
range of existing research and also the desire to break through the theory-practice split which
tends to prevail in this kind of academic writing. But there are also some theoretical principles and
beliefs at play here.

I believe very strongly that good academic work does not automatically have to be difficult and
obscure, yet the number of PhD theses I have actually enjoyed reading, even if I did not
understand everything, are very few. Even something like Abul Manzur Morshed's thesis on
relativization in Bengali, which I did enjoy reading, left me with the feeling 'What have I learnt
about Bengali relative clauses that I didn't know before?' The answer was 'very little', though I did
learn quite a lot about transformation rules. As linguists, particularly, I feel that we should at least
attempt to use our language skills in order to make our meanings clear and intelligible to others
who don't have the same background.

Part of the purpose of a PhD degree is to show that a candidate is capable of original, methodical
thinking, but that is not the same as successfully applying the rules of a particular system. In fact,
there is nothing very original in that - it is comparable to taking a car engine apart and then putting
it back together again according to a given plan with the aim of testing whether the plan is any
good. Perhaps you can rearrange the parts and find a better system, but you are still working with
a given fixed object with no room for expansion. Languages are not like car engines with a fixed
set of parts, which can be arranged (or categorised) in different ways. Languages are living and
growing organisms and our attempts at grammatical classification, interpretation or even rule-
finding should serve to increase our understanding, not to fit the language into prefabricated compartments.

Generative grammars and their numerous and diverse offspring were developed with the explicit purpose of understanding the principles that govern the phenomenon of language and of being able to produce well-formed language from these principles. Although this concept is extremely seductive in theory, it is ultimately based on the belief that if you dig deep enough, everything is explicable. Perhaps all scientific endeavour is to some extent based on this belief, but it carries with it a presumption of achieveability which seems to me to be counterproductive to genuine questioning and research. Bengali grammar research is not yet at the stage where we know everything there is to know about grammatical structures and I think it is appropriate to do the groundwork first, which means to observe and describe language behaviour, without aiming to define the phenomenon of language.

David Graddoll, in his book *Describing Language*, makes the same point:
'It is difficult to make use of a specific theory without taking on board the aims of that theory; this means that, despite the allure of a potential explanatory theory, a simple descriptive approach may often be more suitable, for this will allow a stretch of language to be accurately described, or a problem to be set out in a principled way.' (p 101)

The practice - approaching language structures

Dúsan Zbavitel says in the introduction to his study on Bengali non-finite verb forms: 'I have no doubt that the whole problem of Bengali verbal compounds will have to be solved by Bengali linguists, possessing not only theoretical erudition needed for the task, but also the language feeling, which cannot be acquired in full by any foreigner' (p 20). Bengali linguistics is still in its infancy and many of the younger Bengali linguists choose to become experts in theoretical analysis of very specific grammatical research areas. This results in a gap on the ground floor, so to speak, where a basis needs to be established before we can move on to testing hypotheses. I believe that foreign linguists, even if they do not have the language feeling mentioned by Zbavitel, have a responsibility in trying to close this gap, as they have also contributed to its creation.

In order to establish language use examples have to be found. There has been a tendency, particularly among non-Bengali linguists (eg Milne, Zbavitel, Smith), to concentrate very much on literary Bengali. Although there is nothing inherently wrong with this, it can result in a limitation to older and more formal language structures as the body of our research when there is so much live language to be analysed. Bengali and non-Bengali linguists need to start working together, not only, as Zbavitel says, to employ a balanced mixture of research methods and language intuition, but, first and foremost, to
expand the object of our research. This means taking into account modern, colloquial Bengali, spoken as well as written.

The repetition of identical example sentences over the generations of researchers in order to establish the use of particular structures creates another recurring problem. This goes from Milne (Wenger) to Sutton-Page to Brother James to Smith, for instance:

- কুমি শুনে থাকবে। (You will have heard).
- হিন্দুদের বিষবার বিয়ে করতে নেঁই। (Hindu widows are not allowed to marry).
- না যেলে নয়। (It won't do not to go).

These types of sentences - there are many more examples - have been handed down verbatim throughout the history of Bengali language research. And though it is understandable that a researcher may want to use well-established examples, it results in a fossilisation of our research body 'Bengali' and in a removal of this research body from the living language. I have become aware of this problem only in the course of writing this thesis and have therefore not consistently used new source materials, such as modern Bengali novels, journals and spoken language, though that seems to me to be a crucial component in gaining a new and wider perspective.

An expansion of our research material must be accompanied by the willingness to ask new questions or to ask old questions from a new angle. The grammatical structures discussed in this thesis are, by necessity, only a selected few, and the aims of this study consciously limited to observation and description of language structures, but it is perhaps because of these limitations that a more detailed and accurate analysis can be done and some new insights gained.
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CHAPTER 1
NON-FINITE VERB FORMS

At the beginning of his book on non-finite verb forms in Bengali, Dusan Zbavitel says: 'The possibilities of simple finite verbal forms of Bengali are rather limited. [...] Finite forms taken out of their context, are incapable of expressing exactly delimited and mutually distinguished categories of tense, aspect and mood. [...] The simple present form may refer to present time as well as future and past. [...] In other words, syntactic constructions are needed, instead of pure morphological means, wherever a more definite denotation of tense, aspect and mood is required, or where passive voice is to be expressed.' (p 11) This, then, is one of the functions of non-finite verb forms in Bengali.

What Zbavitel is saying, in short, is that Bengali finite verb forms are inadequate, by themselves, to convey sufficient tense, modal or aspectual meaning and that non-finite verb forms are needed to express these. But why would he refer to finite forms 'taken out of context'? The fact that a present tense verb form can refer to present, past or future events does not mean that, in any actual sentence or text, its reference point is unclear. Bengali finite verb forms (given the existence of continuous (progressive) and of perfective tenses) are quite capable of expressing aspectual denotation, eg

আমরা তাদের খেলছি। We are (in the process of) playing cards. vs
আমরা তাদের খেলি। We play cards (occasionally, regularly etc).

Zbavitel's labelling of finite forms as 'morphological means' as opposed to 'syntactic constructions' (non-finite forms) displays a surprisingly perfunctory understanding of language structure as a whole. Finite verb forms are as much syntactic features of a language as non-finites are. Moreover, the function of a non-finite verb form in a sentence is, by definition, linked to and dependent on a finite verb form. The argument then of 'who can do it better?' becomes rather futile, ie there is no need to devaluate finite verb forms in order to prove the significance of non-finite forms. Finite and non-finite forms are interdependent parts of the verbal system of Bengali and work together to convey meaning. Zbavitel notes a considerable increase in the use of non-finite verb forms over the last 500 years, and this undoubtedly results in more refined distinctions between different structures but does not have to imply a weakening of the finite verb system. Rather, the availability of non-finite forms can enable their finite partners to become more flexible in their expression of tense and aspect.

Every verb in Bengali has a hypothetical stem from which all verb forms are derived. Due to vowel mutation in all monosyllabic verbs with a vowel other than a, we assume a high and a low stem for each verb. Mutation occurs between i → e, e → ɛ, u → o, o → o. Bengali has, morphologically four, syntactically six non-finite verb forms. Verbal nouns (and homonymous verbal adjectives) are derived from the low stem, all other non-finite forms from the high stem of the verb. In monosyllabic verbs with a in the stem there is an a → e mutation. The perfective participle is formed with ɛ, all other non-finite verb forms from the a-stem, eg from stay, remain: থাক- stay, remain: থাকিলে, থাকিতে, থাকা; but থেকে.

Bengali non-finite verb forms are:
1. **CONDITIONAL PARTICIPLE**
This is formed by adding -লে to the high stem of a verb and is used as an alternative to constructions with যদি if. Thus, instead of saying

ঘুমি যদি পার, তাহলে এস। Come if you can, you can say

ঘুমি পারলে এস।

which is shorter, simpler and means exactly the same. The conditional participle is the least complicated of the non-finite verb forms and most authors agree in their analysis of it.

2. **INFINITIVE**
The infinitive is formed by adding -তে to the high stem of the verb. It can combine with verbs, nouns and adjectives and has many different semantic implications.

3. **PRESENT PARTICIPLE**
This is homonymous with the infinitive and some authors (Zbavitel, Smith) link the two together under the name 'imperfective participle'. There is, however, a syntactic difference between them. The present participle can have an adverbial function and is often doubled.

4. **VERBAL NOUN (vн)**
Verbal nouns are formed by adding - অ to the low stems of verbs which are monosyllabic and end in a consonant, eg করা make, do, বলা say, speak, চিনা si, আসা come, দেখা see etc. Monosyllabic stems which end in a vowel add -ও, eg খাওয়া eat, যাওয়া go, দেওয়া give, শোওয়া lie down etc. Verbs with two syllable stems add -ন, -ন, such as যাওয়া drive, পড়েওয়া show, মূলানো sleep, সমাজালো decrease etc. Verbal nouns can act like other nouns (eg as subjects of sentences) but they also have a number of other uses.

5. **VERBAL ADJECTIVE (va)**
Verbal adjectives look like verbal nouns, but are used as attributes or predicates of the sentence subject. Functionally they are past passive participles. All Bengali verbs have a verbal noun form, but only a limited number can be used as adjectives.

6. **PERFECTIVE PARTICIPLE (pp)**
This is formed by adding -ে to the high stem of the verb, but there are some irregularities. The perfective participle is used in sentences to refer to an action which either precedes another or is simultaneous with another. It can also form the first component of compound verbs.

**Terminology**

There seems to be some disagreement on what the different structures should be called. The terms used by the different authors are listed here:
Probal Dasgupta, in his article on the interpretation of verbal nouns, calls them participial gerunds. Muhammad refers to the verbal noun as infinitive. It is tempting to argue that an infinitive cannot be a participle and that only one of the two terms can apply. David Crystal defines a participle as either a noun or an adjective derived from a verb. He says (p 290): 'The name comes from the way such a word participates in the characteristics of both word classes. This makes a good case for verbal nouns and verbal adjectives. But infinitives can also have nominal characteristics. In the sentence I want to go, for example, the infinitive to go functions as the object of the verb want, ie it replaces a noun phrase.

It is more difficult to see how a conditional participle can be interpreted as anything other than a verb. This, however, is the one verb form that is consistently referred to as a participle, apart from the rather bland 'conjunctive' (Chatterji, Bykova). Chatterji states that the conditional participle is 'adjectival in character when it occurs absolutely with a noun or pronoun' and 'a verbal noun when it occurs with the genitive' (p 1004). His examples for the two instances are:

a) adjectival  আমি তাকে দিলে তবে সে বাঁচে। translated as  He would live only if I give him. [sic]

b) verbal noun  আমার না দিলে কিছু আসে যায় না। translated as  It doesn't matter through my not giving [sic].

I must admit that, disregarding the strange translations, I cannot follow his argument for the first form being equivalent to an adjective. What adjective could possibly substitute for this clause? Surely the presence of two subjects in the sentence points to two separate clauses. In sentence b) the combination of the genitive and conditional participle seems unusual to me. I would have expected, for instance, আমি তাকে দিলের জন্য or, simply, আমি না দিলে.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zbavitel</th>
<th>Chatterji</th>
<th>McLeod</th>
<th>Milne</th>
<th>Bykova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>conjunctive</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td></td>
<td>conjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participle</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>conjunctive</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td></td>
<td>conjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>conjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participle</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal noun</td>
<td>verbal noun</td>
<td>verbal noun</td>
<td>verbal noun</td>
<td>gerund</td>
<td>verbal noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal adjective</td>
<td>verbal adjective</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>verbal adjective</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>conjunctive</td>
<td>indeclinable</td>
<td>participle in ইং</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Animesh Pal refers to all the non-finite verb forms by their endings only, ie non-finite verb forms ending in 1. -ile and -le 2. + 3, -ite and -te, 6. -iya and 3 -e, which is one way of circumventing this argument. However, for any kind of analysis of these verb forms, rather than just a listing of their occurrences, a more committed approach is needed. Without resolving the dispute about infinitives and participles, I will refer to the non-finite verb forms as conditional participle, infinitive, present participle, verbal noun, verbal adjective (functionally the past passive participle) and perfective participle.

I would like to make a case for distinguishing between the infinitive and the present participle because, even though they are homonymous, their syntactical structures are quite distinct. In a sentence like

*He listens to music while he drives the car*

the present participle *drives* can structurally be replaced by an adverb, for instance:

*He drives the car slowly,*

which shows that the present participle is adverbial in character. The infinitive, on the other hand, as in

*I have come to tell you this,*

cannot easily be replaced by anything else. It forms a complement to the main verb *have* and the underlying structure consists of two independent sentences, ie

*I have come and I will tell you this.*

There are, however, instances where the dividing line between infinitive and present participle is not so clear-cut. I will come back to these.

Note: There are a number of example sentences in this chapter which were given to me in an informal 'survey' by four young Bengalis. The background to this is explained in section 7.2. Sentences are marked OS (own survey). Unattributed sentences are mine.

The authors

Dusan Zbavitel

The aim of Zbavitel's book is to show the increase in the occurrence of non-finite verb forms over the last five hundred years. He does this by counting the incidents of non-finite verb forms in ten different texts ranging in time from the 15th century to the 1950s. Though this gives him a limited choice of examples, his book is by far the most detailed study on non-finite verb forms in Bengali. Zbavitel's work will be referred to on many occasions and I have tried in this chapter as well as in the chapter on compound verbs to take his views and classifications into account. The examples he gives from his source texts, however, do not lend themselves to being used for demonstrating the structures we are dealing with here - they are often too long or fragmented - so most of my examples are from other sources.
As a point of interest, he is the only author who draws attention to verbal noun pairs like studying, eating, looking after, sport. These verbal noun pairs may not be syntactically significant in that they are used like any other verbal noun, but they are nonetheless a characteristic feature of Bengali.

Qazi Din Muhammad
In his chapter on non-finite verb forms Muhammad (like other Bengali scholars) distinguishes the verb forms by their endings only. He restricts his analysis to listing the verb forms that can occur together. He goes through a list of what he calls operators and auxiliaries - both of these categories represent the sentence-final finite verbs - and shows which non-finite verb forms can or cannot precede them. There are a number of cases where different non-finite verb forms can be used with the same verb. With (as the finite verb) he has verbal nouns be struck off, be deserted, and perfective participles, eg slip away, begin. Muhammad gives both (verbal noun) and (pp) as meaning wheel round. Equally with he gives the verbal noun be unemployed and the perfective participle wait. I have never heard used at all and I would think that in all these cases the perfective participle structures are far more common than the verbal noun ones. In determining the characteristics and occurrences of non-finite verb forms, Muhammad’s study is of limited use.

Animesh Pal
Though Pal’s article is mainly concerned with different types of verbal compounds, he starts with a section on non-finite verb forms. The verbal noun form is not included in his analysis. He seems to be very concerned in establishing a hierarchical order in sentences which contain non-finite verb forms. His conclusions are as follows.

In sentences which contain a perfective participle,

He came after having eaten,

‘the main action to be communicated in this sentence is come and eat is a secondary action’.

With a conditional participle

He says 'Here is the principal action and is not only the subordinate action, its subject is different from the subject of’. I do not quite see the logical connection between these two statements. He goes on to say ‘The subject of the non-finite verb formation with cannot simultaneously be the subject of the finite verb. After one writes the subject of the verb must be someone else, it cannot be’ (p 220).

I almost agree with his first statement about perfective participle structures, though he should have added that this is only true when the two verbs are sequential, ie one action following another. It is not true in compound verbs, where the meaning of the second (finite) verb can disappear altogether. His
claim that conditional participles describe 'subordinate actions' is debatable. In his example the conditional participle is used in a purely temporal sense, but if used in a conditional sense, eg

It can easily be argued that the conditional action is the principal one. If the condition is not fulfilled, then the second action will not even take place.

I disagree with his claim that conditional constructions have to have two separate subjects. A simple example:

When I go to the market, I will buy some eggs.

This presupposes that the speaker is going to the market. If the speaker is not sure whether or not he is going, then the natural thing to say would be

if I go to the market

There is nothing at all unusual about this sentence.

With infinitive constructions, again, the non-finite verb form loses out in importance to the finite verb, in Pal's interpretation. About

He has come to eat,

he says: 'Here we do not know whether the subject actually ate or not, but only that he had come to eat. It is clear that in this sentence the action of eating is secondary in consequence to that of coming.' Is it? If, as the sentence suggests, the only reason for coming is the food then surely the eating is paramount.

This can be shown in the sentence

He came in order to eat but fed the cows instead.

A sentence like this would be illogical if Pal's assumptions were true.

Probal Dasgupta

In his article on participle and gerund in wa/no (verbal noun) Dasgupta sets out to show that verbal nouns are nominal in character, rather than verbal. He moves away from the generative Clause Hypothesis which claims that in a sentence like

Have you finished writing your letter?

the subject of the sentence is your letter with a complementizer and has become the main verb. Dasgupta's (presumably his own) Phrase Hypothesis, on the other hand, interprets to cut a long and complex analysis short, as the subject of the sentence, preceded by a 'possessive adjunct' your letter. He points out that gerunds can take case endings (object, locative and genitive case) and the definite suffix and that they can be governed by postpositions, eg after having eaten rice. 'I conclude that the wa/no word is a noun rather than a verb and the construction containing it a noun phrase rather than a clause' (p 190). His claim that in the example given above the subject rather than your letter is the subject of the sentence, can easily be proved by asking the question What has finished? to which the answer must surely be my letter writing, not just your letter.
This in itself does not, however, sufficiently explain the syntactic relationship between লেখা and লিখিত. 'Adjunct' is a rather vague linguistic term referring to 'a modifier of a lexical head [...] which could in principle be removed without affecting well-formedness' (Trask, p 8). This is accurate for the sentence in question, ie লিখিত can be left out, but the relationship between লেখা and লিখিত is quite simply that of verb and direct object (cf আমি লিখিত লিখলাম। I wrote a letter), and this relationship is not affected by a change from a finite to a non-finite verb form. Dasgupta makes a valid point, but he is intent on showing the nominal character of verbal nouns in their ability to take determiners and case endings and, in the wake of this, ignores the fact that the ability to take an object is, usually, characteristic of verbs. If we allow that লিখিত is a direct object of লেখা, the status of verbal nouns as partly verbal and partly nominal has to be conceded.

The structures

0. PRELIMINARY: COMPARISON WITH ENGLISH

The significance of non-finite verb forms in Bengali can be appreciated better when we compare them to equivalent forms in English. English verbs have three non-finite forms:

- the infinitive with or without a preceding to, eg She can dance or He wants to eat.
- the -ing form, eg singing, which can function
  - in connection with forms of be to form continuous (progressive) tenses, eg we are learning new ways, he was showing off his French, she will be asking questions
  - as a verbal noun (gerund), eg his vision of healing, the pounding of the waves etc
  - as a present participle, eg Walking along the canal, we saw...
  - as an adjective, eg growing faith, a worrying thought, lasting impressions etc
- the past participle, eg sung, which is adjectival. It occurs predicatively in forming passives, eg the liturgy was sung and can also be used attributively, eg the sung part of the service, the spoken word etc. Not all past participles, neither in English nor in Bengali, can function attributively. The criteria for these uses are not clear. Longman's English Grammar has a vague 'many past participles of verbs can be used as adjectives' but there is no attempt to define why it is possible to say a hidden agenda, broken bones, crossed lines but not *withstood pressure, *a gone chance, *kept integrity. There are undoubtedly many past participles on the borderline of acceptability in attributive use. The precise semantic standing of these participles in relationship to their nouns may make for an interesting topic within a semantics model.

Note: Strictly speaking, English has another verbal noun form, which is identical to the basic verb form, eg a talk, a show, a turn, a beat, a hold. These uses have become lexicalised and are no longer felt to be derived, except in newer creations like on the go, the big eat (name of a recent nutritional campaign by a British supermarket), a different take.

A rough overview of English and Bengali non-finite forms looks like this:
0.1 conditional participle
The Bengali conditional participle has no English non-finite equivalent.

0.2 infinitive
There are many instances where Bengali and English infinitives are exactly equivalent to one another, eg when
- governed by another verb
  আমি যেতে চাই। I want to go.
  সে চিন্তা করতে লাগল। He began to wonder.

  implying purpose
  বাসা যেতে উঠল। He got up to go home.
  এই কথা বলতে আসলাম। I came to say this.

  implying permission
  তাকে যেতে দাও। Let him go.
  ভিতর যেতে নেই। It is forbidden to go inside.

- governed by a noun
  এই কথা বলতে তার অধিকার নেই।
  He has no right to say this.
  আমি সাইকেল চড়তে সাহস পাই না।
  I don't have the courage to ride a bicycle.

- governed by an adjective
  কঠিন করতে খারাপ। It is bad to quarrel.
  সে কাজ করতে তৈরি। He is ready to work.

Sometimes a Bengali infinitive corresponds to an English verbal noun (gerund):
  টাকা চুনতে কোন সময় আরম্ভ হবে?
  When will they (implied) start counting the money.
  আমার আর বাইরে আসতে লজ্জা কি?
  What shame is there in my going out of doors?

Sometimes an English infinitive corresponds to a Bengali verbal noun:
  আমার আরও টাকা দেওয়ার উপযোগ নেই।
  I have no means to give more money.
  আমাদের জন্য দিন পালন করার নিয়ম।
  It is our custom to celebrate birthdays.

All these example sentences are given and attributed later on in the chapter.

0.3 present participle
Bengali present participles, assuming we consider them a grammatical category, are much more restricted in their use than English present participles.
• In both languages the present participle can describe simultaneous, parallel actions, eg

He goes to the office singing.

• English present participles can be used instead of relative clauses, eg

• following a subject: the wind driving me on...

• following an object: he has a study overlooking fields...

In both cases Bengali uses relative clauses.

• English present participles can be used attributively before a noun. In fact, a number of them are so common in this position that they are classified as adjectives in dictionaries, eg an exciting prospect, a boring conference, an interesting idea etc. The closest equivalent non-finite verb forms Bengali has to this are verbal adjectives, eg একজন কাজ করা মানুষ a hard-working man, গান করা জেলেটি the singing fisherman.

0.4 verbal noun (gerund)

The English -ing form, apart from its use in the formation of continuous tenses, has two main functions. It can be a present participle (see above) or a gerund. As a gerund it has nominal characteristics comparable to the Bengali verbal noun, but is more limited in its use. Subject, object and complement uses (as in Bengali) are common, eg

as subject Always being cheerful can be hard work.
as object He likes making the rules.
as complement Happiness consists in demanding more of oneself.

Many Bengali verbal noun uses are equivalent to English infinitives. These are discussed in section 4. but as an example, one very common verbal noun use in Bengali is in constructions with ought, দরকার need, and কথা supposed to. In all these cases English uses an infinitive, eg

You ought to say something.
I need to see you.
He was supposed to come today.

0.5 verbal adjective (Bengali) - present and past participles (English)

English has two kinds of verbally derived adjectives, namely the present and past participle. The crucial difference between them is their active/passive status, ie present participles are active, eg a baffling game, past participles have a passive meaning, eg an unexpected strength. Bengali verbal adjectives normally share the passive component with English past participles, but they can also assume an active status and can then be used to translate English present participles, eg the departing ferry রথনা ফেরি. More commonly, English attributive present participles would be translated with a relative clause in Bengali, eg যে রথনা দিয়েছে ফেরিটা.....
perfective participle (Bengali) - past participle (English)

The main non-adjectival uses of the English past participle is in the formation of compound tenses, eg present, past and future perfect (I have foregone, you had forgotten, she will have lost), in the formation of passives with the verb be (it was decided, it is forbidden, it will be remembered), in the formation of causatives (to have one's book published, one's proofcopies checked, one's mail forwarded) or in non-causative constructions with the same syntactic pattern (have + object + past participle) eg to have one's hopes dashed, one's heart broken.

Of all these, only the passive formation has a comparable non-finite verb form in Bengali, eg

I take in this context is most likely a verbal noun which, syntactically, forms the sentence subject but is still capable of having the decision as an object. This type of example is discussed by Probal Dasgupta (see p 21).

English past participles can be used attributively and predicatively (see above) and this is the only instance where they overlap with Bengali past passive participles (or verbal adjectives).

The Bengali perfective participle is the active counterpart to the verbal adjective, but it cannot be used attributively and English has no non-periphrastic equivalent.

The following table starts from the English non-finite verb-forms (column 3) and shows their uses (columns 1 and 2) and Bengali equivalents (column 4), with other functions of the same morphological Bengali form (column 5). Column 5 relates directly only to column 4, ie there is no direct link between, eg column 1 and 5 (hence the arrows). The table shows

• the morphological overlap of non-finite forms within either language, ie English present participle and gerund or Bengali present participle and infinitive
• the Bengali equivalents to the English forms

More details on the use and overlap of the Bengali forms are discussed in sections 1 - 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>column 1</th>
<th>column 2</th>
<th>column 3</th>
<th>Bengali</th>
<th>column 4</th>
<th>column 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>properties and examples</td>
<td>possible syntactic function</td>
<td><strong>morphological form (English)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bengali equivalent, function, properties, examples</td>
<td></td>
<td>other functions of the same morphological form (Bengali)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can express purpose</td>
<td>complements of other verbs</td>
<td><strong>infinitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>infinitive - same as English</td>
<td></td>
<td>present participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm going there to tell him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>আমি তাকে এই কথা বলতে মেলানে যাব।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>gerund</td>
<td><strong>-ing form</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>present participle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>verbal adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like playing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>নিজের পারে হাটতে হাটতে আমি ... দেখলাম।</td>
<td></td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simultaneous action</td>
<td>present participle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>present participle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>verbal adjective (active meaning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking along the river, I saw...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>verbal noun</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>verbal noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributive or predicative (active)</td>
<td>adjectival</td>
<td><strong>past participle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>verbal noun</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>verbal adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a singing fisherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>কাজ করা হয়েছে।</td>
<td></td>
<td>verbal adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work has been done.</td>
<td>formation of passives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>verbal noun</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>other non-finites (Bengali)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributive or predicative (passive)</td>
<td>adjectival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>verbal noun</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>verbal noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a prepared speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>বাণী ব্যক্ত করা</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no non-finite English equivalent</td>
<td>if/when I go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>clausal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no non-periphrastic English equivalent</td>
<td>having gone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>active, perfective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other non-finites (Bengali)**

- conditional
- participle
- perfective
- participle
It is notable that the form of the present participle corresponds in English to that of the verbal noun, in Bengali to that of the infinitive. This may have some significance in the interpretation of the semantic differences between

English: I like swimming. vs I like to swim.
Bengali: আমার সীমার কাটি ভাল লাগে। vs আমার সীমার কাটিকে ভাল লাগে।

There is a tentative suggestion in Longman's English Grammar: '-ing may refer to an action in progress, whereas the to-infinitive may imply 'in general'. (p 317) I suspect that Bengali works the other way round, with the verbal noun use being the more general, but I will come back to this in section 7.

The differentiating factor between finite and non-finite verb forms is that non-finite verb forms cannot be the only verb in a sentence and they do not carry inflectional information. Bengali non-finite verb forms are defined by their relation with the finite verb in each sentence, eg the perfective participle describes a preceding action, the present participle a simultaneous action, the conditional participle a condition for the action described by the finite verb. Both the infinitive and the verbal noun have a variety of syntactic functions. The following section offers a closer analysis of the structures we are dealing with, their characteristics and how they are used. In addition to the authors mentioned above my main sources have been Chatterji, Smith, Milne and to a lesser extent McLeod and Brother James. Mimi Klaiman's analysis of perfective participle structures with more than one subject in a sentence has contributed some new aspects.

Having said, at the beginning of this chapter, that all Bengali verbs have four, actually six, non-finite verb forms, this has to be rectified by pointing out that the incomplete verb আঁছা has all its non-finite verb forms supplied by forms of থাকা stay, remain (but see also chapter 5). A verbal noun form for the zero verb is postulated as থাকা in the Samsad dictionary, but this is not used in sentences. A conditional participle নেইলে is used as an alternative to না হলে if not, otherwise. When negated, all non-finite verb forms are preceded, not followed, by the negative particle না.

1. THE CONDITIONAL PARTICIPLE

These irregular forms should be noted:

- গেলে from গেলা go, দিলে from দিলা give, নিলে from নিলা take, sometimes এলে from আসা come.
- আসলে is also possible, চাইলে and পাইলে from চাওয়া want and পাওয়া sing respectively, তেলে (or তাইলে),
- পেলে (or পাইলে) from পাওয়া eat and পাওয়া receive.

The conditional participle is the most straightforward of all the non-finite verb forms and there is a general consensus as to its properties, but we must take note of Milne's introduction to his section on conditional participles with this grand statement: 'The uses of this participle reveal some of the most important idioms in Bengali and it will be impossible for the student ever to understand the colloquial
language properly unless he carefully studies the various senses in which it is found.' (p 183) So, let us pay attention and study!

1.1 conditional use
The conditional participle provides us with the simplest way of making a conditional sentence, eg

1.1.1 দেখি হলে আমাকে জানান। Let me know if you are running late.
The use of this participle is particularly appropriate in short clauses where it stays close to the subject of the sentence, whereas in longer clauses the use of যদি if tends to prevail, eg

1.1.2 যদি মুখ্যর সূর্যে বসবাস করতে চায়... If he wants to live in a fool's paradise... (Smith, p 167)
The conditional participle as a non-finite and thus 'tenseless' verbform can replace যদি if in simple as well as in hypothetical clauses. The phrase আমি যেমন-can mean either if I go, if I went or if I had gone, depending on the tense in the main clause, eg

1.1.3 দেখি হলে চলবে না।
It will not do to be late. (Smith, p 142) or

1.1.4 অসুন্দরিয়া না হোলে থেকে যেতাম।
if there weren't a problem, I would stay. (Das, p 75)

1.2 temporal use
Zbavitel points to 'a loss, or at least a weakening, of the conditional meaning of this participle' (p 50).
'Not seldom, it is used instead of a perfective participle in a syntactic construction of two verbal actions, where no condition, but a simple temporal sequence is involved' (p 14).

1.2.1 ভয় পালায়ে বুঝি ছাড়ে। lit:
Wisdom increases when the thief has fled. (Milne, p 183)

Milne interprets this as: To shut the stable door after the horse is stolen (didn't the horse just go?), but I think it means something more like to become wise after the event.
This use of conditional participles in a temporal sense is perhaps not surprising. The normal structure in Bengali to describe a sequence of events is with a perfective participle which is usually restricted to two or more actions or events with the same subject. The conditional participle offers a convenient alternative in sentences where different subjects are required. For instance, the English sentence

When guests arrive we give them tea,
can be rendered in Bengali with the use of a conditional

1.2.2 মিষ্টান্ন আসলে আমরা চা দেই। but not of a perfective participle
*মিষ্টান্ন এসে আমরা চা দেই।
Zbavitel also has this example which does not involve two different subjects

1.2.3 বড় হলে একমিন বুঝবে।
When you grow up one day you will understand. (p 14)
There is an interesting time issue at play here. Syntactically, the sentence could also be formed with a perfective participle describing one action preceding another. The perfective participle has no direct
reference to an actual point in time, that is, the action which it precedes can take place in past, present or future and is determined by the finite verb in the sentence. But in this case, with a reference point lying years ahead in the future, the use of a perfective particle would be overstretching its temporal capacities and the use of a conditional participle is, semantically, more appropriate.

1.3 followed by পর, পরে

Smith puts forward that, apart from being used both in a temporal and in a conditional sense, the conditional participle is sometimes followed by পর / পরে after eg

1.3.1 তার অসুখ হল পরে... After he became ill... (p 141)

Milne has similar examples and explains them by saying that in these sentences 'the participle retains its adverbial sense - it denotes a succession of events' (p 183):

with one subject 1.3.2 সকালে উঠিলে পরে তিনি সুপারাইজের করিলেন।

After rising early he bathed and took his meal.

with two subjects 1.3.3 আমি সেখানে গেলে পরে তিনি আসিলেন।

He came after my arrival there.

I am not very familiar with this structure - perhaps it is no longer commonly used. It seems to me that in same-subject sentences a perfective participle (সকালে উঠিলে তিনি সুপারাইজের করিলেন), in sentences with different subjects a verbal noun structure like আমার সেখানে যাওয়ার পর তিনি আসিলেন would be more usual, but this use should at least be recorded.

1.4 with preceding infinitive

Milne mentions this structure 'used very idiomatically' (p 184). He gives these examples:

1.4.1 বলিলে গেলে, সেই সর্বোৎপাদক দণ্ড। In fact, he is the richest of all.

1.4.2 এ কাজ করতে গেলে অনেক টাকা চাই। It requires a large sum to do this work.

1.4.3 কোন কেন্দ্রে বীচিতে গেলে আমি ও মরে যাব। If I go to save you I too shall die. (all Milne, p 184-5)

1.4.4 বলতে গেলে অনেক কথা বলতে হয়।

If (I) were going to speak, (I) had a great deal to say. (Smith, p 147)

'I would have had a great deal to say' or 'would have had to say a great deal' is a more acceptable translation.

Syntactically, these are ordinary conditional sentences but the infinitives add a note of intent or deliberateness which is similar to their semantic value in sentences like 2.1.8 (see below)

আমি স্পষ্টই দিতে যাচ্ছি।

I'm going [in order] to give a report. (Smith, p 147)

For this reason, it may be more appropriate to class these sentences under uses of the infinitive.

1.5 followed by ই or ও

Conditional participles can be followed by either of the two particles ই (for emphasis) or ও (to add concessive force). Examples for these are:

-
non-finite verb forms

1.5.1 *Just a high price does not make a thing good.* (Smith, p 141)

1.5.2 *This book is very easy - it only requires to be read to be understood.*

(Milne, p 185)

Brother James adds to this that when used in a temporal sense the particle ते, added to the conditional participle can also imply *as soon as*, eg

1.5.3 *As soon as he had eaten that rice he became sick.* (p 94)

This sentence - there are similar examples with perfective participles - indicates a subtle semantic shift towards a possible causal meaning, but by using a temporal structure the speaker deliberately refrains from making a more direct, possibly accusatory, statement.

Examples for uses with the particle ते are:

1.5.4 *Even though it's small, the flat is sufficient for him.* (Smith, p 141)

1.5.5 *Though he eats, he is not satisfied.

1.5.6 *Even if my Guru ordered me - I will not do this.*

(both Milne, p 188)

1.6 with होता and होता

Smith points to the two impersonal constructions with होता and होता implying it will do, it is sufficient.

Both of these structures are quite colloquial. The use of tenses and negatives is interesting here. Both होता and होता can be used in the past habitual tense in its subjunctive meaning.

1.6.1 *Even a cup (of tea) would do.* (Smith, p 142)

1.6.2 *Afterwards I thought it would have been better had I gone.* (Smith, p 142)

All other examples with होता are in the future tense as in sentence 1.1.3 (देरी होता होता ना) and in

1.6.3 *It won't do (for me) not to go to the office today.* (OS)

1.6.4 *One shouldn't waste even a little time.* (Smith, p 142)

होता, on the other hand, is not used in the future tense but only in simple present and simple past tense. Milne (p 186ff) somewhat arbitrarily separates these uses, without, however, defining their differences, eg

with simple past in the sense of be sufficient

1.6.5 *If you simply give your permission, it is enough.* (Milne, p 186)

1.6.6 *If you simply give your permission, it is enough.*
But one need not let one’s hair turn grey.

and, as an example for Milne's creative brand of translation:

1.6.7 মারিয়া হলের এ তেজার কাজ নয়।

Beat me? You think that's an easy task for you? Never! (p 186)

with simple present

1.6.8 তাকে পতিত বলিয়া হয়।

One may as well call him a Pundit.

1.6.9 সোজা কথা, বলে নিলেই হয়। imaginatively translated as

It is a simple thing and may be said without beating about the bush.

with simple present negative (either না or নয়)

1.6.10 একজন ভারী ভাঙলে হয় না?

Won't it be wise to call a doctor?

1.6.11 কিছু আজ তাহার না খাইলে নয়।

But today he can't go without eating.

with concessive না in simple present denoting as well

1.6.12 পাখন বলিয়াও হয়।

One may as well call him a fool.

1.6.13 তেজার সাধে বলিকবায় বেড়াতে গেলেও হয়।

I may as well go to Calcutta with you. (all examples Milne, p 186ff)

I do not see enough difference between these types of sentences to treat them separately. The simple past verb form হল (1.6.5 - 1.6.6) has a tenseless connotation, similar to its use in, for instance

কথা হল সে এখনও আসে নি।

The thing is, he hasn't arrived yet.

or in its uses as a pro-copula (see chapter 5).

There is no semantic difference between sentences 1.6.8 and 1.6.12 - the concessive না seems to have lost its impact here and could just as well be left out. In sentence 1.6.13 the added না sounds decidedly strange.

The difference between the use of হয় না (1.6.10) and হয় (1.6.11) is more intriguing. Intuitively, I would say that হয় is more decisive and uncompromising, whereas হয় না retains some of the dynamic character that is intrinsic to হয়, but this may be partly caused by its interrogative context.

Future tense forms of হয় are conspicuously absent among these examples, most likely due to previous semantic 'engagements', in the sense of, eg

এটা হবে। which can mean this will happen, or this is enough, and

এটা হবে না। this will not happen, or this is not enough.

The semantic implications in the above structures of appropriateness, acceptability, sufficient effort are not expressed through the future tense of হয়.

Another marginal use of the conditional participle, which is not mentioned by any of our authors is the combination of two forms of the same verb in imperatives, eg দিলে দাও or গেলে যাও. This has an
exhortative effect, probably best translated as Go on, hand it over! and Go on, get going! Again, these structures are quite colloquial.

2. The infinitive

Irregular forms: যেতে from যেতা go, নিতে from নেতা give, লিতে from লেতা take, খেতে or খাইতে from খাইতা eat, চাইতে and পাইতে from চাইতা want and পাইতা sing, respectively.

The Bengali infinitive can correspond very nicely to the infinitive in English, but in the cases where it does not, things can become complicated. In order to describe the infinitive most authors simply give a long list of its uses with no discernible structure to it, variously based on semantic or syntactic criteria.

In order to bring a bit of system into this chaos, I suggest putting the syntactic criteria above the semantic ones and then have a sort of 'dustbin' category for all the structures that do not fit anywhere else and for idiomatic uses of individual verbs, as, for instance, বলতে and দেখতে.

Present participles are discussed in section 3.

2.1 with other verbs

This is by far the largest category of infinitive uses. Many of these uses are similar to English structures. Zbavitel lists the following ten verbs which can govern an infinitive: পারা be able to, পাওয়া get, receive, লাগা start, begin, হওয়া want, যাওয়া go, বসা sit, থাকা stay. The following verbs take on a different meaning when following an infinitive: লেতা let, allow, আই be permitted, হওয়া must, have to.

Apart from হওয়া and আই all these verbs in conjunction with a preceding infinitive form sentences where the infinitive can be interpreted as a complement of the verb. Some of these structures imply purpose. Let us look at some simple examples (sentences 1-10 from Smith, p 145ff):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>পারা</th>
<th>2.1.1</th>
<th>সে বাঙ্লা বলতে পারে না।</th>
<th>He cannot speak Bengali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>লাগা</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>আমি নিতে পারব না।</td>
<td>I won't be able to accept it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>থাকা</td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>বয়স ৬০-৬৫ হতে পারে।</td>
<td>His age may be 60 or 65.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This structure seems straightforward to us because it is exactly parallel to the English, but it has to be remembered that পারা in Bengali is a full verb, not an auxiliary as the English can, but more appropriately translated as be capable of. Chatterji interprets সে চলতে পারে He can walk, as he - in the act of walking - is able (p 1014).

In connection with verbs of sensual perception পারা takes on an unexpected emotive connotation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.4</th>
<th>আমি তার কথা শুনতে পারি না।</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can't stand listening to him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead, the verb পাওয়া get, receive with verbs of sensual perception expresses ability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.5</th>
<th>শুনতে পাচ্ছি?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can you hear?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.6</th>
<th>চোখ খুলতে সাকাশ।</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(He) began to open his eyes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.7</th>
<th>সে বাড়ি ফিরে যেতে চায়।</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He wants to go back home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.8</th>
<th>আমি রিপোর্ট দিতে যাচ্ছি।</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I'm going to give a report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Milne's sentences with infinitives followed by the conditional participle  
(1.4.1 - 3) belong here.

**Verb (implies purpose)**

2.1.9 ताहा आलाप करत बसल।

_They sat down to talk._ (Brother James, p 69)

2.1.10 उस्ब अंत रहते रहसूल।

_The sun was about to set._ (Smith, p 147)

**Verb (implies continuity or repetition)**

2.1.11 बिनमों दर दिन पानूर ताके इंजेक्शन दिते थाकलेन।

_Pasteur went on giving him injections day after day._

(Smith, p 148)

These are the verbs listed by Zbavitel, but I suggest that the following should also be included:

आते _come_ can be used in the same way as गो गो:

2.1.12 आते तास ठेलके आसे।

_I will come to play cards._

उठान _get up_ can be used in the same way as बसा _sit:_

2.1.13 बसा जेके उठलान।

_I got up to go home,_

Both sentences imply purpose.

सेवरा _implies permission_ 2.1.14 ताके जेके गाओ।

_Let him go!_

This structure is somewhat different from the previous one in that it contains an embedded sentence, i.e., the sentence can be separated into 'तेही दाओ गुड_ जाओ and ने नाम_ हि जाओ. The verb सेवरा _give_ acquires the semantic component of permission only in combination with a preceding infinitive.

In addition to these I would also include the verb बना _say, tell_ as in

2.1.15 आते ताहोंके आसे कोलै।

_I told you to come,_

because it is structurally similar to infinitive combinations with बना, let, allow. बना does not change its semantic properties in this context. There are, of course, a number of other verbs which can be combined with an infinitive, but, as Zbavitel points out, many of them can use either the infinitive or the verbal noun.

Before we go on to this group of verbs, however, the remaining two verbs on Zbavitel's list need to be dealt with. The incomplete verb आई_ can, in sentences with a preceding infinitive, imply permission. Smith gives the example

2.1.16 सेपहान कि जेके आचौ?_

_Is it permitted to go there?

The equivalent negative structure is formed with नेह, eg_

2.1.17 एसपहां जूला परतें नेह।

_It is forbidden to wear shoes here._

The structure with वा is quite different from any of the other structures. The combination of an infinitive with a form of वा expresses obligation or moral duty. The logical subject of the sentence, when it is not omitted, appears in the accusative or genitive case. Sentences look like this:
Both this structure and the infinitive + 动工- combination have a semantic force which lies in their syntactic make-up rather than in the meaning of individual words. This is discussed further in section 3.5 in chapter 5.

This structure is very frequently used in the future tense 2.1.18 কাজকে আমাকে যেতে হবে। I will have to go tomorrow.

A future tense reference is not necessarily involved, eg

2.1.19 সকলেই মরিয়ে হবে। Everyone must die. (Milne, p 192)

I have recently marked about 100 O-Level Bengali exam papers, where the sentence In perfromance you have to feel the same thing, was invariably translated with a future tense form of হওয়া। কাজটি হলে একই জিনিস অনুভব করতে হবে. This makes me inclined to think that in colloquial usage of this structure the future tense is the common tense for general, 'tenseless' statements.

Uses in other tenses are:

simple present 2.1.20 সকালে নাত্সা বানাতে হয়।

Breakfast has to be prepared in the morning. (OS)

present continuous 2.1.21 উঠে ও টাকা মিতে হচ্ছে। probably best translated as

Again I (implied) am having to give money. (OS)

simple past 2.1.22 মাকে সত্ত্বা কথা বলতে হলো। I (implied) had to tell mother the truth.

(OS)

The past habitual is not impossible, eg

2.1.23 প্রোডিপ কাজটা না করলে আমাকে করতে হত।

If Prodig wasn't doing the work, I would have to do it. (OS)

but this use is not very common.

Zbavitel lists the following verbs - this is where we get into deep water - as being able to govern an infinitive but says at the same time that verbal noun forms can also be used in some of these cases. The verbs are:

জানা know 2.1.24 আমি জানি বলতে যেতে। I know how to gamble.

জেনা learn 2.1.25 বিজ্ঞান যদি থেকে হয়, হলো।

You haven't learnt to drink foreign spirits. (both Smith, p 132)

This example from Chatterji presents a different problem:

দেখা see 2.1.26 তাকে যেতে দেখলাম। I saw him walking.

He says 'The -rite infinitive is liable to be confused with the -ite present particple, and it is at times difficult to decide which form it is' (p 1015). The same, presumably, goes for the next example.

হয়ে hear 2.1.27 আমি তাকে বলতে পারি নি। I haven't heard him talk.
These examples show that there is a potential overlap of infinitives with verbal nouns on the one hand (sentences 2.1.24 and 25) and possible confusion with present participles on the other (2.1.26 and 27). I will discuss examples of these further in section 7.1 and 7.2, but some preliminary considerations may be appropriate here.

Both Smith and Zbavitel state that the infinitive is preferred to the verbal noun where emotions or attitudes are concerned (Zbavitel, p 60). Zbavitel adds to this, couched in no uncertain terms: 'If the action is qualified in some way, the verb must stand in the form of a present verbal noun. The imperfective participle (infinitive) is never used in such cases, eg it is easy, difficult, troublesome, possible, dangerous' etc (p 61) These are contentious claims. We have to remember that Zbavitel's research is based on a limited number of texts and that his conclusions are drawn from these texts only - but because of these limitations he should be wary of making such sweeping statements, particularly as counter-examples are easily found, eg sentences 2.3.6 and 2.3.7 below. With verbs expressing emotion or attitude, लभविन्नी love, भुन / कारण लाभ like, dislike, पहेलन करा / होवा like, enjoy इष्ठा करा / होवा wish there are these examples

with infinitive

2.1.28 बिड़ला माफ ओळे खेत भालवासे।
Cats like to eat fish and milk. (Brother James, p 71)
2.1.29 आपनार बाँध शुद्ध भाल लाभी।
I like what you are saying. (Das, p 61) or
I like listening to you.
2.1.30 धुळ खेत तात्र खुब पहेलन। He likes drinking milk. (OS)
2.1.31 एसा नितेह होतेह होतेह तात्र।
He had wanted to take it. (Smith, p 116)

with verbal noun

2.1.32 ज्यामी कराय आमार भाल लाभे।
I like gardening. (TYB, p 138)
2.1.33 आमी बांग्ला पढ़ा पहेलन करी।
I like reading Bengali. (Seely, p 245)
2.1.34 वायावाय बाला काच्यात बाय्या आमार खुब भाल लाभे।
I love to take walks by the sea. (Smith, p 117)
2.1.35 परेंन मन बाळा वेळ्या आमी भालवासि ना।
I don't like to worry others. (Milne, p 176)
2.1.36 विभा विभुवत्स लोकांना यांगळा आमार इष्ठा नन।
I don't wish to go there without an invitation. (Milne, p 176)

Both पहेलन करा and इष्ठा करा are included here only for their semantic properties. They, along with all the other verbs Zbavitel gives, are actually noun-verb conjuncts, like नेरंगा करा, भय करा etc and I would put them under

2.2 with nouns

Smith has a category of infinitives governed by nouns implying delay or similar concepts, eg
2.2.1 He is now very late.

2.2.2 It didn't take very long to know and understand. (both p 132)

Smith's very semantically orientated classification does not allow for any other infinitive structures 'governed by nouns'. He does, however, have a section with 'verbs describing feelings, attitudes and intent'. All the verbs given in his example sentences are actually conjunct verbs, formed by a noun with colourless verbs like हाय वा हाय कार, पाओ या, for instance लाजा करा be embarrassed, तरसा पाओ या be encouraged, आया करा begin. One of his sentences in this section is indeed verbless, though आया-could be added.

You have such a desire to see Calcutta. (p 131)

These conjunct verb uses are quietly slipped into the category 'governed by verbs' by Smith and Milne, as well as by Zbavitel, but I think that a closer look reveals that in these sentences the infinitive stands in relationship to the noun itself, rather than to the verbal conjunct. If we consider the following simple sentences, which can all be translated as I have the wish to go there is I want to go there:

2.2.4 আমার ওখানে যেতে ইচ্ছা।
2.2.5 আমার ওখানে যেতে ইচ্ছা করে।
2.2.6 আমার ওখানে যেতে ইচ্ছা হল।

we find that this particular class of abstract nouns can often form conjuncts with more than one verb, (in this case with an omitted আয়, কার or হায়া) which shows that there is some flexibility within the conjunct but the relationship with the non-finite form (in this case the infinitive) is constant.

This is not meant to imply that the infinitive is the only possible non-finite verb form in these sentences

2.2.7 আমার ওখানে যাওয়ার ইচ্ছা আছে।

with a verbal noun form is also possible, but the semantic implications are somewhat different.

There are also a number of other nouns which can take an infinitive. In some of these instances, the verbal noun (usually in the genitive) can be used instead. Because of this overlap, I will deal with these infinitives in comparison to verbal noun structures under 7.2 (see below)

Abstract nouns in conjunct verbs with infinitives for which I have found no verbal noun equivalents (though there is no guarantee) are: নিষ্ঠা prohibition, অনুরোধ request, শুষ্ক beginning, আরাম power, influence. Example sentences for and discussion of these are given under 7.2.

2.3 with adjectives

There are not a lot of examples for this use and Smith does not mention it, but I think it should be included in a grammar as some of these examples are very common. The verbal noun can also be used in some of these sentences. Syntactically, most of these uses are subject - complement copulative sentences with a zero copula. The adjectives are:

- **good**  2.3.1 সবজি খেতে ভাল।  It is good to eat vegetables.

- **bad**  2.3.2 কথা করতে খারাপ।  It is bad to quarrel.

- **ready**  2.3.3 সে কাজ করতে তৈরি।  He is ready to work.
Apart from ুমিড়, ুামি and ুাজি, which have a future-directed component, all of these adjectives could just as easily be used with verbal nouns.

Brother James also gives the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ুামি</td>
<td>ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ুাজি</td>
<td>willing, agreeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ুামি</td>
<td>difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ুাজি</td>
<td>easy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 in other idiomatic structures

Smith (p 132f) has some examples of both see and শোনা hear in sentences like

2.4.1 কেমন দেখতে? What does (it) look like?
2.4.2 শুনতে দোষ কি? What's the harm in listening?

The syntactic status of these sentences is worth a thought. A subject, as in

2.4.1a কেমনটি কেমন দেখতে? What does the girl look like?

can be added, but no finite verb form. This suggests that we have here a copulative sentence with zero verb, parallel to a sentence like শোনাটি সুন্দর। The girl is beautiful, with a possible past tense rendering of

2.4.1b শোনাটি কেমন দেখতে ছিল?

The infinitive, modified by কেমন, thus has the syntactic function of a sentence complement.

Smith also points out the use of বলতে with the meaning called, known as, when one says, eg

2.4.3 শরম বলতে কি কিছু বেশ আর? Is there no longer anything called shame?
2.4.4 এখানে তাঁর প্রাচীনতা কেদার বলতে আর কেউ বেশ? Is there no one else here who can be called his close friend?

Milne also has

2.4.5 বলতে কি, তিনি উপস্থিত হওয়ার আগে খুব কঠিন হইয়াছে। To tell the truth, his presence has caused me great loss. (p 176)

I suggest that these idiomatic uses of বলা might be better dealt with on the lexical level.

3. THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE

The present participle, though homonymous with the infinitive, should be treated separately because it is in most cases syntactically quite distinct from it. Chatterji, without any further explanation, says quite categorically 'This -ite [ie the infinitive] of course is entirely different from the present participle affix' (p 1014). I assume that he refers here to the historical development of the two forms. In another
context he points out that, in particular contexts, it may be difficult to decide whether a given -ite form is a present participle or an infinitive (quoted on page 20). The present participle in a sentence has a comparable status to an adverb, as I mentioned earlier. This, however, only applies when the subject in both clauses is the same. In the case of two different subjects, eg

3.1 আমি যাইতে যাইতে সে আসতেলা।  *While I was going, he came.*

(Chatterji, p 1000)

the adverbial character is no longer felt. The doubling which often occurs with the present participle indicates continuity of the simultaneous actions or events, but the present participle is by no means always doubled. Chatterji has

3.2 তার এমন ভাই ধাকতে সে কষ্ট পায়।

*With such a brother living, he suffers.* (p 1000)

The present participle is most commonly used to describe an action which is simultaneous to the action of the finite verb, eg

3.3 আমি গান শুনতে শুনতে গাড়ি চালাই। *I listen to music while driving the car.*

It can also serve to provide a kind of time frame for the action expressed by the finite verb. Chatterji's second example (3.2) can be interpreted in this way. Smith also gives

3.4 এ বাড়িতে এ বাড়িতে বিয়ে হয়েছিল।

*While grandfather was alive a wedding took place in this house.*

Followed by the particle ে the present participle takes on the meaning as soon as. Smith has the following example:

3.5 এ সময় চূল বুড়ি লাইনা হেসে উঠলে।

*As soon as she opened her eyes Lila burst out laughing.* (p 134)

Another common use of the present participle is the doubled participle with এ between the two forms and followed by ে. This construction is best translated as no sooner than, eg

3.6 এ এক বছর যেতে না যেতেই সেনার প্রথম অশ্বারোহী শুরু হয়ে যায়।

*No sooner had a year or two passed than a great disquiet began in his family life.* (Smith, p 134)

Zbavitel has this interesting example (p 56)

3.7 কিন্তু সে তা প্রাপ্ত থাকতে পারব না।

*But I shall not be able to do that as long as I live.*

The position of the participial clause প্রাপ্ত থাকতে lit: *life remaining* within the main clause is unusual, but also shows clearly the need for separating present participle from infinitive uses. Present participle structures, such as this, involve two separate subjects, whereas infinitive structures can only involve one subject. This is, in fact, quite an important argument against treating the two structures as one.
As far as modern novels, both from West Bengal and from Bangladesh, are concerned, the present participle seems always to be doubled when there is only one subject in the sentence. Here are some examples, all taken from 'Uttorer hawa' by Bimal Kar:

3.8 while turning the pages he started to look... (p 56)

3.9 He thought of his brother while lying down. (p 13)

3.10 As he was talking Pabitra picked up the magazine from the table (p 11)

Zbavitel gives a number of examples with single present participle forms in order to show how they fall neatly into either of the following two categories

- there are two different subjects involved, eg

3.12 As soon as I went near, he too quickly sat up, startled. (Smith, p 134)

- the non-finite verb form is eg

3.13 Restrain yourself before it is too late. (Zbavitel, p 57)

Counter-examples are sentences 3.5 and 3.9, so no definitive rules can be made, but, based on Zbavitel's examples and sentences taken from modern Bengali novels, there is certainly a tendency towards this use of non-geminated (Zbavitel's term) present participles.

A crucial difference between English and Bengali present participles is that Bengali present participles cannot be used attributively. In fact, the only way to translate an English present participle phrase like a hard-working man with a non-finite form in Bengali is to use the verbal adjective একজন কাজ করার মানুষ. This is discussed in section 5. Due to their descriptive properties, present participle structures are much more common in narrative than in spoken language.

4. The verbal noun

The verbal noun can be used like any other noun, ie it can take case endings (eg sentences 4.2.1ff and 4.3.1ff) and determiners (eg sentence 4.1.1). There are two morphological forms of the verbal noun. Either আ - এ is added to the low stem of the verb, or বা - বা is added. The second form was originally a future tense verbal noun, and apart from one structure with ভাব, eg বলাভাব এনে না, বলাভাব on seeing, বলাভাব on saying etc, it is no longer used in the nominative case, but only in the genitive (see section 4.6).

4.1 as sentence subject

Taking together all the different examples for verbal nouns as subjects, a simple way of classifying these uses is to say that verbal nouns can occur as subjects in these three types of sentences:
4.1.1 in ordinary sentences like any other noun, eg

4.1.1.1 *Now the headache disappeared in a moment.* (Smith, p 124)

4.1.1.2 *I don't like your drinking alcohol.* (Radice, p 135)

4.1.2 in equational sentences with adjectival or nominal complements, eg

4.1.2.1 *It is not very easy to swim.* (Milne, p 176)

4.1.2.2 *Murder is a great sin.* (Milne, p 176)

4.1.3 in passive sentences

4.1.3.1 *(lit: My getting down didn't happen) I didn't get down.* (Smith, p 124)

Smith's classification of verbal nouns gives a misleading impression. His first section is verbal nouns as sentence subjects (§34.1.1) and his second impersonal uses with खाओ (§34.1.2) The logically-minded reader will see the two categories as alternatives and conclude, wrongly, that in the second use the verbal nouns are not sentence subjects.

If we are looking at verbal nouns as sentence subjects then Smith's §34.1.2. (impersonal uses with the third person of खाओ) and §34.1.3 (with उचित) should also come under this heading.

4.1.1 active sentences

Although this use seems straightforward, examples for it are surprisingly hard to find. Even sentence 4.1.1.2 has an equational element in it. Smith (p 124) has a syntactically similar sentence in

4.1.1.3 *But it wasn't in the fate of many to recover and return to their loved ones.*

Apart from the two sentences given (4.1.1.1 and 4.1.1.3), all of Smith's other examples in this paragraph are equational (as in 4.1.2) or governed by postpositions (section 4.4), where the verbal noun is not actually the sentence subject, eg

4.4.10 *We will keep the vow until we come back here.* (p 124)

From this we can conclude that equational (copulative) sentences as well as passive sentences are much more likely to have a verbal noun subject than active sentences.

4.1.2 equational sentences

Sentences with उचित are syntactically parallel to other structures with adjectival complements, eg sentences 4.1.2.1 and 4.1.2.2. The use of उचित should, ought is usually taught and listed, with good reason, together with दरकार need and कथा supposed to. These semantically related structures are often the students' first introduction to verbal noun use. I have separated उचित here on the grounds that in sentences with उचित the verbal noun takes on the role of sentence subject. उचित is an adjective (both
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An important difference between these structures and sentences with 动词 is that 动词 can be preceded by verbal nouns only whereas with 动词 etc the sentence subject can be any noun, eg

4.1.2.3 动词 动词。 It is easy to say but hard to do.
4.1.2.4 动词 动词。 Walking is good. (Brother James, p 60)

This may be partly explained by the semantic properties of 动词, in particular by its modal component, which call for an action or process rather than a thing preceding it. Examples with 动词 are:

4.1.2.5 动词 我们 do? Shouldn't that be done? (Milne, p 218)
4.1.2.6 动词 动词 动词 动词. We should have come earlier. (Smith, p 125)

Due to its inherent modal properties, 动词 does not seem to occur in future tense sentences. Some adjectival complements can have possessive pronouns preceding their sentence subjects, but, for instance, sentence 4.1.2.4 is more likely to change to

4.1.2.7 动词 动词。 Walking is good for you, rather than

A sentence-initial possessive pronoun is acceptable with the following adjectives:

4.1.2.8 动词 动词 动词. His going is necessary.
4.1.2.9 动词 动词 动词. I can't delay any longer: (lit: my delaying any longer is not possible)
4.1.2.10 动词 动词. My staying here is not suitable. (all OS)

and in Dasgupta's example

4.1.2.11 动词. Have you finished writing your letter?

These types of adjectives are more similar to 动词 in their syntactic behaviour than, say, 动词, 动词 etc. They have either a modal or an aspective component and combine well with verbal nouns, but not, as is the case with 动词, exclusively with verbal nouns.

4.1.3 passive sentences

Verbal nouns with 3rd person forms of 动词 (Smith's §39.2.1) also belong here. They are syntactically equivalent to the structures with 动词, eg

4.1.3.2 动词 动词 动词. It won't be possible to go this way.

lit: the going this way will not go

4.1.3.3 动词 动词 动词. Are vegetables available here?

lit: does getting vegetables go here?

Semantically, sentences with 动词 refer to the actual occurrence of events, sentences with 动词 to the possibility of their occurrence. Both structures can be used in all tenses, eg

4.1.3.4 动词. Everything was done to make the journey possible.
The new wife had been told to work. (Smith p 143)

4.1.3.5 কিছু দেখা না। It wasn't possible to see anything.

In connection with, say, conditional participles, these structures demonstrate the thriftiness in verbal energy which is so typical of Bengali, eg the English *if it is possible to understand* is in Bengali simply যোগ না।

Seely points to these variations
1. [verbal noun + দেখে + 3rd person of পারা] eg তা বলা দেখতে পারে। *One could say that,* and
2. [verbal noun + পারা + 3rd person of যাওয়া] eg তা কল্পে পারা যায়।

with the same meaning. There is undoubtedly redundancy, as Seely puts it, in these sentences, but it is an endearing kind of redundancy, and a neat demonstration of the combineability of non-finite forms.

The [vn + 3rd person of যাওয়া] structure is so common that, to the speaker, its semantic impact loses some of its force and the additional use of পারা *be able to* is meant to redress the balance. This is by no means just an uneducated, colloquial usage. Seely gives the following examples:

4.1.3.6 ...রায়েক নিষিদ্ধ জগত সৃষ্টি করবার প্রয়াস - যেকে কবি - জগত বলা দেখতে পারে।

...there remains the urge to create the perfect world - what might be called the poet's world...

4.1.3.7 কবিতা রচনার প্রক্রিয়া সম্পর্কে সংক্ষেপ বলতে পারা যায় এই: ...

Concerning the process of composing poetry, in brief one can say this:...

(both: Jibananda Das, *কবিতা প্রসঙ্গে*)

There is some disagreement as to whether we are dealing here with genuine passives or with impersonal structures - the difference seems to be somewhat unclear. In order to come to some conclusions on this, we need to take a closer look at the exact definitions of these terms. I intend to do this in chapter 6.

4.2 in the genitive with abstract nouns

4.2.1 with দরকার *need* and কথা *supposed to*

Both these structures are very common in Bengali and are often taught together, but there are important differences between them. Typical example sentences are

4.2.1.1 তোমার কিছু বলার দরকার। *You need to say something.*
4.2.1.2 আমার বাবার আসার কথা। *My father is supposed to come.*
4.2.1.3 কাটি জ্বালার দরকার নেই।

*(You) don't have to light the tinder.* (Smith, p 125)
4.2.1.4 তার সে কাজ করার দরকার ছিল।

*He needed to do that work.* (Brother James, p 62)
4.2.1.5 সেটা তোমার জানার কথা ছিল না। *You were not supposed to know this.*

A syntactical difference between the two is that দরকার can be preceded by other nouns

4.2.1.6 আমার একটি কলম দরকার। *I need a pen,*
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whereas the use of কথা in this sense is restricted to verbal nouns (as is উচ্চত).

Seely says about কথা: 'it is used with verbal noun + genitive to mean that the action is supposed or scheduled or due to take place or has the possibility of taking place' (p 91) The structure is not mentioned or listed separately in Bengali grammars, nor are there examples for it in dictionaries (Samsad, Bangla Academy). This suggests that from a language-internal point of view, this is just another idiomatic use of কথা, not to be singled out in any way, as for instance the use infinitive + দেওয়া allow would be and is in fact given in the Samsad dictionary. The sentence তার আসার কথা literally means there is word of his coming, which can refer to something that has been agreed or arranged or even promised, taking into account (Radice, p 239) that কথা দেওয়া means promise (give one's word).

Thus, although this is a useful structure for foreigners to learn in order to become acquainted with genitive verbal noun use, for Bengalis it is likely to be no more than one of the semantically more challenging of the many uses of কথা.

The situation with দেরকার is a little more complicated. As mentioned, দেরকার can be preceded by nouns other than verbal nouns and these nouns are, more often than not, apparently in the nominative (example 4.2.6). Verbal nouns can also lose their genitive ending, eg

4.2.1.7 আমার খেয়া আন্দোলন দেরকার। I really must know.

4.2.1.8 তুমি মেরে মেরে দেরকার।

(You) must take a look at that now and then. (both Smith, p 125)

These uses are either unexplained (Smith) or dismissed as 'sloppy' (as Klaiman would put it). Seely goes so far as to say 'though a noun, দেরকার also behaves as if it were an adjective, allowing for the verbal noun without genitive construction', eg

4.2.1.9 এ কথা দেওয়া যে তোমার পূর্ব বাংলায় গীতে কিছু কিছু কথায় দেরকার।

Believe me, it's important that you spend (lit: you need to spend) a little time in an East Bengal village. (p 358)

None of these explanations are very satisfactory. Taking a closer look at the syntax of sentences with দেরকার may take us a step further. Sentence 4.2.6 আমার একটি কলম দেরকার could be an equational sentence with দেরকার a nominal complement, but this does not work because there is an omitted আছে in this sentence which puts দেরকার firmly in the subject seat. If the slot preceding দেরকার is filled by a personal pronoun,

4.2.1.10 আমার তোমাকে দেরকার। I need you.

4.2.1.11 তোমার কি (কাকে) দেরকার? What (whom) do you need?

we find an unambiguous direct object. There is in Bengali, usually, no case ending for inanimate objects, which means that in a sentence like 4.2.6 কলম may look like a nominative but is, on the basis of 4.2.10 and 11, more likely to be a direct (accusative) object. Bengali makes no morphological distinction between datives and accusatives, so we tend to refer to an object case, but the semantic distinction of course remains. If we accept this interpretation, we arrive at two alternative structures with দেরকার:
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- can be preceded by a genitive, syntactically a genetivus objectivus, comparable to the Latin metus mortis fear of death or, as in sentence 4.2.4 need for doing something.
- can be preceded by a direct object

A comparable syntactical situation exists in English sentences like

* She doesn't like his evading the issue. or She doesn't like him evading the issue. 
I don't understand your doing this. or I don't understand you doing this.

There is, both in English and in Bengali, a degree of formality involved, ie the genitive structure is more formal, but both structures are acceptable and, what's more, syntactically explicable. This parallel holds only in so far as the alternative case use is concerned. Semantically closer are sentences like

* There is no need of your coming. or There is no need for you to come.

but these examples are more complex in structure.

Syntactically, this result is unusual for two reasons

- we have a direct object which is, to all intents and purposes, governed by a noun (government)
- there seems to be no other noun in Bengali which behaves in this way

Thus, though this explanation is satisfying in explaining the two different uses of government, it poses syntactical problems. In the absence of a more convincing solution, however, it must be considered at least as a possibility.

4.2.2 with other abstract nouns

In §34.4.1 Smith lists verbal nouns in the genitive used as complements, but all these uses of verbal nouns are actually governed by a particular and limited group of abstract nouns, used as components of conjunct verbs. There is a considerable overlap of these with infinitive structures and it seems appropriate to look at these structures together. In section 2.2 I have tried to show the internal relationship of conjunct verbs of this type in connection with preceding infinitives. The same relationship holds true for their use with genitive verbal noun forms. For the following abstract nouns I have found examples with verbal nouns but not with infinitives: यदि pretence, शुभकामना arrangement, नियम custom, कारण reason, cause, उदेश्य purpose, संभावना possibility, उपाय way, means, राजा way, road. Example sentences are given and discussed in section 7.2.

4.3 in the locative

This use of verbal nouns expressing cause is no longer very common in modern, spoken language where, as Zbavitel (p 13) indicates, it is replaced by a finite verb form followed by because. But it is still used in written language. McLeod (p 81) has these examples:

4.3.1 कौन से कान्हा बलाय आम्र भागच थरकिय हूँ।
Because you said that, my brother was grieved.

4.3.2 मिस्तिरा आज काज शेष ना कराय ताजेर काल आबार आसक तम्बर।
As the workmen could not finish the work today they will have to come again tomorrow.
The syntactic logic of a sentence like 4.3.1 is not immediately obvious. If the verbal noun form is taken strictly as a locative, eg 'तुम्ही सो कथा बलाय' you, in saying this, the verbal noun phrase is seen to be similar to a postpositional phrase. This means that we would not expect a second subject, but either of the following two structures, which only have one subject.

4.3.1 a) 'तुम्ही सो कथा बलाय आमार भाइको दुःख गिरेछ।
In your saying this you have hurt my brother. or
4.3.1 b) 'तोमार सो कथा बलाय आमार भाइ दुःखित होइहुँछ।
In your saying this my brother was hurt.

Sentence 4.3.2 fulfils the expected pattern with only one subject, but sentences 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 make it even clearer:

In your saying this my brother
wóth.

Sentence 4.3.2 fulfils the expected pattern with only one subject, but sentences 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 make it even clearer:

In both these sentences the verbal noun form is linked to a possessive pronoun rather than to a nominative/subject pronoun and the structure therefore seems more logical, but the existence of both these structures has to be registered.

4.3.5 तिनि उपस्थित होइहुँछ ते आमार खुब कठिनति हुइहुँछ।
His presence has caused me great loss. (Milne, p 176)

This sentence, again with two different subjects, would in spoken language more likely be:

4.3.5 a) तिनि उपस्थित छिलन बन्ल आमार खुब कठिनति हुइहुँछ।

This use of बन्ल is given in section 6.5.

4.4 with postpositions

Verbal nouns can, like other nouns, precede a postposition. Their case endings are determined by the postposition which follows them. Thus we can have:

4.4.1 रित्या कथा बला समुद्रे about lying
4.4.2 राज करार परिवर्तने instead of being angry
4.4.3 तौर याओऱ्यार गरें after his leaving

In any given sentence the tense reference is given in the finite verb form and the verbal noun phrase can then be, more appropriately, translated with a finite phrase in English, eg

4.4.3 a) तौर याओऱ्यार गरें आमार नास्ता खाव।
We will have breakfast after he leaves. or
4.4.3 b) तौर याओऱ्यार गरें आमार नास्ता खोयेछिलम।
We had breakfast after he left.

Verbal noun combinations with जप्ने for are used to express purpose in the same way as infinite structures are, eg instead of

2.1.9 तौरा अलाप करतेबसल।
They sat down to talk. (Brother James, p 69) we can say
4.4.4 तक्रार अन्वापन करार जनना करन।
There is a slight difference between these two semantically identical uses, in that the verbal noun structure is more stressed, more pronounced. In this example the infinitive sounds more natural, followed by a simple finite verb form, whereas in the following examples (both Smith, p 127) with more elaborate predicates the verbal noun structures are more appropriate:

4.4.5 দে সব হবি দেখার জন্য চারপাশে খাওয়ার জন্য খাওয়ার জন্য বেলে চিন্তা হয়েছে।
A crowd of people has formed all around to see those pictures.

4.4.6 জিজ্বে তাজা করে বেসার জন্য আনোন্দেই কফি হাউসে বাঁধে পড়ছে।
Many people drop into the coffee house for refreshments.

With the postposition থেকে, used in a temporal sense, verbal nouns take the genitive, eg

4.4.7 কলেজে অধ্যাপনা করার থেকেই এই অভ্যাসটা হয়ে গেছে।
He has had this habit since he taught in college. (Smith)

Verbal nouns behave differently from other nouns in connection with the postposition পর্যন্ত until, where the verbal noun is often, but not always, preceded by the negative না:

4.4.8 মেটির না থাকা পর্যন্ত অশেষ্কা করতে থাকে।
(They) are waiting until the car stops. (Smith, p 83)

4.4.9 দেখানে না যাওয়া পর্যন্ত ফিরে করতে পারে না।
I won't be able to do anything until I go there. (Milne, p 256)

but these are also possible:

4.4.10 ছুঁড়ে আসা পর্যন্ত... until the train comes... (Samsad)
4.4.11 দেখানে না যাওয়া পর্যন্ত আমারা ব্রত পালন করে।
We will keep the vow until we come back here. (Smith, p 124)

Smith also gives this rather tricky example

4.4.12 ছুঁড়ে আসা পর্যন্ত বসুন।
and, with a different postposition, Seely has

4.4.13 ছুঁড়ে এটা কেনার পরে আসি আসন।
After you buy this, I shall come.

As in sentences 4.3.1 and 4.3.5 we have here a verbal noun form in connection with a nominative pronoun without a finite verb to form a clause, ie the verbal noun has its own subject. In all these cases a possessive pronoun, eg তোর আসা পর্যন্ত... would have seemed more logical. Neither Smith nor Seely offer any kind of explanation for these structures. A closer syntactic analysis is needed, but as these examples are rather isolated I will have to leave them for the moment until a clearer pattern emerges.

4.5 used attributively
Bengali nouns in the genitive can be used attributively with other nouns. This is very common in cases where English uses compound nouns, eg heart-ache মনের ব্যাধি, sleep deprivation ঘুমের অভাব, wartime যুদ্ধের সময়, hand writing হাতের লেখা। Verbal nouns can be used in the same way and in these contexts often have an element of purpose or intent, eg
non-finite verb forms

4.5.1  
knife for cutting meat

4.5.2  
sitting room  (Smith, p 126)

4.5.3  
writing table  (Smith, p 126)

4.5.4  
rice set aside for giving as alms  (Chatterji, p 1019)

Three out of these four examples employ the future tense verbal noun and though, in the genitive, future and present verbal noun forms can often be used alternatively, there is good reason for these uses here.

4.6 future verbal nouns

The future tense verbal noun is, in most grammar books, only mentioned in passing as an alternative to the present tense verbal noun. The only remaining use of future tense verbal nouns in the nominative is in combinations with মাত্র only, corresponding to as soon as, but even in these cases it alternates with the present tense form, eg

with future vn  
4.6.1  
He went off as soon as he heard this.  (Milne, p 178)

4.6.2  
As soon as I entered the room he asked...  (Smith, p 125)

with present vn  
4.6.3  
As soon as it was evening Sharma went out.

In the genitive the future can be used instead of the present tense form without any change in meaning. Smith (p 126f) has these mixed examples

with present vn  
4.6.4  
Have you something to say?

4.6.5  
I am doing what has to be done.

4.6.6  
There is nothing to see there.

with future vn  
4.6.7  
That which was going to happen, has happened.

4.6.8  
Do what has to be done now.

These sentences are probably representative of the quantitative distribution of these verbal noun forms, ie the future tense forms with their special future-directed semantic component are in decline. Their gerundival meaning that which is to be done, is losing some of its impact in modern Bengali. This could indicate a gradual phasing out of the future verbal noun form, but it is unlikely to be replaced entirely by present verbal nouns as they do not have the same semantic force. Zbavitel says 'the gerundival meaning is the only one reserved exclusively to the future verbal noun, which is irreplaceable by a present verbal noun, in this function', but modifies this by pointing to the 'loss, or at least weakening of the awareness of this difference between present and future verbal nouns' (p 41). If we accept Zbavitel's assumption that the future verbal noun is not going to survive in Bengali, then what structures are likely to replace it in its gerundival use?
In sentence 4.6.8 the obvious alternative to the verbal noun structure is an infinitive + construction, ie the verb to be followed by a verb. This sentence has an explicit compulsory element but, even without that, infinitives are most likely to replace these future verbal noun structures from a semantic point of view. They can express the same future-directed intent or purpose as future verbal noun forms:

2.1.12 आमा आर किंतु करार थाकेना। I will come to play cards.

In real use we will also find present tense verbal nouns, eg

4.6.9 आमा आर किंतु करार थाकेना। Nothing more remains for me to do. (Smith, p 127)

This sentence could also, and with perhaps more impact, read आमा आर किंतु करार थाकेना। with an infinitive.

5. THE VERBAL ADJECTIVE

The verbal adjective represents the past passive participle, ie बनाना as an adjective means having been prepared. Verbal adjectives are homonymous with verbal noun forms, but are used attributively or predicatively with nouns. Zbavitel says 'In many cases these verbal adjectives have become so common that it is difficult to decide whether any verbal element is still felt in them' (p 47).

Ordinary adjectives, like nouns, can take the determiners त्रय or त्रय in an appropriate context. This is, in effect, a nominalisation of adjectives. For instance, when asked

5.1 कौनसा / कुला लें? Which one(s) will you take?

the answer can be

बड़ा the big one, नरम गुला the soft ones,
नया the new one, फली the good one,
अनूठा the unripe ones, लाल गुला the red ones,
शुष्क राखा the beautiful one etc.

With verbally derived adjectives the definite articles त्रय and त्रय can be used with the following:

पाकता the ripe one, अकस्मा the broken one,
विड्डला the wet one, रंग करता the coloured one,

possibly with

खोला open 5.2 मिट्टी में तेज खोंब खेलना आश्चर्य का।
If you want to eat sweets, eat the ones that have been opened first.

काटा cut 5.3 कोना कितने काटा? काटाइ।
Which cake should I give? The one that's been cut.

खोला count 5.4 कोना टाका नियोजा।खोला गुला।
Which money did he take? The money that was counted.

खोला buy 5.5 कोना नाट परब? पक्कले का काटाइ।
Which shirt will you wear? The one bought yesterday.

Deriving adjectives from verbs only to make them into nouns seems a complicated procedure, when nouns can be derived from verbs directly and when, morphologically, the forms remain the same, but
there is an important difference in meaning, ie *কেনা* as a verbal noun means *the buying* (active), whereas the product of verb → adjective → noun means *the one that has been bought* (passive and perfective).

This kind of structure is possible with quite a number of, but by no means all, Bengali verbs, eg with a verb like দেওয়া *give*

5.6 যেখানে দেওয়া কথা  ...  *the promise made to mother*

is possible, but

কেনা কথা?    which promise?-

* যেখানে দেওয়ারা ...  *the one made to mother* (?)

sounds unlikely. The more natural answer to the question কেনা কথা? which promise? would be

আমি মাকে যা দিয়েছি  *the one I made to mother;*

with a finite verb form in a relative clause.

The initial hypothesis that verbal adjective formation is restricted to transitive verbs turns out to be wrong, as পাকা *ripen* is an intransitive verb. Equally,

5.7 সরা গাছ  *dead tree*  5.8 ভাসা ভাল  *broken branch*

5.9 বুকা খুলি *bent knife*  5.10 থামা পাড়ি *car that has been stopped*

are all derived from intransitive verbs.

In contradiction to Zbavitel's statement above I find that even with a well established verbal adjective like পাকা *ripen* the verbal connection remains strong. When asked

5.11 আমারগুলো কি পাকা? (adjective)  *Are the mangoes ripe?*,

a negative answer is likely to be

না, এখনো পাকা নি। (verb)  No, they haven't ripened yet,

rather than

না, এখনো পাকা হয় নি।(adjective) No, they are not yet ripe.

Attributive examples for verbal adjectives (mainly from Smith):

5.12 তৌষণী পানি *boiled water*

5.13 ময়না মিশে বানানো রুটি *bread made with flour*

5.14 আঁকা ছবি *drawn picture*

5.15 নাম করা কবি *famous (lit: having made name) poet*

5.16 বেঁধা যানা জানা ছেলে *educated boy*

5.17 সচেয়ে নেওয়া গল্প *story taken from a book (TYB, p 153).*

5.18 এই সব বাল দেওয়া শব্দ *all the omitted words (TYB, p 153)*

As can be seen from examples like 5.15 নাম করা কবি *famous poet* and 5.16 বেঁধা যানা জানা ছেলে *educated boy* the passive aspect of verbal adjectives can change to an active meaning. Zbavitel has more of these examples - most of them are not ordinary everyday language but their occurrence should be noted:

5.19 বাবা মা মারা ছেলে *child whose parents have died*

5.20 ইন্টারেজী কেথায় লোক *man who has learnt English*

5.21 কনিছি করতে পারা মেয়ে *girl who can copy* (most unusual!)

5.22 পায়ে চলা রাস্তা *footpath (all p 48)*

which is just a roundabout way of saying হ্রাসের রাস্তা *a road for walking.*
The question remains of how productive these structures are. If one can say

5.21 করলে তবু না তারে

is it also possible to say

5.23 বিজ্ঞাপন ব্রিকে চোখে চাহিয়েছেন the boy who wants to eat ice-cream ?

This opens up unexpected possibilities, but I would not consider these ordinary language uses. However, the sentences show the potential of the verbal adjective to take on active meaning and also to lose its perfective element. It is thus semantically linked to the present participle, which cannot be used attributively in Bengali. Earlier on we found conditional participles 'standing in' for perfective participles when there is more than one subject in the sentence (examples 1.2.1 and 1.2.2). Here again, we have a case of one verb form 'helping out' where particular syntactic restrictions apply. For an English present participle, eg the singing boy the closest Bengali equivalent is a verbal adjective পান করা হয়েছে.

Smith gives, under the predicative uses of verbal adjectives: সব তার জানা আছে . . . This is more likely to be a verbal noun, forming the subject of the sentence, ie he has the knowing.

Predicative uses of verbal adjectives are:

5.24 দরজা সারাধিন খোলা থাকে। The door stays open all day.

5.25 তার কাঠামো উলটা। What he says doesn’t make sense.

(lit: his words are upside down)

5.26 কাপড়ের হুলুলা ফিজা।

The clothes are all wet. (all Sableski, p 441)

The verbal form মারা is suitably classified as a verbal adjective in example 5.19, but Sutton-Page also calls this a past passive participle (ie an adjective!) in the sentence

5.27 সে মারা গেছে। He’s dead. (p 157)

The main argument against this is the fact that no other adjective, verbally derived or otherwise, combines directly with যাওয়া, without the perfective participle হয়ে to make the connection, such as বড় হয়ে যাওয়া grow up, ফিজা হয়ে যাওয়া get wet etc.

Seely (p 134), surprisingly, links মারা যাওয়া with verbal noun + 3rd person form of যাওয়া to express possibility, as in পাঁচ যাওয়া যাওয়া available. In মারা যাওয়া, not only is the semantic component of possibility lost, but the syntactic element of passivity is also absent. সে মারা গেছে he has died is clearly, syntactically at least, an active sentence and different from তাকে ডাক দেওয়া যায় he can be called where no active agent is given and তাকে him is the object of the verb.

I think মারা যাওয়া needs to be considered a fixed verbal phrase. The grammatically expected সে যাওয়া is also used, though more for plants and animals. But for humans মারা যাওয়া is the more common form.

6. THE PERFECTIVE PARTICIPLE (pp)

The perfective participle is by far the most common of Bengali non-finite verb forms. Chatterji gives a sentence with fifteen perfective participle forms and one finite verb and says 'There is nothing unusual in a Bengali sentence like:

তাকে ডাকে, সকল সে চারটি খোলা নয়, জিন্দগীরুরা সবে তবে নিয়ে গাড়িতে চড়িয়ে দিয়ে।' etc, etc (p 1011)
It is not worth giving the whole sentence or translating it, and the sentence is so unusual that it is almost as famous as 'supercalifragilistic....', though perhaps not in the same circles, but Chatterji is making the point that the perfective participle is a very common and characteristic feature of Bengali. In active sentences its use is restricted to sequences of actions or events with the same subject. Perfective participles are also used for making compound verbs, where the perfective participle forms a closer link with the finite verb form. Instead of a sequence of events we have one action or event, with the perfective participle carrying the main meaning and the sentence-final verb carrying tense, agreement, and sometimes aspectual information. In some cases the sentence-final verb can lose its own lexical meaning altogether. Compound verbs are dealt with in a separate chapter.

The Bengali perfective participle has the following functions:

6.1 describing preceding actions or events
In sentences with two or more verbs the perfective participle is used to refer to the earlier verbal action in a temporal sequence of events. Any Bengali verb can be used in this structure. The perfective participle is an active verb form and English equivalents are are having done, having said, having gone. In English you can form a sentence like

*Having arrived at the station, he went to buy his ticket.*

but the structure sounds clumsy and unnatural, compared to the easy, elegant and idiomatic perfective participle structure in Bengali:

6.1.1 প্রথমে স্থানে তার টিকেট কেটে দেল।

No wonder these structures are so popular in Bengali! In order to avoid this type of 'school-boy Latin' in English, Bengali perfective participles are best translated with connecting conjunctions like and, after, then etc. Examples are:

6.1.2 আরপর কিছুটা হেঁটে থাকা উপর বিয়ে করল।

*After that they walked a bit, went onto the grass and sat down.*

6.1.3 আমি কাজ ছাড়ে সকাত বিদ্যে থাকবো।

*When I finish the job, I'll be standing there.* (all Smith, p 135)

and this, both syntactically and politically, rather extreme example

6.1.4 গুল্ম রটি যে বিশেষভাবে কল্যাণের কাজ নিয়ে গিয়ে ধূঢ়ক করেছেন।

*Rumour has it that the missionaries are tricking the boys, seizing them, taking them away and making them Christians.* (all Smith, p 135)

In negative sentences a negated perfective participle can describe either a preceding action, as in

6.1.5 অর্থাৎ না কেনায় থাকতে পারবি না।

*Don't go until you have got permission.*

or it can express manner (see 6.3) and is then best translated as without, eg

6.1.6 না কেহ থাকতে পারি না।

*We can't live without eating.* (both Brother James, p 87)

6.2 describing simultaneous actions or events
non-finite verb forms

Instead of a temporal sequence the perfective participle can describe an action or event which is simultaneous with that of the main verb. Smith says that this is always true when the perfective participle is a stative verb but active perfective participles are just as common. These are his examples:

6.2.1  দুজনে নাও ডেকে শুমাঁছিলা।
  
  Both were snoring as they slept. (p 135)

6.2.2  সাদৃশ্য বিন্দুর বেসে দে হাত মুছে।
  
  Sitting at the side of the courtyard, he is washing his hands.
  (p 159)

6.2.3  অনেকে তার দিকে অক্ষরে যেতাল।
  
  Many people stared at her.
  (p 134)

6.2.4  আমি আমার আমার বড়ু বিমল মুঠো পালালাম।
  
  I and my friend Bimal ran away.
  (p 134)

Sentences 6.2.3 and 6.2.4 could almost be considered examples for compound verbs as the respective verb forms are practically synonymous and translate into English as one semantic unit. They are not acceptable as compound verbs only because neither বেশ না পালালাম nor ফেলু are among the verbs which are defined as compound markers in Bengali. But their use in these sentences shows that the boundaries between what can or cannot be a compound marker are more flexible, and our definitions more arbitrary than we like to think.

The demarcation line between this and the adverbial use of perfective participles is sometimes blurred. In sentence 6.2.1, for instance, নাও ডেকে snoring could be seen as an adverbial phrase expressing manner rather than as a simultaneous occurrence. The distinction between the two uses serves to draw attention to adverbial structures which do not involve an element of time (see below).

6.3 used adverbially

The perfective participle can, syntactically, assume adverbial character and express, semantically, manner, temporal circumstances or cause of the main verbal action. In these cases it loses its perfective aspect. Examples for adverbials expressing manner are:

6.3.1  হেলে ক্ষেতে উপায়টি করে খাবে।
  
  He will earn his money by his own hard work (Zavoret, p 67)

6.3.2  আমারা মৌকা করে এসেছি।
  
  We have come by boat. (Sutton-Page, p 157)

The perfective participle করে having done is commonly used to turn adjectives or nouns into adverbs, eg ভাল করে well, সাদৃশ্য করে carefully.

Other verbs are

6.3.3  দেয়ালের দিকে যুগ ফিরিয়ে খায়।
  
  He eats with his face turned towards the wall. (Smith, p 135)

Milne also gives

6.3.4  এক পয়সা জাহা এত বিদান কোন?
Why so much bickering about a penny? (p 181)
but লাই (or নিয়ন) in this case is a postposition with পায়া as an object. The sentence has nothing to do with a description of manner.
A negated perfective participle can be used to express without, instead of, eg

6.3.5 কেবল পালা না করে এমন সুশীল বাংলা পুরূরবছল।
You have bagged such a husband without making any effort.
(Smith, p 136)

6.3.6 তাত না খেয়ে খালি মাংস দাখ।
He just wants meat instead of rice. (OS)

The perfective participle can describe temporal circumstances. Rather than giving a preceding or simultaneous verbal action this participle construction provides either a time frame or a temporal reference for the action of the finite verb. This use is perhaps best classified as a sub-category of adverbial uses of manner. The dividing line between the two categories is sometimes blurred, for instance in this sentence

6.3.7 পশ্চাতে একটি একটি করে আমাদের বলে দেবে।
He will tell us the story bit by bit (in instalments) (Das, p 76)

there is a temporal element, but as in sentence 6.3.9 (see below) the perfective participle describes the manner of the sentence predicate. In the following sentence the temporal element is less ambiguous, ie the perfective participle does not give the manner, but the time reference of the finite verb:

6.3.8 আমাদের বিশ্বাস করে বিশ্বাস করতে হচ্ছে।
We must rest awhile. (Smith, p 72)

A note on In the chapter on postpositions করে is not considered to be a postposition in Bengali because in many of its uses a separate preceding or simultaneous action is involved (eg sentence 6.3.1 and 2) There are, however, a number of uses which would require some semantic acrobatics in order to be considered separate actions, as in these sentences (all from Milne, p 444)

6.3.9 অক্টো পরে একটি একটি করিয়া পরিচয় পাওয়া দেব।
Then, by and by, we came to know him.

6.3.10 আমি তাকে ধাকিয়া করতে বললাম।
I used every possible entreaty to induce him to stay.

6.3.11 কথাটা পোকারে হঠাৎ যেন নতুন করিয়া ঠেকিয়া।
The idea suddenly struck Gora in quite a new light.

In these sentences, as well as in expressions like হঠাৎ করে suddenly, দেয়া করে kindly, কহিয়া করে how, একটা করে one by one, বিশেষ করে especially etc করে goes semantically beyond a perfective participle and ought to be given a different status. The difficulty in considering it a postposition lies not so much in the fact that it doesn't translate into English with one equivalent preposition, but in that it combines with a variety of nouns, adjectives, interrogative and even adverbs (হঠাৎ suddenly), and generates an adverbial rather than a postpositional phrase.

-53-
Examples expressing cause are:

6.3.12 T j ^ N
M ^ IT O t' ^ 1
I have pain in my feet because I have travelled 20 miles. (Milne, p 181)

6.3.13 I  am ill because I was awake during the night. (Milne, p 181)
Although there is clearly a causal relationship in these sentences, the perfective aspect of the participle is still felt, ie there is still the element of one action preceding another. The same is true for some of the sentences Smith classifies as describing manner, for instance

6.3.14 The eldest boy came and stood up straight in front of him. (p 135)
It may therefore be more appropriate to classify these uses as containing an additional semantic element rather than as an alternative to the uses given in 6.1.

6.4 with ì and ü
Perfective, like conditional, participles can be followed by ì or ü, for emphasis, ü for concessive force. Followed by ì the perfective participle can take on the meaning as soon as, just then.

6.4.1 As soon as I lay on the bed I fell asleep. (Brother James, p 89)
6.4.2 Tell this to father as soon as you get home. (Milne, p 182)
but it can also simply add emphasis, eg

6.4.3 My brother is going to take (for sure) the sari over to the old house.
(Seely, p 103)
Structures with a concessive ü following a perfective participle are best translated with although, even though. They are not as common as conditional participles with ü, but they imply that the preceding action has, in fact, taken place.

6.4.4 Even though he knows so much, he is so silent. (Smith, p 137)
6.4.5 Although I went there I could not see him. (Brother James, p 88)
In present tense sentences this use can be semantically identical to the conditional participle use:

6.4.6 Even if he is punished, he doesn't cry.
Milne (p 182) gives a number of examples in which the perfective participle followed by ü and the finite verb form are from the same verb. These combinations result in some interesting semantic interpretations. Sentences are of this type:

6.4.7 Even if he is punished, he doesn't cry.
non-finite verb forms

Though he saw his own son's fault, he overlooked it.
6.4.8 তুমি কাজটা করিয়াও করিলে না।
Though you did the work, you did not do it properly.
6.4.9 তাহারা একথা শনিয়াও শুনিল না।
They heard this but paid no attention to it.

6.5 uses of বলে

Smith lists the following uses for the perfective participle of বলে:

- as a quotation marker, eg
  6.5.1 প্রুষ বলে কিছু নেই। There is nothing called a 'ghost'.

- corresponding to 'as', eg
  6.5.2 তাদের পরিবারের সুখাদি বলে প্রায় আছে। in this case better translated with 'for':
  Their family have a reputation for being beautiful.

- with double objects after copular verbs, eg
  6.5.3 তাকে বলে বলা মানুষ বলে মনে হয়।
  We (implied) consider him to be an extremely good man.

- at the end of a clause to mark speech clauses, eg
  6.5.4 বিধায় বললে বলে মনে হয় না। I don't think that he was lying.

- at the end of a clause meaning because, eg
  6.5.5 বাস বন্ধ হিসেবে বলে মনে হয়।
  She returned on foot because the buses had stopped.

- at the end of a clause corresponding to in order to, eg
  6.5.6 ঐ মানে দেখায় বলে রাখি নিয়ে যাচ্ছি।
  I'm taking this home to show it to mother.

Milne (p 406) also has these examples with কি বলে in the meaning of how, I think in all these cases the use of কি বলে would be more usual:

6.5.7 তুমি কি বলিয়া এরূপ সুখী জীবনের সহিত মেলিতে পার।
  How can you play with such naughty children?

6.5.8 তুমি কি বলে আর সেখানে দুঃখ সেখানিয়া?
  On what pretext will you show your face there again?

Smith's classifications are based mainly on semantic criteria. From a syntactic viewpoint sentences 1-3 and 7-8 are structures where বলে retains at least some of its perfective participle features. More interesting are sentences 4-6 where বলে follows a finite verb form and it is in these occurrences that বলে establishes its status as a conjunction in Bengali. Since all of these are idiomatic uses of just one verb, I suggest that they be dealt with on the lexical rather than the grammatical level.

6.6 same subject condition (Klaiman)
'A past participle in the first clause with a finite verb in the second clause can only be used if the subject of both the participle and the finite verb is the same' (McLeod, p 39)

This claim is widely supported, eg by Chatterji, Dimock, Milne and Zbavitel. In sentences that require different subjects the conditional participle can be used to express a temporal sequence of events (eg We will go when the rain has finished) - so, apparently, there is little need for using the perfective participle in sentences with more than one subject. However, on closer inspection, it becomes clear that there is a need to differentiate between types of sentences. The 'same subject condition' (SSC, Klaiman) applies to active sentences, ie sentences where the perfective participle and the finite verb express consecutive actions.

Mimi Klaiman, in her book *Volitionality and Subject in Bengali* gives a detailed analysis of sentences where the perfective participle and the finite verb have different subjects. All example sentences in this section, unless otherwise attributed, are Klaiman's.

Her first sentence - and this is the only example of an all-active sentence - is a case of what she calls 'sloppy identity', eg

6.6.1 জানুয়ারি সংখ্যা হ্যাটেলে গিয়ে আমারা দুজনে মাছ খেলাম।  
*When I went to the restaurant with Jodu, we both ate fish.*

Though there is some referential overlap between the two subjects (I - we), they are grammatically quite separate. A similarly 'sloppy' situation exists when both verb forms refer to the same subject but in different cases, eg

6.6.2 খিসিসু লুকিয়ে আমার অনেক বই পড়া হয়েছে।

Though logical subject of both verb forms is I, the second clause আমার অনেক বই পড়া হয়েছে is a passive structure with বই book as its grammatical subject. The sentence is best translated as

*I have read a lot of books secretly at the office.*

Another similar example is

6.6.3 এর ফুল খেয়ে তার ফল হয়েছে।

*Taking the medicine has benefited him.*

The following sentence is from a modern Bengali novel *Uttorer hawa* by Bimal Kar:

6.6.4 বাবা বাবা চেষ্টা করেও প্রমাণিত আলোগুলো জুলিয়ে রাখা যাবার না।

*However much she tried (pp) it wasn't possible to keep the candles lit* (p 151).

Again, the second clause is a passive structure.

Klaiman gives the following examples, but claims that they are no exception to the SSC because 'the dative subjects of these clauses, though not overt, are nevertheless coreferential with the subjects of the respective reduced clauses'. (p 109)

6.6.5 অনেক কি হবে?  *What is accomplished by getting angry?*

6.6.6 আমারা চাহিয়ে দরকার নেই।

*There is no point in worrying your head.*

6.6.7 কি জামাট কিছু জামাট করিয়ে?

*What does it profit one letting letters pile up?*
What is the alternative to going on the bus?

Smith (p 136) has two very similar examples with না উপায় ছিল না: 6.6.9

There was nothing to do but get up.

Smith (p 136) has two very similar examples with না উপায় ছিল না: 6.6.9

There was nothing to do but get up.

Klaiman's interpretation of these structures may be a logical part of her dative subject theory, but structurally it is untenable. There certainly is coreferentiality in a sentence like 6.6.3 কিছু থেকে তার ফল হলো, but in sentence 6.6.5 এর কিছু হবে? it is not at all clear what কিছু হবে refers to. If the sentence is extended to 6.6.11

What will happen to the children if you (implied) get angry,

the subjects are clearly not coreferential.

The same is true for sentences 6.6.6 to 6.6.8. The use of the perfective participle in sentence 6.6.6, though acceptable, is not as common as the verbal noun in the genitive would be, ie মাধ্যম ঘটনার সমাধান নেই.

Another condition for the SSC to apply is, according to Klaiman, the animacy of the subject. That is, the perfective participle can be used in sentences with different subjects, as long as these subjects are inanimate, eg.

6.6.12 ঘরে রুইট পনের কাঠের মশুম মলে হলো। translated as

The rain entered the room and the wooden floor was ruined.

In the following paragraph, however, Klaiman states that a human subject can also occur in this context, ie as the 'subject' of the finite verb form, as long as it is used in a passive construction, eg

6.6.13 ট্যাক্স বেড়া নিয়ে অনেকের কষ্ট হয়েছে।

Taxes have increased and many people have had difficulties.

Klaiman is conservative in her translation of these sentences, when the causal relationship between the two clauses is so obvious. I suggest the two sentences should be translated as

6.6.12 The wooden floor was ruined by the rain entering the room.

6.6.13 Many people have had difficulties through the tax increase.

In conclusion of these considerations, the rules for the use of the perfective participle should be reformulated as follows:

- the same subject condition applies in active sentences, but can sometimes be neglected if
  - the two subjects are at least partly coreferential (sentence 6.6.1), or if
  - the same subject is referred to in different cases (6.6.2 and 6.6.3)
- the same subject condition does not apply if the finite verbal clause contains
  - a passive structure (6.6.2, 3, 4, 12 and 13), with either
    - an inanimate subject (6.6.2, 3, 4 and 12) or
    - a human subject in oblique case (6.6.13)
• an impersonal structure (6.6.5 to 10)

Again, we come up against the somewhat unclear dividing lines between passive and impersonal structures, but in this case the distinction is not essential as the same subject conditions apply to both equally. However, a clearer definition of these structures is a crucial factor in understanding Bengali sentence structures (see chapter 6).

7. SUMMARY

7.1 COMBINATIONS AND OVERLAP OF NON-FINITE VERB FORMS

The previous sections consisted of a one-by-one analysis of non-finite verb forms and have established, to some extent, their different uses, semantic implications and syntactic restrictions. The next step is to bring this information together in order to establish the way in which non-finite verb forms interact with one another and in how they overlap or can be used alternatively. The research questions are

• which non-finite verb forms can be used together and how do they syntactically interact with one another?
• which non-finite verb forms can be used alternatively and what are the semantic implications?
• what other connections exist between any two non-finite verb forms?

This may give us a clearer overall picture of the non-finite half of the Bengali verbal system. The verb forms are dealt with in the same order as before, ie 1 conditional participle (cond part), 2 infinitive, 3 present participle, 4 verbal noun (vn), 5 verbal adjective (this does not form combinations with other non-finite forms) and 6 perfective participle (pp). The list reduces itself as it progresses (1 compared to 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; 2 compared to 3, 4, 5, 6 etc)

1 conditional participle

The conditional participle can combine with these non-finite verb forms, eg

1-2 with infinitives

a) সে তোমাকে যেতে নিলে... if he lets you go

in infinitive + যেতে নিলে structures (1.4)

b) কলকাতা যেতে translated as in fact

in infinitive + যেতে নিলে structures (2.1), denoting obligation:

c) তোমাকে তার সঙ্গে যেতে নিলে... If you have to meet with her...

In infinitive + যেতে নিলে structures implying permission, a conditional participle is less likely to appear. The strangeness of

d) ?ওখানে যেতে থাকলে...

if it is allowed to go there...
lies in the semantic ambiguity of the verb in this context.
Conditional participle and infinitive combinations are possible in all cases where an infinitive is
governed by another verb (section 2.1), noun or adjective

e) If you have such a desire to see Calcutta ...(sentence 2.2.3)
f) If he is getting ready to go out ... (sentence 2.3.4)
The conditional participle, by replacing a finite verb form, changes a main clause into a
dependent conditional or temporal clause without affecting the interdependent relationships
among the sentence components.

1-3 with present participles

a) if he drives with the radio on (listening to the radio)...
Syntactically, the present participle is more likely to appear in the same sentence function as the
conditional participle and to offer an alternative structure, eg

b) if (when) I write a letter...
c) while I am writing a letter...

1-4 with verbal nouns

Combinations occur especially in passive structures. The verbal noun forms the sentence
subject with conditional participle forms of হওয়া and যাওয়া, eg

a) if I see him
b) if it is possible to bring the book...
The verbal noun can form an object in a conditional sentence, but in these cases the connection
between the two non-finite forms is not strong:

c) if (you) learn to drive
Equally, genitive verbal nouns in connection with conjunct verbs can be used in conditional
clauses but the real connection is between the verbal noun and the following noun, not between
the two verb forms
d) if you want to go
Verbal nouns and conditional participles can be used alternatively in structures with চলা with a
semantic component of acceptability. The equivalent conditional participle uses are discussed in
section 1.6. Examples are

with conditional participle e) One shouldn't waste even a little time. (Smith, p 142)

with verbal noun f) It will no longer be possible to stay in the hotel.
g) Everything may be done here. (Smith, p 144)
These sentences are, of course, very similar to verbal noun \( \text{structure} \)s expressing possibility, but I think that the comparison with conditional structures is also justified.

1-5 **verbal adjectives** are by definition linked to nouns, either predicatively or attributively, and do not form direct links with other non-finite verb forms. They will not be considered further, except in comparison with verbal nouns.

1-6 **perfective participles** combine readily and easily with other non-finite forms. Examples with conditionals are:

a) *if you come after finishing this*

b) *if you leave all this and go on the bus*

It is important here to distinguish between sequential contexts and those where the perfective participle is part of a compound verb, as in:

c) \( \text{if you explain the poem} \)

where there is a much stronger connection between the two non-finite forms than there is in the previous sentences.

Perfective participles cannot generally be used in active sentences with more than one subject - in these cases the conditional participle can step into the breach and assume a temporal rather than a conditional meaning, eg:

d) *I will meet with him when I go to Kolkata.*

e) *When I go to Kolkata he will come, too.*

**2 infinitive**

2-3 and **present participle** are identical in form. They are neither used together nor alternatively, but there has been a lack of criteria for making a clear distinction between the two. From the findings in this chapter the following can be stated with some confidence:

- Geminated, ie doubled, uses are always present participles.
  
a) *He thought of his brother while lying down.*

- In sentences with more than one subject the non-finite form is always a present participle.
  
b) *While grandfather was alive a wedding took place in this house.*

- When this form functions as subject or object of another verb, including \( \text{he will, \&c. or conjunct verbs, it is always an infinitive.} \)
  
c) *They started to talk.*

  d) *Breakfast has to be prepared in the morning.*

  e) *Is it permitted to go there?*

  f) *I want to die. (Smith, p 118)*
These findings enable us to draw a clearer line between infinitives and present participles and in the absence of syntactic criteria, which will cover most cases, semantic considerations can help to clarify the situation, for instance if we compare

g) बाजारে येते आमी खाली नियो खाव।
   *I will take the bag to go to the market.*

h) चेख खुलतेनॉ लीला चेहने उठलो।
   *As soon as she opened her eyes Lila burst out laughing.*

the semantic component of purpose, which is characteristic of infinitives is present in sentence g) and absent in sentence h), clearly distinguishing the two forms. This component of purpose occurs with intransitive main verbs, as in sentence g).

If we take

i) तारा तस्य खेलते आसव। *They will come to play cards.*

a potential present participle reading can only be achieved by doubling the verb form

j) तारा तस्य खेलते खेलते आसव। *They will come playing cards.*

2-4 **Verbal nouns** and infinitives are often used alternatively (see 7.2), but there are some instances where they can be used together. These tend to be examples of rather formal or stilted language, eg on a poster

   a) अपनाके अपेक्षा करते बला हवे *you will be told to wait*

Equally, sentences like 2.1.9 can be turned into passive sentences by changing the subject into a genitive, the finite verb form into a verbal noun and making it the subject of the sentence, eg

   b) तारा आलाप करते बसव। *They sat down to talk* can be changed to

   c) तादेव आलाप करते बसा हवे।

This is syntactically acceptable but in all other respects rather pointless and a suitable translation would require some syntactical contortions in English. From a definitional point of view, examples like these show that verbal nouns are capable of taking complements. Dasgupta makes a strong case for classing verbal nouns as nominal, but their ability to take complements or objects (see p 22), is a verbal characteristic.

The other examples of infinitive and verbal noun combinations are Jibananda Das's sentences

   d) याके कवित-जल्लक बला येते पारव।

   *what might be called the poet's world...*

   e) संस्कृतम बलते पारव याय एव। *... in brief one can say this....*

which, as Seely indicates, contain some redundancy.

2-6 **Perfective participles** and infinitives combine easily, but the examples which spring to mind tend to be of the compound verb variety, eg

   a) भात फेंको दिनेते हवे। *The rice will have to be thrown away.*

In sequential cases, as in, for example

   b) स्नान करें खेतें।
Come to eat when you have had a shower.

the connection between the two non-finite forms is rather tenuous. However, again as with conditional participles, infinitives can precede perfective participles, eg

c) having gone to cut a tree

d) having seen the child crying

If perfective participles and infinitives are used alternatively in identical sentences, their semantic properties can be clearly seen

with pp
e) The boy came after having a wash.

with infinitive
f) The boy came (in order) to have a wash.

3 present participle

3-4 Present participles are adverbial or clausal which means that they are syntactically independent, additional and do not directly engage with other parts of the sentence. Present participles can sometimes express manner, eg in passive sentences with verbal nouns:

a) By giving a head massage the pain can be reduced.

But in spite of the semantic cause-and-effect link, the two non-finite verb forms are syntactically quite independent from one another.

3-6 Perfective participles can either precede

b) He thought of his brother while lying down. (sentence 3.9)

or follow present participles

c) He ran away shouting.

but there is no syntactic connection between the verbs involved. In both examples b) and c) the perfective participles are components of compound verbs.

4 verbal noun

4-5 Verbal nouns and verbal adjectives are identical in form and in individual cases there can be confusion between them, cf Smith classifies this example (p 129)

Everything a person needs to know is known by him.

as a predicative use of a verbal adjective. This is a possibility in the first clause if the sentence is seen as parallel to, eg The door is open. However, the use of a possessive pronoun before जानी suggests that this is a verbal noun use. In the second clause जानी can only be a verbal noun. If we keep in mind that adjectives are characterised by their attributive or predicative adherence to nouns, the scope for confusion between the two forms is considerably reduced.
4-6 Connections between verbal nouns and perfective participles tend to be of the same type as infinitive - perfective participle combinations, i.e., they occur very naturally in compound verb structures, e.g.,

with যাওয়া

a) তাকে নিয়ে যাওয়া যাবে না।

It won't be possible to take him along.

with হওয়া

b) ময়বাঁলোকা ফেলে দেওয়া হয়েছে।

The rubbish has been thrown away.

Sequential contexts are possible but they do not result in a syntactical connection between perfective participles and verbal nouns, e.g.,

c) ছবিগুলো না দেখে বলা যায় না।

It isn't possible to comment without having seen the pictures.

The following table shows the findings of these comparisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sentence function</th>
<th>semantic/aspe ctual properties</th>
<th>combinations with other non-finites</th>
<th>used in alternative with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cond part</td>
<td>clausal</td>
<td>conditional, temporal</td>
<td>can combine with all others</td>
<td>in temporal contexts with pp, with vn in structures with চলা</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf</td>
<td>subject, object, complement of other verbs</td>
<td>can express purpose; active, dynamic properties</td>
<td>with cond part, vn and pp</td>
<td>with genitive vn governed by abstract nouns (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres part</td>
<td>adverbial, clausal</td>
<td>active, simultaneous</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>only finite clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vn</td>
<td>subject, object, as gen obj with other nouns</td>
<td>nominal, stative</td>
<td>with cond part, pp, infinitive (in genitive) with infinitives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va</td>
<td>only attributive and predicative</td>
<td>passive, perfective</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp</td>
<td>adverbial, clausal</td>
<td>active, perfective; can express manner, cause</td>
<td>syntactic engagement only as compound verb component</td>
<td>with cond part</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 ABSTRACT NOUNS PRECEDED BY INFINITIVES OR VERBAL NOUNS

In this section, I have brought together a group of abstract nouns and their combinability with either infinitives and / or verbal nouns. Unattributed example sentences (marked OS earlier on) were elicited - the phonological proximity to 'illicit' is entirely appropriate here - in an oral 'survey' done with four young people from a village in Natore/Bangladesh. I gave them the abstract nouns and asked for
The type of structures we are dealing with can be looked at from three different research perspectives:

- Abstract nouns can combine with different verbs in order to form conjunct verbs, e.g. ইচ্ছা করা, ইচ্ছা হওয়া, ইচ্ছা আছে. In any given case, which of these verbs are acceptable and how does their use alter the meaning of the resulting conjunct verb? This is discussed briefly in section 3.3 of chapter 5.

- What semantic components in a conjunct verb of this type make it more or less likely to combine with either an infinitive or a verbal noun?

- In cases where either is possible, is there a difference in meaning?

The alternative uses of infinitives and verbal nouns are not restricted to conjunct verbs. As we saw in section 2.1 there are a number of verbs like জানা know সেখা learn, and verbs of like and dislike which can combine with either verbal nouns or infinitives, e.g.

with infinitive

- 

with verbal noun

Concerning these two sentences a Bengali friend said to me that বিক্ষণ মাছ ও দুই হাতে ভালবাসে means Eating mangoes is good for your health and মাছ ও দুই হাতে ভালবাসে না। means Mangoes are good/delicious to eat.

In English we have a comparable situation with infinitive and gerund (-ing form) use. This was mentioned briefly before (page 27). Again this is an attempt to differentiate between structures which are basically interchangeable.

If we look at an English example in the light of Longman's tentative comment that 'ing may refer to an action in progress, whereas the to-infinitive may imply 'in general', (p 317) we can picture the following situation: Two people are sitting at home, discussing their plans for the rest of the afternoon. According to Longman it would be unusual for one of them to say I like swimming, as this would indicate a general preference rather than a suggestion about what to do for the next few hours. His partner is, however, unlikely to object if he does say it, i.e. there would be no serious breach of grammatical rules. When they are in the swimming pool, on the other hand, they are much more likely to say I like swimming than I like to swim. The second sentence would sound odd in the context. What
we have here is two sentences with the same basic meaning whose appropriateness is decided by the language-external situational context. This means that in judging the 'correctness' of a sentence, we move away from syntactic and semantic criteria towards aspective and functional factors. This indicates that there is an aspectual difference between infinitives and verbal nouns, but its import depends on the specific speech situation. With the addition of an adverbial phrase the difference can be obliterated altogether, e.g. *I like swimming in the sea* and *I like to swim in the sea* are synonymous, both expressing a general preference.

Bengali infinitives and verbal nouns have different aspective properties which make them more or less likely to be used in a given situation. These are tendencies rather than fixed rules, but they can determine actual language use. If we compare these two sentences

\[
\text{a) }
\text{আমি রানা করা শিখছি।} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{I am learning to cook.}
\]

\[
\text{b) }
\text{আমি তরকারি রানা করতে শিখছি।} \quad \text{I am learning Bengali cooking.}
\]

we see a tendency for sentence a) to be about a subject (cooking) and b) to be about a process. Verbal nouns in Bengali, due to their nominal character, present an entity; infinitives present an activity. This can be shown by expanding the two sentences to

\[
\text{a) }
\text{আমি বাঙালি রানা করা শিখছি।} \quad \text{I am learning Bengali cooking.}
\]

\[
\text{b) }
\text{আমি তরকারি রানা করতে শিখছি।} \quad \text{I am learning to cook curry.}
\]

In sentence a) *বাঙালি* is a qualifying adjective, whereas *তরকারি* in sentence b) is a direct object. Combining *বাঙালি* with the infinitive or *তরকারি* with the verbal noun would result in ill-formed sentences. We can see from this that verbal nouns in Bengali can have a stative, infinitives a progressive aspect. The morphological proximity of infinitives to present participles and verbal nouns to passive participles may have an influence in determining these aspectual properties.

What significance do these properties have on combinations with conjunct verbs? In some cases, where either infinitives or verbal nouns can be used, the differences are fairly easy to recognize, e.g.

with infinitive

\[
\text{c) }
\text{আব্দুল জাহানেল যেতে ভয় করে না।} \quad \text{Abdul is not afraid of going into the forest.}
\]

with verbal noun

\[
\text{d) }
\text{তার বিয়ারে মায়ার ভয় নেই।} \quad \text{He is not afraid of going on a plane.}
\]

Sentence c) is likely to be used in a situation where Abdul is just about to go into the forest. Sentence d) talks about a general fear of flying and does not have to refer to a particular situation.

In other cases, the situation seems to be almost reversed

with infinitive

\[
\text{e) }
\text{আমার মনে যেতে ইচ্ছা করেছে।} \quad \text{I want to die. (Smith, p 118)}
\]

with verbal noun

\[
\text{f) }
\text{বিনা নিষ্কৃতি সেখানে যাওয়া আমার ইচ্ছা নয়। [sic]} \quad \text{I don't wish to go there without an invitation. (Milne, p 176)}
\]

Here it seems that the infinitive structure makes a more general statement and the verbal noun structure refers to an imminent event. If we look at the abstract nouns for which only infinitive combinations were found (there is no guarantee for these!) we can tentatively state that they refer to future directed activities, although there is no reason to assume that, for example, the sentence with *ক্ষমতা* *power, influence* could not be used with a verbal noun instead, e.g.

\[
\text{হরতালভাবে বাতিল করার ক্ষমতা আমার নেই।} \quad \text{I don't have the power to cancel the strike.}
\]
A detailed semantic analysis of the abstract nouns in these structures is needed, not only in order to establish likely combinations with infinitives or verbal nouns, but also to get a clearer impression of their uses as conjunct verbs. This needs to be done in a separate study, but making an open-ended list of examples found with infinitives and/or verbal nouns can give us a starting-point for further research. A preliminary list is given as an appendix.

7.3 Summary

A number of questions remain unresolved and are worthy of further research. What this chapter shows very clearly, though, is the importance of non-finite verb forms in the Bengali verbal system. In narrative text perfective participles are so prevalent and contribute so much to ease and fluency of language that they have become a vital feature of Bengali. Zbavitel has a somewhat unfortunate tendency, partly based on his perception of historical developments in Bengali, to talk of non-finite verb forms as if they were an additional feature of the language, the icing on the cake, so to speak. The increase of non-finite verb forms over the last few hundred years, which Zbavitel establishes, is undoubtedly significant, but his conclusions are dubious. The existence of, for instance, the conditional or the perfective participle is seen as a syntactical device which other languages lack. There are two problems with this kind of perception.

1. I do not (yet) know enough Sanskrit to give an informed comment, but from a perusal of a Sanskrit grammar it is obvious that there are a variety of non-finite verb forms such as infinitives, verbal nouns, past and present participles. Non-finite verb forms, therefore, are not a modern invention which add a bit more variety to a language but are an integral part of verbal systems.

2. The fact that Bengali has some non-finite features which are different from those in other languages does not make these features 'additional'. This concept can arise when languages are compared to one another, but from a language-internal point of view the perfective participle is just as much part of the language as any finite verb form.

The findings in this chapter can contribute to a clearer understanding of

- the division between infinitives and present participles
- the uses of the perfective participle in sentences with more than one subject
- verbal nouns as sentence subjects
- the clausal character of conditional and present participle
- non-finite verb forms which can be used alternatively
- co-occurrence of non-finites
- the differences between the English and the Bengali non-finite system

More research needs to be done on the overlap of infinitives and verbal nouns. The listings given in section 7.2 indicate factors of arbitrariness and of stylistic variation in choosing one of the two forms. These cases need not be pursued any further, but some inherent aspective differences between infinitives and genitive verbal nouns need to be taken into account. Factors such as the addition of
adverbials, adjectives etc may also play a significant role. A semantic analysis of the abstract nouns involved in these constructions will shed more light on the matter, but language does, of course, have the capacity for expressing the same semantic concept in grammatically different ways, and a choice between two structures may be based on the situational context.

Appendix to this chapter:
Conjunct Verbs in Combination with Infinitives and Verbal Nouns
CHAPTER 2
COMPOUND VERBS

1. THE STRUCTURES
This chapter is concerned with the very common structure consisting of the non-finite verb form ending in -e (-iya is the older form), i.e., the perfective participle (pp) of one verb followed by a finite verb form. In Bengali, this structure provides a convenient way of describing a sequence of actions, usually carried out by the same subject.

For instance, the English sentence:

After his meal he changed his clothes and left.

can be translated into Bengali by using perfective participle constructions only:

ঠেরী, এবং চলে যাইলে।

lit: having eaten rice, having changed clothes, he left.

All Bengali active verbs can be used in chronological sequences like this and there are no restrictions to their uses.

What makes this structure particularly interesting, however, is the fact that some verbs, when used as the second (finite) component, change their lexical meaning in order to form a closer connection with the preceding perfective participle. The example sentence above contains three perfective participle forms: ঠেরী, পরিবর্তন and চলে - however, only the first two represent separate actions preceding the finite verb form of চলে. The combination চলে যাইলে, consisting of the perfective participle of চলে move, go and the 3rd person past tense form of চলে go, represents one single semantic unit (Zbavitel, p 75), called a compound verb, and can be translated as leave. To take a closer look at the way these second component verbs change their meanings and also under which restrictions they operate is the aim of this chapter.

2. THE TERMINOLOGY
The term compound verb is not unambiguous. As well as describing the perfective participle + verb structure it is used to refer to noun/adjective combinations with verbs, e.g., পেরিনত্রজ্জা করা (attempt - noun + do - verb: try) or পরিবর্তন করা (clean - adjective + do - verb: clean).

Some authors (Muhammad, Dakshi, Pal, McLeod) also include verbal combinations where the non-finite first verb is in verbal noun (ending in -a or -na) or infinitive (ending in -te) form. These constructions, however, have quite different internal structures.

Verbal noun + finite verb constructions are the same as noun + verb constructions, e.g., সম্পর্কে করা is syntactically equivalent to পরিবর্তন করা. It does not take a lot of analysis to see that a verbal combination infinitive + verb, such as পারা করা be able to go or কাজ করা start working cannot be interpreted as parallel to a perfective participle + verb construction. In the infinitive construction both verbs retain their full lexical meaning and the syntactical relationship between পারা / কাজ and the preceding infinitive is that of full verb (Dasgupta calls this a modal verb) and complement.

In order to avoid confusion Zbavitel has suggested that perfective participle + verb constructions should be termed verbal compounds as a subcategory of compound verbs. Sarkar, on the other
hand, argues that the proper term for noun/ adjective + verb constructions is conjunct verb and that the term compound verb should be reserved for the structure we are dealing with here (p 293). Probah Dasgupta also refers to noun/ adjective + verb combinations as conjunct verbs, which leaves the term compound verbs free for pp + verb constructions. He implies that these two terms are now generally accepted in contemporary linguistic terminology.

The two components of the compound verb, in Sarkar's sense, are referred to as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>author</th>
<th>first component</th>
<th>second component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bykova</td>
<td>notional verb</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zbavitel</td>
<td>directing verb</td>
<td>compound maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasgupta</td>
<td>pole</td>
<td>vector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakshi</td>
<td>gerund</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarkar</td>
<td>main verb</td>
<td>vector verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>perfective participle</td>
<td>aspective auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seely</td>
<td>PAP (perfective active participle)</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pal</td>
<td>first component</td>
<td>compound maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bender / Riccardi</td>
<td>gerund</td>
<td>second member of verbal cluster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would question the term gerund for the non finite verb form ending in -e. This term seems more appropriate for the verbal noun rather than the verb form in -e which is verbal or, at least, adverbial in character. The use of the term auxiliary for the second verb form is widespread, but questionable. For the moment I would like to adopt Animesh Pal's term compound maker and discuss the appropriateness of auxiliary later (see p 87).

3. THE BACKGROUND

Compound verbs exist not only in Bengali but also in many other Indo-Aryan languages. In most of these languages they are a relatively recent phenomenon, though there are instances of compound verbs in classical Bengali. Their occurrence has increased considerably over the last four hundred years. Peter Hook suggests that in some languages the 'compound verb has evolved into an explicit means of expressing perfective aspect' (1993, p 97). The need for aspective meaning could be one reason for the emergence of compound verbs, but not all compound makers contribute only aspective features to the main verb (perfective participle). The compound makers in Indo-Aryan languages and the aspective qualities they express show remarkable similarities.

Kachru gives the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>go vs come (Bengali যাওয়া vs আসা�)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deictic meaning (Hindi-Urdu, Bengali, Marathi, Kashmiri)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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continuation vs completion (Hindi-Urdu, Bengali, Kannada, Tamil, Telugu, Gujarati, Kashmiri)

take vs give (Bengali নেওয়া vs দেওয়া)

benefactive meaning (Hindi-Urdu, Marathi, Bengali, Punjabi, Kannada, Kui, Tamil, Telugu, Kashmiri)

fall (Bengali পড়া)

suddenness in Indo-Aryan languages (change of state, suddenness in Kashmiri)

pour, put, add, push, throw (Bengali ফেলা - throw)

violence, 'to get it over with' (Hindi-Urdu, Marathi, Bengali, Tamil, Kannada)

(speed, recklessness, relief in Kashmiri)

keep, put, place (Bengali রাখা)

completion, action accomplished for future use (Hindi-Urdu, Marathi, Bengali, Tamil, Kannada) (proactiveness, future use in view, Kashmiri) (Kachru, p 115)

Not all languages are at the same stage of development. Kashmiri is a language with a relatively low percentage of compound verbs (between 1 and 2%) of all verbs, compared to about 12 to 16% (Hook's estimate) in Hindi-Urdu and Bengali. This means that Kashmiri is at an earlier stage of development in the emergence of compound verbs. Peter Hook lists the following properties in languages with a highly developed compound verb system:

(i) They are more restricted in the range of syntactic constructions that allow them to occur. In particular, they are less free to occur in non-finite forms.

(ii) Vector verbs are more highly grammaticalised. This means there are fewer restrictions on which main verbs vectors can combine with.

(iii) Compound verbs have the expression of perfective aspect as one of their functions.

In less developed compound verb systems, as in Kashmiri, compound verbs have

• greater freedom to occur as non-finite forms, negative sentences etc.

• less grammaticalised vectors. This means that semantic and structural compatibility between vector and main verbs plays a greater role in determining what combinations are acceptable.

• absence of perfective aspect as one of the compound verb's functions. (Hook, 1992, p 6)

The situation in Bengali:

(i) Although there are, of course, syntactic restrictions for the use of compound verbs, it is not true that compound makers cannot occur in non-finite form.

Examples with ফেলে দেওয়া throw away:

• in verbal noun form:

  পতকালের বাসি ভাত ফেলে দেওয়া উচিত।

  *The stale rice from yesterday should be thrown away.*

• in conditional participle:

  তুমি ভাত ফেলে দিলে আমরা কি খেবো?

  *If you throw the rice away, what will we eat?*

• in infinitive:

  এসব জিনিসগুলো ফেলে দিয়ে হবে।
All these things will have to be thrown away.

- in perfective participle:

\[\text{কিন্তু আমার দিকে খেলে দিয়ে চলে গেলো।} \]

\[ \text{He threw the letter at me and left.} \]

(ii) This is true in Bengali, eg

a) এসো কথা বলেছ। (simple verb)

b) এসো কথা বলে গেছে। (compound with যাওয়া go)

c) এসো কথা বলে উঠেছে। (compound with গুঞ্জ rise, get up)

d) এসো কথা বলে বসেছে। (compound with বসা sit)

\[ \text{can all be translated as He has said this.} \]

There may be different shades of meaning or emphasis, but they are so slight that they are difficult to convey in translation; and it is likely that native speakers would not agree on them. On the other end of the scale there are, however, compound makers which change the meaning of the main verb considerably, eg

e) আমি তাকে ভাঙে। (simple verb) → \text{I will hit him.} \quad \text{and}

f) আমি তাকে ভাঙে ফেলে। (compound with ফেলা throw) → \text{I will kill him.}

(iii) \text{is true in Bengali.}

4. DEFINITIONS

Compared to other areas of Bengali grammar, such as postpositions, passive constructions or the pronoun system, the phenomenon of Bengali compound verbs has been dealt with quite extensively. The authors who have worked on compound verbs come from different theoretical backgrounds and each contribution offers new aspects and insights which help to define the role of compound makers. Of particular significance is Đusán Zbavítel's detailed analysis of non-finite verb forms.

Pobitro Sarkar sets out the criteria for a verbal combination to be considered a compound verb (p 293):

(i) the first member (Main Verb MV) retains the chief burden of meaning that the sequence carries

(ii) the last member more or less loses its lexical meaning

(iii) the first member is usually a non-finite verb form

(iv) the last member is a finite form, ie it carries the verbal concordance

There is a contradiction between (ii) and (iii). There are five non-finite verb forms in Bengali, ie infinitive, verbal noun, conditional participle, present participle and perfective participle. If the non-finite verb form in a sentence is anything other than a perfective participle, however, the last member (finite verb) does not lose its lexical meaning but remains the main verb of the sentence. Examples for these are

• with infinitive:

\[ \text{আমি তোমাকে আসতে বলেছি। I have told you to come.} \]
The relationship between the finite verb and the preceding infinitive is that of main verb and complement/object. There is no merging of the two verb forms.

- with verbal noun:
  आजके यात्रा हासिल हो ना। *I won't be going today.* lit: *my going today will not be*
  Verbal nouns are nominal by definition and behave like any other noun. In this case, the verbal noun is the subject of the sentence.

- with conditional participle:
  एक बार ते मेरे हाथ में है। *If we don't go now, we will be late.*
  Both verbs retain their meaning. The conditional participle with its adjuncts forms a separate clause.

- with present participle:
  आज गोल में चलकर करते हमारे। *He chats while he works.*
  The present participle describes an action parallel to that of the sentence-final verb. Both verbs retain their meaning.

Sarkar himself is aware of the different syntactic relationships between first and second component verbs in these structures. He eliminates verbs like चाहिये *want* and अच्छा *be able to*, because they 'take underlying sentences as complements' (p 294).

Describing the second member of a compound verb as finite (iv) is mainly for simplicity's sake. The connectedness of a combination like फेंके में फेंका *throw away* remains the same, even if the compound maker is in non-finite form. In the sentence:

आज के पाकानेर के तौर पर फेंका हो। *I have thrown the rice from yesterday away.*

फेंका is in finite form, but it is equally possible to say:

पाकानेर के तौर पर फेंका हो। *Yesterday's rice has to be thrown away.*

with फेंका in the infinitive form without changing the relationship between the two verb forms.

Animesh Pal defines pure verbal compounds as: 'the compounds of two verb roots placed side by side and suggest[ing] one single meaning which is somewhat different from the original meaning of either of the two verb roots' (p 221).

Zbavitel echoes this by stating that verbal combinations in order to qualify as verbal compounds must represent a 'single indivisible semantic unit' (p 75).

W.L. Smith puts forward that 'aspective auxiliaries, when combined with perfective participles, lend them an aspectual coloring and at the same time lose their own 'meaning' (p 149). Almost identical is Clinton Seely's statement that 'auxiliary verbs, though they have a literal meaning of their own, are not translateable literally but add instead a nuance to the 'meaningful' verb which they follow' (p 149).

Qazi Din Muhammad adds the element of stress to distinguish compound verbs:

Compound verbs are 'a combination of a non-finite verb plus an operator. The finite verbal form is one of a restricted series of verbs. The verbal piece as a whole behaves like a simple single verb form. In the characteristic utterances of these types of verbal piece in sentences, one major stress is recognized in the beginning of the sentence' (p 23).
The general consensus, thus, seems to be that of the two verb forms the first (non-finite) determines the meaning of the compound, the second verb colours this meaning and also, usually, carries the inflectional information.

5. BORDERLINES
In order to understand what a compound verb is, it is equally important to define what it is not. Zbavitel points out the crucial difference between constructions like जबोधा बना and एस पड़ा, जिने आसा lit: *having taken, come*, though translateable by one verb *bring*, nevertheless represents a sequence of actions where the lexical meaning of both verbs is fully retained. In एस पड़ा lit: *having come, fall*, on the other hand, the meaning of पड़ा *fall* is lost and it serves instead to add an element of suddenness, unexpectedness to the meaning of आसा, eg

से सफल किये एस पड़े। He turned up (unexpectedly) this morning.

Zbavitel makes this distinction, but still accepts structures like जिने बना and एस पड़ा into his class of compound verbs. In all of these, the compound makers retain their meaning.

Clinton Seely goes one step further and excludes जिने बना as in जिने बना from his list of auxiliaries. His justification of whether the second component of a pp + verb construction is an auxiliary (compound maker) or not is based on the meaning of this second component, which means that even though the constructions जिने बना and पड़ा बना seem to be structurally the same, Seely assigns a different function to the second component बना, according to its lexical meaning, or lack thereof, in the sentence.

Probal Dasgupta points out another important distinction when trying to identify compound verbs. The sentence

जबूरुला देखा नही।

can be interpreted in two different ways: It can either be what he calls a pole + pole sequence, in which case it will be translated as: Look at the pictures and take them!

In this case, even though the verb नेंद्रा *take* is perfectly capable of acting as a compound maker (Dasgupta: vector), both verb forms retain their full meaning and represent a sequence of actions, not a compound verb. The sentence can also be translated as:

Have a look at the pictures!

- with नेंद्रा in its role of compound maker (vector) (Dasgupta p 70)

In order to identify genuine compound makers (vectors) Dasgupta gives the following, traditionally accepted, restrictions. A vector is:

1. syntactically restricted, ie it occurs immediately after the pole
2. semantically heteronomous, ie it does not retain its autonomous meaning and
3. grammatically subservient, ie it can not take modifiers. In the sentence जबूरुला देखा सिद्धान्त नाही, the verb नेंद्रा cannot be interpreted as a compound maker (vector). Adding सिद्धान्त
decision, as a modifier of नेंद्रा, reverts the sentence back to a pole/ pole reading, ie

Look at the pictures and make a decision.

6. THE AUTHORS
Zbavitel gives a very detailed analysis of non-finite verb forms and their occurrence in older and in modern texts in order to show how non-finite verb forms have become a lot more frequent in the last four hundred years. This development has also affected the emergence of compound verbs. His research shows clearly that those verbs which can function as compound makers have gradually changed away from their original meaning. In his classical texts, for instance, the verb *throw* combines with verbs whose meanings are similar to that of *throw* itself, and it is only in his modern texts that loses its original meaning and takes on a different role, adding suddenness, completedness or intensity to the action of the main verb.

Zbavitel confines his, undoubtedly very competent, analysis of compound verbs to the verbs he found in his ten texts. He questions his own judgment for interpreting language structures and, drawing his examples from actual texts, avoids relying on his own language intuition. By doing this, however, he misses out on some very common verb combinations, which should really have been part of his analysis. Examples for these are:

- go away, *take away*, *forget*, *flee*,
- *sink*, *drown*, *get lost*, *explain*, *bring*,
- *tear up*, *lie down*, *stay lying down*.

Zbavitel’s book provides us with the most detailed treatment of compound verbs and could be improved only by expanding his sources and including an analysis of spoken language.

Alibha Dakshi

Her interest in looking at compound structures is to discover their aspectual qualities. She includes infinitive as well as perfective participle constructions in her analysis. As we have seen earlier, infinitive structures cannot be classed as compound verbs because the two verb forms in the sentence remain quite separate. There is no doubt that compound makers can add aspectual meaning to the main verb of a sentence, eg when *come* is followed by *go* the compound meaning becomes *arrive*, which adds a completive aspect to the main verb. In her conclusion Dakshi says: 'These aspectual meanings are expressed by compound verbs only and they seem to be considered as grammatical categories which can be derived from the analysis of the usages of compound verb forms in Bengali' (p 73).

I would argue, however, that in some of Dakshi’s examples the aspectiveness stems from the lexical meaning of the second verb form, not from the combined verb forms. Of her examples, the verbs *start, begin* (aspect: inceptive), *get, receive* (aspect: acquisitive), *can, be able to* (aspect: possibility, potential), *want* (aspect: desiderative), *stay, remain* (aspect: durative) all carry their original meaning, in compound constructions as well as on their own.

Her aim of exploring the aspectual qualities of compound verbs is an interesting and valid proposition. More research may be necessary in order to establish exactly what should come under the heading of ‘aspect’. My own feeling is that aspect has to do with time, eg duration, beginnings and endings, repetition, completed or unfinished processes, suddenness of action or continuity of...
compound verbs

states but I would not include desiderative (to want to eat), acquisitive (to be able to see) and permissive (to allow to come) features as aspectual qualities. Through her aspectual approach, Dakshi comes up with interesting pairings of compound makers. Where, more usually, the verb throw is paired with fall (transitive- intransitive), Dakshi puts together with keep, both verbs expressing a completive aspect. Similarly, come and take are grouped together as both verbs 'denote an action which affects the agent primarily' (aspect: reflexiveness) (p 72). Viewing verbal structures in this way can provide valuable insights into the workings of the language.

Probal Dasgupta

Rooted firmly in transformational generative grammar, Dasgupta develops various tests in order to differentiate between genuine vectors (compound makers) and second position pole verbs ie the second verb form in a sequence of actions like look and then take. One of them is the double negation test. Since a vector, in the traditional definition, is grammatically subservient, ie not able to take a modifier, then a double negative automatically results in a pole-pole reading, eg

I can only be translated as
Don't take the pictures without having seen them.

The lexical meaning of is retained and so the verb combination represents a sequence of actions rather than a compound verb. This brings up an interesting question, which Dasgupta does not pursue. How are compound verbs negated?

I can, surely, only be translated as:
Don't take the pictures after you have seen them,

which means that we are dealing with a sequence of actions rather than a compound (Dasgupta: pole + pole). The negation affects the second verb take only and we do not have a negated compound verb. Another way of negating this sentence is

which, again results in a verbal sequence. The sentence can only mean:
Take the pictures without looking at them.

I believe that there are a number of cases where a negative is prone to revert a compound back to a simple verb form. When answering a question in the negative:

the most natural answer would be:

A simple verb, not

Other examples are easily found:

Both of those sentences are more idiomatic than
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The reason for this is probably the fact that many compound makers add an element of completedness to the meaning of the main verb. In a negative sentence, since the action is then not completed, the presence of the completing element, ie the compound maker, is no longer appropriate.

These particular examples prove that compound makers cannot take modifiers of their own, ie they are grammatically subservient, but Dasgupta gives the following counter-example:

अामाकेएहं। दांडो। do this work for me.

In this example, it is the 'subservient' compound maker which determines the choice of अामाकेएहं। दांडो। nor the verbal compound with फेला। are acceptable. Dasgupta concludes from this that though नेहुझ as a compound maker cannot have its own complements, it can influence the choice of complements in a sentence on a syntactical level. There is no difference in meaning between:

अामाकेएहं। दांडो। and अामार। एहं। दांडो।

Both sentences can be translated as: Will you do this work for me?

Dasgupta brings in the factor of transitivity harmony and points to the following verb pairs in their use as compound makers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>transitive</th>
<th>intransitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अामा।</td>
<td>अामा।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जोला।</td>
<td>गठा।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>राखा।</td>
<td>राखा।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>फेला।</td>
<td>पडा।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each intransitive vector that takes only intransitive poles, there exists a synonymous transitive vector that takes only transitive poles, they express the same vector meaning, although the stems in their polar function are non-synonymous.' (p 79) Dasgupta leaves these observations without drawing any further conclusions, but I think that more can be said on the subject.

E.M. Bykova

Bykova identifies three functions of auxiliary verbs (compound makers) in verbal combinations:

1. the spatial characterisation (direction) of an action

The following verbs can take this function and be seen as pairs of symmetrical opposition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>down, away from</th>
<th>up, towards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>खाओ।</td>
<td>जो।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पडा।</td>
<td>गठा।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>फेला।</td>
<td>जेन।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>फेला।</td>
<td>जेन।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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and indicate motion away from and towards the speaker, respectively, and can combine with movement verbs to give direction. Examples with याओया are given on page 15.

All of these verbs can also be used with आयो.

Equally, देखो give and लेखो take direct the action in the sentence either away from (देखो) or towards (लेखो) the subject of the sentence.

rise and fall represent upward and downward movement without reference to the position of the speaker. raise, lift and throw are their transitive counterparts.

2. qualitative characteristics of an action

Under this heading, Bykova lists the following aspects/features:

a) intensity of an action:
- याओया go denoting the development of an action from a certain point in time with a negative result or simply intensifying the action
- आयो come tracing the development of an action from the past to the present
- राजी rise indicating development, progress, stressing the starting point of an action, intensifying the action
- फाल fall intensifying regressive actions
- उत्तर raise, lift often expressing a new (improved) state
- फांसी throw marking completedness or suddenness of the action
- सीत sit expressing suddenness, unexpectedness, also persistence or stubbornness

b) resultativity:

Bykova lists the following verbs as stressing the result of an action:
- सीत, बन वरी stand, धरा catch, hold, राखा keep.

I would also add याओया go, as, for instance, in the phrase बड़िया निकल से है। The watch is broken.

c) continuity:

expressed through the compound maker चला. It describes actions which have begun in the past and, sometimes after an interruption, continue in the present. Bykova gives the following examples: चला संगीनी continue playing (music), चला संगीनी wandering. चला चला chattering. She does not include the verbs धरा stay, remain and the incomplete verb आयो be in her list of compound makers, but both of these can express continuity in combination with other verbs. The reason for not including them as compound makers may be that their original meaning is almost fully retained in compounds.

d) iterativeness:

expressed with the verb बन चला move around. Bykova gives चला चला walk about, circle, drive around and चला चला searching around.

e) 'the degree to which an action manifests itself as a quality' (p 122)

I must admit that Bykova's definition of this aspect/feature is not clear to me. She starts by saying that this meaning is expressed by राजी rise, but then her examples are given with याओया.
take and with देखा give, to express 'the low degree of the manifestation of an action' (p 126), eg शुरू देखा ले go for a walk. Both examples seem rather unusual to me.

The characteristic feature seems to be 'to make the subject feel better', or with देखा give to 'give pleasure to others'.

f) emotional and evaluative colouring

Verbs in this group are उठा rise, गिरा fall, तोला lift, raise, फेंका throw, बसा sit.
All of these verbs can, in particular contexts, convey a sense of unexpectedness, suddenness or provoke negative or positive emotions.

Bykova says: 'The semantics of combinations with these verbs, especially combinations with बसा and फेंका is rich in shades and becomes obvious only in definite speech situations' (p 127)

3. indication of transitivity - intransitivity of an action

Bykova sees the transitivity factor as a by-function of the first two categories, direction and mode. Compound makers can mark transitivity or intransitivity in compounds with verbs that can be either. Examples of these are given on page 14.

Another function of the compound maker can be to stress the transitivity or intransitivity of the main verb. Verbs from the same stem can form intransitive compounds on the one hand, and transitive-causative compounds on the other, eg:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>intransitive</th>
<th>transitive-causative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>भरे हुए</td>
<td>be filled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ले ले जा</td>
<td>get down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मिले याहा</td>
<td>combine, get mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ले जाए</td>
<td>survive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I will come back to the question of transitivity later.

Animesh Pal

Pal starts with a detailed analysis and clear definition concerning compound makers and their properties, with his analysis based very much on semantic factors. When he goes on to listing his verbal compound makers with translations, however, he seems to lose sight of his original definition of compound verbs expressing one single idea. Even given his explanation that translations are approximate only, it is difficult to see how phrases like to get something done and come back (करे आना) or to tear something and then bring in (चिड़े आना) can be compressed into single ideas.

More surprising, though, is the fact that, after examining structures like करते गिये and करते पेले he comes to the conclusion that करते गिये having started to speak is a pure compound, whereas करते पेले having gone to do is not. His concern is with the retained lexical meaning of याहा in the second verb combination, but the structure करते गिये could just as easily be translated as
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having gone to say or करते होने (somewhat clumsily) as if doing. This example demonstrates that purely semantic considerations, and especially semantic considerations based on translations, are not sufficient in defining syntactical structures.

His rather narrowly semantic definition of verbal combinations should prevent him from including infinitive + verb constructions in his analysis, but it does not. 'A few constructions are in use with lag as a second component.' (p 226), eg কোনোদিনে গল্প, হামিদের গল্প etc. By his own criteria a compound maker's meaning is 'either partially or totally lost' (p 221). The fact is that the verb গল্প in its meaning start, begin not only retains its lexical meaning fully but can be combined with the infinitive of practically every active verb in Bengali.

The other construction which he includes in the pure verbal compound category is the impersonal structure of an infinitive with a third person form of হওয়া, expressing must, have to, eg

আমাকে আজকে যেতে হবে। I will have to go today.

Though I do not presume to be able to syntactically explain this structure I feel sure that it does not belong with verbal compounds of the type পড়ে খাওয়া. The meaning of হওয়া is different here from its lexical meaning be, become, but I would consider it the main verb in these structures, with the preceding infinitive as its complement. The two verb forms do not combine to represent one meaning, but remain separate.

Qazi Din Muhammad

Muhammad is generally concerned with any kind of verbal combination and does not interpret what Sarkar calls a compound verb any differently from other combinations.

His second component verb forms are called operators in active sentences and auxiliaries (these include only হওয়া, যাওয়া, আছে and থাকা ) in passive sentences. Since his passive constructions do not contain the non-finite verb form in -e as a first component, they do not concern us here.

Muhammad's article is descriptive rather than analytic and his aim is to bring together verbal combinations, which are listed as he finds them. He has an interesting interpretation of the compound যেতে বসা forget, spoil as in the sentence:

কুহীর পুরোনো পাড়া সব যেতে বসেছে। which he translates as:

You have forgotten all the previous lessons.

The translation is undoubtedly correct, but I believe that the idiom here is পড়ে খাওয়া forget studies rather than যেতে বসা. Interpreted in this way, the meaning of বসা sit becomes rather vague.

His list of compound makers include a few verbs which are not included elsewhere, eg compounds

with বসা die: যেতে বসা play hard, করে বসা suffer, পড়ে বসা be involved,

নিসে বসা be exhausted by constant writing

with দেখা see: যেতে দেখা taste, দেখা দেখা go, করে দেখা take chance, তুলে দেখা have a look,

নিসে দেখা take chance, তুলে দেখা attempt to play

with আনা bring: তুলে আনা bring out, উঠিয়ে আনা pick out, চিনে আনা choose out,

ঘুরিয়ে আনা arrange, তুলে আনা beg

The translations for these compounds are taken out of context and therefore, necessarily, somewhat arbitrary, but I his translations for the following compounds with বসা are a bit too varied to be acceptable

নিসে বসা complete journey, reach, যেতে বসা finish eating.
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In these compounds Muhammad identifies three meanings of 'sāt': starting an action, finishing an action and being able to do something. The aspect of finishing is appropriate, but the ability factor seems rather farfetched. Although I agree that 'sāt' can take on a variety of shades of meanings, I believe that these emerge only in particular contexts and Muhammad's distribution of beginnings and endings is not logical.

7. THE COMPOUND MAKERS

In this section I want to take a closer look at the actual verbs involved in forming compound verbs on the basis of their occurrence alone. Some of the verb combinations under discussion may not qualify for Zbavitel's 'single semantic unit' (p. 75), but because their uses are frequent and idiomatic I am including them here. This is a list of the verbs which are generally accepted to function as compound makers with a hint of their effect on the main verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbs</th>
<th>lexical meaning</th>
<th>adverbial nuance as compound maker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>यांया</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>असा</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>gradually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गठा</td>
<td>rise, get up</td>
<td>suddenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पड़ा</td>
<td>fall</td>
<td>suddenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बना</td>
<td>sit</td>
<td>abruptly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तेजाना</td>
<td>lift, raise</td>
<td>altogether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सेहाया</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>for you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सेहाया</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>फेला</td>
<td>throw</td>
<td>thoroughly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following verbs are accepted by some, but not all, authors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbs</th>
<th>lexical meaning</th>
<th>adverbial nuance as compound maker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>चला</td>
<td>move, go</td>
<td>carrying on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>राखा</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td>for keeps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तेजानो</td>
<td>move around</td>
<td>round and about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दोंजानो</td>
<td>stand</td>
<td>having finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ठाका</td>
<td>stay, remain</td>
<td>habitually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आहाँ</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>continuously</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the traditional interpretation of what constitutes a compound verb, the semantic 'merging' of the two verb forms is a crucial factor. Combinations like निरू हांया having taken, go and बसे ठाका remain sitting are accepted as compound verbs almost by default. Both हांया and
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The verb যাওয়া, in the combinations given, retain their own lexical meaning, but combinations like these make their way into the compound verb system for the following reasons:

- They are frequent and idiomatic,
- The connection between the two verb forms is very strong,
- They are intuitively different from verbal sequences like লিখে বলা, having written say,
- The same compound makers are capable of losing their own meaning with other main verbs, e.g., in get broken, there is no trace of going anywhere,
- Any complements or modifiers belong to the compound verb as a whole

This last point is where things can begin to get tricky. It is perfectly possible in Bengali to say আমি নিয়ে আসি যাওয়া. I will take you home with me, lit: having taken you I will go home.

The modifier যাওয়া belongs to যাওয়া alone. This must mean that we have a pole/pole (Dasgupta) reading here. It is, however not possible to place a modifier between the two verb forms in যাওয়া হওয়া, উঠে যাওয়া come off, তুলে যাওয়া forget, পুকুরে যাওয়া dry and many more similar examples. How then do we decide which of these are compound verbs and which are not? Probable Dasgupta has made an important contribution in ‘tightening up’ the defining criteria. In order to arrive at a satisfactory definition, more questions into the behaviour of these second component verbs need to be asked and tested through examples. Some of these are:

- Does the compound maker retain its lexical meaning?
- Can the compound verb be used in all tenses?
- Can the compound verb be used in negative sentences?
- Can any modifiers be placed between the two verb forms?
- Is there a connection between aspective features and tenses?
- Are the combinatorial possibilities of verbs with compound makers limited?

There are many more such questions and though a number of attempts have been made to explore them, a lot of them still remain open.

8. THE VERBS

যাওয়া - go

The verb যাওয়া is by far the most common and widely used of the compound makers. It can combine with a great number of verbs, both transitive and intransitive, and has, as Bykova puts it, 'infinite semantic capacity' (p 123). Zbavitel divides its uses into three main categories:

1. with verbs of movement
2. to express completion of the verbal action
3. to express continuity of the verbal action (Zbavitel p 99)

W.L. Smith adds to these the function of যাওয়া as marking the intransitive use of verbs which can be used both transitively and intransitively. The transitive use of these same verbs is formed with প্রেরণা give or বিলা throw. Examples for these are:
1. with verbs of movement

In these verb combinations, undoubtedly retains some of its lexical meaning and serves to
direct the movement away from the speaker. W.L. Smith calls these combinations directional
comounds. The most common of these are:

- go away, fly away, walk around
- go back, return, descend, get down
- sink, drown, get dry
- go visiting, go out, enter

2. to express completion of verbal action

is used in these compounds to indicate that an action is over, but it can also stress the result
of an action or process. For instance

He arrived this morning,

implies and stresses the result: He is now here. Equally,

My bicycle has got broken,

stresses the fact that the bicycle is now broken. It would be interesting to see whether these types
of compounds are linked with particular tenses, eg the perfect tense. It would be unusual, to say
the least, to say (compound verb) rather than (simple verb).

Is this true in all cases or only with particular verbs? Sentences like

You will fall,

and equally future tense constructions with

get broken, get torn, become

are perfectly acceptable. I suspect that there is a regularity in this phenomenon, similar to the
restrictions in negating compound verbs (see p 75), which is likely to be based on actual usage of
these phrases. In structures like the connection between perfective participle and finite
verb is so strong that the compound has virtually taken the place of a simple verb structure and
can therefore be used in all tenses. This is not the case with become.

The main verbs used in these combinations can express either a process which takes some time
and has now come to an end, eg

become dry, forget, become increase, become, or they can express actions which have no extension in time, like
3. to express continuity

W.L. Smith gives the following examples to demonstrate this use of अग्र to express continuity:

- he went on listening,
- he was gradually disappearing.

Though I do not disagree with his interpretation that these verb combinations express continuity, all the forms of अग्र are in either present or past continuous forms. Surely this is what accounts for the implication of continuity in these sentences, not the verb अग्र itself. In another tense, say the present perfect tense, अग्र has burst, exploded the shade of meaning अग्र adds to the verb अग्र is again that of completion, rather than continuity. Perhaps it would be more accurate, though somewhat redundant, to say that अग्र in its continuous tenses can convey a sense of continuity.

अग्र - come

Like अग्र, अग्र combines with verbs of motion, but in the opposite direction. The movement is towards the speaker:

- come back, come down, arrive, return.

W.L. Smith gives two further senses of अग्र as a compound maker. One is indicating gradual changes, especially in the weather, time of day etc. Examples are:

- lessened, grows dry, becomes deserted.

The other meaning of अग्र is to describe an action or process beginning in the distant past and continuing into the present (Smith p 151). Smith’s example sentences contain phrases like

- since time immemorial,
- since primitive times.

The presence of these phrases begs the question whether just the verbal compounds alone would have the connotations Smith assigns to them.

अग्र - rise and पड़ा - fall

Both these verbs used as compound makers imply a change of state, coloured by their original meanings, ie motion upwards or downwards. Consider the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with अग्र</th>
<th>with पड़ा</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>बढ़े अग्र</td>
<td>बढ़े पड़ा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बढ़े अग्र</td>
<td>बढ़े पड़ा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>फूल अग्र</td>
<td>फूल पड़ा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सेवे अग्र</td>
<td>सेवे पड़ा</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with  Hartford</th>
<th>with  Petra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flare up</td>
<td>fall asleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get better</td>
<td>sit down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wake up</td>
<td>lie down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are combinations with intransitive main verbs which themselves express an upward or downward movement.

In combinations with other verbs both Hartford and Petra imply suddenness or unexpectedness, though, in most cases, they are not interchangeable. More research needs to be done to find out which verbs combine with either Hartford or Petra, but Smith has identified two groups of verbs which characteristically form compounds with Hartford or Petra.

Hartford can be combined with verbs expressing human or animal sounds and indicates the sudden onset of these sounds, e.g.,

burst out laughing,  
say, blurt out,  
ring (telephone),  
shout, cry out.

Petra combines with verbs of motion to express suddenness:

turn up unexpectedly,  
get up, get out,  
enter unexpectedly.

The compound verb Hartford Petra tends to have negative connotations and describe some sort of decline, i.e., the original meaning of Petra fall is at least partly retained. Examples are:

become poor,  
become weak,  
become concerned.

Zbavitel has found two cases where Hartford Petra are interchangeable. These are:

become worried,  
start weeping.

Smith says that Petra in compound verbs describes "exaggerated, inappropriate or impudent actions" (p 158). The translations of his example sentences are, however, relatively tame. Zbavitel stresses suddenness and unexpectedness in compounds with Petra, but all his example sentences contain adverbs like suddenly, almost, so that the factor of suddenness does not emerge from the verb alone.

What both Hartford and Petra add to a verb like say, if anything, is the sense that he won't be saying anything more, which is a completive aspect. I am sure that an environment can be created where Petra has the connotations Smith ascribes to it, but, to err on the safe side, I would say that Petra adds a shade of finality to the main verb, nothing more.

Hartford - sit

Smith calls this the least problematic of the compound makers. It can add finality to an action, as in

say, tell, keep, put away, send, give up,  
throw away.
or it can imply that the action is carried out for the benefit of someone else. Examples for this are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>write for someone</td>
<td>лите везува &quot;писать за кого-то&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do for someone</td>
<td>кера везува &quot;делать за кого-то&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bring for someone</td>
<td>&quot;внести для кого-то&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smith points out the frequent combination of 

with causative verbs. Examples for these, in opposition with go as its intransitive counterpart, are given on page 78.


take
What does for others, does for itself. To show the contrast between the two compound makers, here are some examples with identical main verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>for others</th>
<th>for self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>open for sb</td>
<td>open for self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write for sb</td>
<td>write for self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do for sb</td>
<td>do for self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wipe for sb</td>
<td>wipe for self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as I can see, does not have the nuance of finality that can have. In compounds like wipe for self there is a fair amount of its original meaning left in . The compound could also be translated as wipe and then take.

raise, lift
This verb is simply the causal counterpart of . It combines with transitive, and often causative verbs. Both Zbavitel and Smith give lists of examples where compounds with correspond directly to their intransitive counterparts with . Some of these are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with</th>
<th>with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>кера</td>
<td>become</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>саричь</td>
<td>recover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гадон</td>
<td>wake up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бее</td>
<td>survive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>барка</td>
<td>grow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just like , can have connotations of upward movement or sudden change.

throw
is undoubtedly one of the most interesting compound makers because it can invoke a great variety of meanings in a sentence, including highly emotional ones, and also because it renounces its own original meaning so thoroughly.
compound verbs

Bykova ascribes to it: quick energetic actions, unexpectedness, suddenness, rudeness. Smith adds force or violence and I would also include thoroughness. Some examples with their implications:

आखिर तो कब ये बांट देंगे? I have (inaidventantly but irrevocably) told him everything.

से तोमाके देखा फेलेंगे। He has already seen you. can imply: you don’t need to hide anymore.

से खाना खाया फेलेंगे। He has eaten up all the meat. implies: he was supposed to leave some, but now there is none left.

The interpretation of these sentences depends on the context, but it becomes clear very quickly what a wide range of meanings फेला can have.

फेला is the only transitive compound maker which can be used with intransitive perfective participles. Traditionally quoted are फेला फेला burst into tears, and फेला फेला burst out laughing. Syntactically, these combinations are unexpected. A transitive verb requires an object and without it the sentence is incomplete. फेला is undoubtedly the compound maker which has developed the furthest from its original meaning and function, but it is hard to believe that the need for a direct object is no longer felt. Is it possible that the perfective participles फेला and फेला themselves could function as direct objects?

राखा - keep, put

राखा is accepted as a compound maker only by some authors (Zbavitel, Sarkar, Smith, Pal, Bykova). There is no doubt that राखा can form very close connections with verbs, eg बुझ राखा burst into tears, बुझ राखा burst out laughing. The reason for not accepting राखा as a compound maker is, most likely, that its original meaning is largely retained. The shade of meaning it adds to the compound can be that of prolongation (Smith) or of completion (Dakshi), but it does not entirely lose its own meaning.

थाका - stay, remain, आख- be

These two verbs, virtually synonymous, add to a compound the sense of either remaining in one particular state, when the main verb is stative, eg

शुद्ध थाका remain lying down, नाना आख remain sitting, आखिर थाका remain standing.

or with active verbs they can convey a meaning of habitual or repetitive actions:

थाका थाका keep singing, थाका बल थाका keep talking, थाका बल थाका keep looking.

आख- is an incomplete verb with only simple present and past tense - in all other tenses it is replaced with forms of थाका. Though the examples given are both common and idiomatic, it is clear from the translations that थाका is another verb which, in its role of compound maker, retains quite a lot of its original meaning.

other verbs

We have so far accepted that, in order to qualify as a compound maker, a verb which follows a perfective participle of another verb has to either change or lose its original meaning, which can result in semantic merging of the two verbs. We have also accepted that these types of verbs can combine with a number of preceding perfective participles and consistently add particular
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semantic colouring to their meanings. What, then, is the relationship between the verb forms in these two sentences?

Many people stared at her.

I and my friend Bimal ran away. (both Smith, p 134)

In both sentences we have a semantic merging of two more or less synonymous verbs which means that these combinations have to be considered compounds. However, neither see nor flee can easily combine with other verbs and they do not add semantic colouring to the preceding perfective participle, so there is no question of considering either of these two verbs as compound makers. The examples show that a potential for semantic merging is not restricted to the type of compound makers discussed in this chapter.

9. SUMMARY

Zbavitel makes a very valid point when he says: 'I am not at all sure that this combination (निये आছा, translateable as bring - one concept) is felt as one semantic unit by Bengalis themselves, which is, of course, much more important than its interpretation by foreigners' (p 75). Animesh Pal also points out twice in his article that any English translation of compound verbs can be an approximation only. This means whether a pp + verb construction is a compound verb or a sequence of actions cannot be determined by the translation into English. If we accept the definition of a compound verb as a single, indivisible semantic unit then our semantic interpretations have to be made on the basis of Bengali, not of English. Bengali also has a single semantic unit for the concept bring, namely the verb আসা, and, if for a speaker of English আসা and আসা seem synonymous, they are probably not synonymous to a Bengali speaker. If I were asked to explain the difference between the two, 1 would say that with নিয়ে আসা the main stress is on the fact of coming, whereas with আসা the actual coming is not as important as the bringing. But, then again, this is an interpretation by a foreigner.

I am not happy with defining a word class on purely semantic grounds, but, even if we accept this for the moment, the either-or solution that Zbavitel, Pal and Seely seem to suggest does not do justice to the variety of functions second component verbs in Bengali can take.

Clinton Seely uses the term auxiliary for compound makers which, in combination with another verb, lose their lexical meaning and ‘instead add a nuance to the meaningful verb which they follow’ (p 149). In cases, according to Seely, where the compound maker retains its meaning, however, the term auxiliary is not appropriate. I agree with him on the need for a distinction between structures like পড়ে যাওয়া (the meaning of যাওয়া go is lost) and নিয়ে যাওয়া (the meaning of যাওয়া is retained), but what about cases where the role of যাওয়া is not so clear-cut? With the compounds of movement, for instance, চলে যাওয়া go away, পরে যাওয়া move around, বেরিরে যাওয়া go out, and even থেকে যাওয়া stay longer, যাওয়া retains some, if not quite a lot, of its lexical meaning. Should these uses of যাওয়া be considered nothing more than arbitrary verb sequences? It may be more appropriate to suggest that between the two extreme points of:

পড়ে যাওয়া - one single, indivisible semantic unit, where the meaning of the compound maker is completely lost

-87-
on the one hand, and

- two verbs syntactically linked, but semantically independent

on the other, there exists a scale of connectedness which would look something like this. 'Lexical meaning' refers to the extent to which the compound maker retains its original meaning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One semantic unit, eg</th>
<th>one unit with some lexical meaning, eg</th>
<th>quite a lot of lexical meaning, eg</th>
<th>separate, eg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>পড়ে যাওয়া full</td>
<td>বুলে যাওয়া forget</td>
<td>বুলে যাওয়া go later</td>
<td>বলে লেখা say and write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>তেজে যাওয়া get broken</td>
<td>বেরিয়ে যাওয়া increase</td>
<td>চলে যাওয়া go away</td>
<td>বলে বলা sit and say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>হারিয়ে যাওয়া get lost</td>
<td>চলে যাওয়া go away</td>
<td>বলে যাওয়া leave behind</td>
<td>খেয়ে যাওয়া eat and go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>হয়ে যাওয়া happen</td>
<td>চলে যাওয়া go away</td>
<td>খাওয়া leave behind</td>
<td>কাজ করে আসা come back after working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>মুক্তিয়ে যাওয়া dry</td>
<td>বলে আসা come back</td>
<td>বলে যাওয়া leave behind</td>
<td>এটি আর বলে back after writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>কেটে যাওয়া be cut</td>
<td>বিকে আসা return</td>
<td>বলে যাওয়া keep saying</td>
<td>আরো একটা come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ফেলে দেওয়া throw away</td>
<td>বিকে আসা return</td>
<td>বলে থাকা sit down</td>
<td>রো আরো একটা come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>রেখে দেওয়া put away</td>
<td>বিকে আসা return</td>
<td>বলে থাকা sit down</td>
<td>সব আরো একটা come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>বলে দেওয়া say</td>
<td>বিকে আসা return</td>
<td>বলে থাকা sit down</td>
<td>সব আরো একটা come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>বলে ফেলা break</td>
<td>বিকে আসা return</td>
<td>বলে থাকা sit down</td>
<td>সব আরো একটা come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>যেখে ফেলা eat up</td>
<td>বিকে আসা return</td>
<td>বলে থাকা sit down</td>
<td>সব আরো একটা come</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let me, at this point, come back to the question of the term auxiliary. Traditionally, the term auxiliary is used for verbs which are 'subordinate to the chief lexical verb in a verb phrase, helping to express such grammatical distinctions as tense, mood and aspect' (Crystal). They also cannot be used on their own. A distinction between word classes and sentence functions needs to be made here. The verb যাওয়া is, of course, a full verb in Bengali. If we (or Seely) want to call it a full verb in some contexts and an auxiliary in another, we need to justify this on more than purely semantic grounds. যাওয়া in connection with a preceding perfective participle can convey completion, as in হয়ে থেকে over, finished. The fact that these type of structures can be used to refer not only to past but also to future events, where the completive element is considerably weaker, shows that যাওয়া can lose not only its own lexical meaning but also its aspective potential. There is little more than a stylistic difference between these two sentences

বাচ্চাটা বড় হবে। এবং বাচ্চাটা বড় হয়ে যাবে।

Both sentences mean The children will grow up.

যাওয়া can be seen as having an auxiliary function in this type of sentence, but the more neutral term compound maker seems preferable and more accurate. It indicates that যাওয়া, and other verbs, can have the function, in particular contexts, to form compound verbs. The full verb যাওয়া go can then be marked in a dictionary as being able to form a variety of compounds with varying degrees of connectedness with the preceding verb.

There can be no doubt that structures like নিয়ে যাওয়া are common and idiomatic and should be treated differently from mere verbal sequences because the connectedness between the two verbs is very strong. The two structures পড়ে যাওয়া and নিয়ে যাওয়া appear to be structurally identical, but,
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in fact, they are not, and the difference between them is perhaps more significant than has so far been taken into account. The combination of a transitive verb ले ओया take with an intransitive compound maker जाओ go, whereas in ले ओया both verbs are intransitive. In order to distinguish between verbal combinations of the type Seely discusses, the transitivity factor adds a structural dimension to a semantic one, and could, therefore, provide a more solid basis for defining word classes.

The question of transitivity harmony is raised by Probal Dasgupta and I believe that it can be taken further.

As an example he gives लूटेक लेना (both transitive), and लूटेक पड़ा (both intransitive) but it is not possible to form a compound verb *लूटेक पड़ा (transitive verb + intransitive compound maker) or *लूटेक पड़ा (intransitive verb + transitive compound maker). Any number of mixed transitivity compounds can, of course, be found, but it is a one-way process. Intransitive compound makers combine with transitive verbs, but not the other way round. The exception to this is लेना in compounds with ग्राहक and दाता (see under लेना). In the examples above there is one other intransitive - transitive compound लूटेक लेना break. I suspect that लूटेक in this case is an abbreviated form of the causative लूटेक, a fairly common phenomenon in Bengali. Other examples which have come up in this chapter are: भुले सेवा for भुले ले ओया fill, छिड़े सेवा for छिड़े ले ओया tear, रखेस सेवा for रखेस ले ओया mix. I find this structure more easily acceptable than छिड़े सेवा. I can only assume that compounds with सेवा as a compound maker have become so common that सेवा in this context is no longer felt to be a transitive verb. This may be syntactically unsatisfactory, but language changes do not always happen according to grammatical principles.

To sum up: In the analysis of compound verbs and in trying to define what criteria need to be fulfilled in order for a verb combination to be considered a compound verb, a lot of attention has been given to the concept of semantic oneness. Only if the second verb form has lost its original meaning (Smith, Seely), only if the verbs together form one single indivisible semantic unit (Pal, Zbavitel), will the combination be recognised as a compound verb. More often than not, the criterion for the 'one semantic idea' concept seems to be based on translation. We have अनेक ले ओया forget and नियर ले ओया take. According to Zbavitel's criteria, अनेक ले ओया would be acceptable as a compound verb whereas नियर ले ओया would be disqualified because ले ओया retains its meaning.

I do not doubt that verbs like लूटेक, लूटेक, पड़ा, etc take on a different function and also a different meaning in their role as compound makers, but their meanings seem hard to pin down to one or two concepts. Muhammad interprets the input of लूटेक with different verbs as 1. beginning an action, 2. finishing an action and 3. being able to do something (Muhammad, p 49). This may be an extreme case, but it seems that intransitive compound makers, particularly, are capable of a great variety in shades of meaning. In order to understand the concept of compound verbs better, we need to look beyond semantic considerations. If transitivity harmony is given serious thought, then a three-way split in the interpretation of verbal compounds will be more appropriate than the all-or-nothing definition which has prevailed so far. On the one hand we will have verbal combinations which are chronological sequences without any kind of connectedness between the two verb forms. On the other hand there are verb combinations, where both verbs are either
transitive or intransitive. These combinations are capable of forming single semantic units and the meaning of the second component verb form can be either transformed or lost completely, as in, for instance, ফেলে দেওয়া throw away, হেঁটে দেওয়া give up, কসে পড়া burst out crying. বসে পড়া sit down. In between those two groups is the large group of mixed transitivity compounds in which the two verbs can be closely connected but do not merge together. Both ভুলে যাওয়া forget and নিয়ে যাওয়া take combine a transitive verb with an intransitive compound maker and the supposed semantic difference between them is based on English concepts and is unlikely to be felt by native speakers.

Instead of a polarised all-or-nothing definition (Zbavitel):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sequence of actions</th>
<th>compound verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syntactically linked</td>
<td>single semantic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but semantically separate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

we would have the following three way split:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sequence of actions</th>
<th>compound verbs (mixed)</th>
<th>compound verbs (pure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syntactically linked</td>
<td>mixed transitivity, verbs can be closely linked but do not 'merge'</td>
<td>transitivity harmony verbs can 'merge' and represent a single semantic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but semantically separate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | বসে দেওয়া having seen, say | বসে দেওয়া tell, say |
| | বসে দেওয়া sit down | |

I believe that this interpretation is closer to how Bengali speakers experience their own language. Even if the compound maker বসে sit does not retain its original meaning in a compound like বসে বসে say (with a variety of possible connotations), a residual separateness between the two verbs remains. In fact, the range of a compound maker like যাওয়া, from losing its own meaning completely (হয়ে যাওয়া become, happen) to retaining it fully (নিয়ে যাওয়া take away) can only make us acknowledge the flexibility of Bengali language structures.
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CHAPTER 3
POSTPOSITIONS

There has been virtually no research done on Bengali postpositions. W.L Smith and W.S. Milne have lists of postpositions with examples and Chatterji discusses the origin of a number of postpositions, but no detailed analysis has been done so far.

For this reason the shape of this chapter will be somewhat different from chapters on grammatical structures that have been well researched. After a brief consideration of Chatterji, Milne and Smith's work I propose to do a preliminary analysis of Bengali postpositions myself. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to deal with all the postpositions Milne lists - he has 108! - so I will concentrate on those postpositions which are in common use today.

This turns out to be wrong as I found when I had finished writing the chapter. Rashida Begum has done an extensive analysis of Bengali postposition within the parameters of Government and Binding theory. Her book was published by the Bangla Academy in 1999 and I found it quite by accident.

She used a series of tests to establish whether particular postpositions are governing or not, for instance by inserting an adverbial exactly between noun and postposition or adding the determiner to the postposition. These show that it is possible to say directly in front of the house, just before midday, or the one on top, the one at the side but not exactly for, about you etc. What her tests achieve is to separate postpositions which can also be used as adverbs from those which cannot. Her list of postpositions is all-inclusive, far longer than Milne's, including locatives like at the top of, at the front of, because of, in the middle of. Although I myself would put a limit on these inclusions, it is interesting to see that a (presumably) native speaker can apparently perceive these locatives as something other than ordinary noun forms. Her list of postpositions with example sentences is, of course, of immense value. It is given as an appendix.

THE AUTHORS
S.K. Chatterji

In The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language Chatterji has a chapter on postpositions which looks at the development of nouns and verb forms with a postpositional function. He has a number of postpositions which are not included in Smith's and Milne's lists. These are, using his terms:

- doing, having done, having as the doer, in the house, used in comparison, in the place, for, for the sake of, with, used to express dative and locative relations, without, apart from, for the sake of, with, used to indicate the dative of inclusion.

Chatterji is not consistent in the way he treats his postpositions. Sometimes there is an English equivalent, eg for, for the sake of; sometimes there is a functional explanation, eg the use of
with the genitive to express the dative and locative relations' (p 770). This kind of explanation is difficult to understand and made more difficult by the frequent lack of examples. Other entries have English equivalents, functional explanations and examples.

The following postpositions seem questionable to me:

■^1, translated as *having done* and explained as 'added to the locative oblique in -e- to denote the instrumental' and 'used with an adverbial force after adjectives and nouns' (p 767). Examples given are জের করে _forcibly_, টাইম করে _tightly_, ভাল করে _well_. Although I agree with his translations and with his comment on 'adverbial force', I fail to see the connection with postpositions.

If you compare the following two sentences:

1) আমি তোমার সঙ্গে থাকবো। _I will go with you._
2) আমি ভালে করে পুরেছি। _I washed (it) well._

it becomes immediately obvious that the two sentence structures are quite different. In sentence 1) the postposition _সঙ্গে_ puts the subject of the sentence _আমি_ into a position, a relationship with the rest of the sentence. In sentence 2) _ভালে করে_ makes a comment on the verb of the sentence only, i.e. it is an adverb. The function of _করে_ is purely grammatical, changing an adjective into an adverb. It can certainly not be considered a postposition.

*বর, ঘর* translated as _house, in the house_. Again Chatterji's explanation is not very clear: 'used colloquially to indicate the oblique cases in the plural' (p 768). Unfortunately he does not give an example of this, but he seems to imply that _বর_ is used instead of a plural ending. If this is the way _বর_ is used it cannot be considered a postposition in our sense of the word.

*চছি* and _চেয়ে_ are both given as being used in comparison. Chatterji's only example is in Hindi, but the use of _চেয়ে_ in comparison is, of course, very common. The two sentences:

1) আমি তোমার চেয়ে লম্বা। _I am taller than you._
2) আমি তোমার সঙ্গে থাকবো। _I will go with you._

are structurally quite different. Whereas _তোমার সঙ্গে_ is an independent constituent within the sentence, _তোমার চেয়ে_ cannot be considered on its own. In fact, _চেয়ে_ connects the two underlying sentences _আমি লম্বা_ and _তুমি লম্বা_ and should therefore be considered a conjunction.

One very interesting fact emerged for me from Chatterji's description of _সঙ্গে_ (with variations _সাথে, সঙ্গে_ as a postposition. In the villages around Nator in Bangladesh - it is probably more widespread than this - the word _সঙ্গে_ is used in place of _সঙ্গে_ in, what the village people call, their _আখণ্ডিক ভাষা dialect_. Now I understand where the word comes from.

W.S.Milne

Milne's chapter on postpositions contains a very extensive list of postpositions and examples of their uses. Many of the postpositions he gives are taken from literary texts and used only in sadhu bhasa. Some of them are outdated. There is a complete list of Milne's postpositions at the end of this chapter but, in order to give an impression of his choice of postpositions I have given a selection of them with examples. The unattributed examples are Milne's.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postposition</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>অনেকের</td>
<td><em>beyond</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>মানব মূঢ়ির অনেকের</td>
<td><em>beyond human understanding</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>আমার অনেকের</td>
<td><em>without my knowledge</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no sin beyond the ken of one’s consciousness.

Give molasses in lieu of honey.

Judgment went in his favour.

You are the highest above the earth. (Psalm 97,9)

I did this out of regard for you.

On the score of religion it is good to speak the truth.

He has revealed his righteousness before the nations. (Psalm 98, 2)

There is much discussion nowadays on Zemindari affairs.

He couldn't come because of his illness. (Ghulam Murshid)

She is sitting like a figure in a picture, thinking of her companions.

The mountains melt like wax. (Psalm 97,5)

I will send the letter to your address.

Without a reason on account of doubts he punishes his wife.

Rameshchandra Mojumder  প্রেমজ্ঞ জ্ঞাতির অবস্থা (Advanced Bengali, p 254)

Your name was written by mistake. (Begum)

I could not do this work because of various difficulties.

Such distress of mind comes not but from separation from one’s beloved.

Without experience it is very difficult to be farsighted.
postpositions

**without, besides**

*I can endure all things except dishonour.*

>No one was there apart from him.* (Ghulam Murshid)

Everyone except Kolpona will get a prize.* (Begum)

**near**

*The Queen is sitting near the king.*

*He came close to the king and blessed him.*

*By the water of Meriba they made God angry.* (Psalm 106,32)

**with**

*One day the king had gone hunting with a large army.*

*The two young ascetics were ready to go with Sakuntala.*

**in the presence of**

*Tremble in his presence!* (Psalm 96,9)

You have set our iniquities before you.* (Psalm 90,8)

---

Under *except, without* Milne has a very interesting example sentence from Tagore:

*What other fault have I committed in your eyes - apart from the fact that I am dead.*

In this sentence *except* follows a finite verb form. Milne says the example has to be carefully studied. There is nothing wrong with studying, but I suspect that this is an unusual and highly individual use of this postposition. Functionally *except* has to be considered a conjunction here.

Concerning another Tagore example:

*Those who had gone with wood in the early morning heard this news.*

Milne calls this use of *with* in a temporal rather than a locative sense, anomalous. It may have been so at the time but there is nothing unusual about this use today.

---

W.L. Smith

Smith's listing of postpositions is very comprehensive and equipped with plenty of examples which clearly demonstrate the use of each postposition. For each postposition the case of
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The preceding noun or pronoun is given so that students of Bengali should be able to use postpositions independently and correctly.

As Clinton Seely in his review of Smith's *Reference Grammar* shows, there are some discrepancies between the rules Smith states about preceding case endings and his examples. For instance, with the postposition *through* Smith claims that it follows a genitive, but in his examples *follows* nominative endings. Seely discusses these inconsistencies in detail in his review (lines 113 to 161), so I will not repeat them here.

I would like to make the following points:

1) For *ago* the nominative case is given, as well as the genitive. This presumably refers to an adverbial use as in

    তিন বছর আগে  three years ago

Smith himself gives no example for this but if this use of *ago* is included then *later* with a preceding nominative should also be mentioned, e.g.

    তিন বছর পরে  three years later. The two constructions are exactly the same.

2) Under *with* Smith has the following two examples:

    মি তার নাস্তিকিটির জন্য তা নিয়ে যুক্ত । *The maid entered with tea for her nurse.*  and

    তৃতীয় ব্যাতিটি স্ত্রীকে নিয়ে বড় রাতার দিকে চলে গেল।

    *The third individual went in the direction of the highway with his wife.*

I can see no reason why *with* in these two examples should be considered anything other than a perfective participle.

3) Smith lists *from* as a postposition. He gives the following examples:

    বিড়ালদান হেঁচ়ে উঠলাম।  *I got up from the bed*

    নিঙ্কিয়া খোঁজা হেঁচ়ে উঠে এলা। *The sepoys got up from their meal and came.*

Could Smith's decision to include *from* be influenced by the English translation of these sentences? From a language-internal point of view I would interpret *from* as a perfective participle in both sentences.

4) If *instead* is included as a postposition why not *at*?

5) One of Smith's interpretations of *from* is *by itself, of one's own volition* but his example sentences include words meaning *self*, i.e. *আপনা থেকে, নিজে থেকে.* Surely, this is where the meaning of these sentences comes from. *নিজে থেকে* sounds unusual. Wouldn't *েচে* be more normal? In any case, *from* means nothing more than *from* in these sentences.

6) Smith mentions double postpositions like

    নিচ পর্যন্ত  down to

    পাশ দিয়ে  by the side of

    ডিজের থেকে  from inside

Sutton-Page says about this: 'Double postpositions are not uncommon. But this is generally a case in which the first postposition has really reverted to its original function as a noun' (p 134). I agree with him.
**DEFINITION**

Prepositions, of which postpositions are a variation, are traditionally defined as indeclinable and as forming a 'closed lexical category' (Trask, p 215). The function of pre/ postpostions is to place a noun phrase in relationship to the rest of the sentence. This relationship can be either:

- **spatial**  
  *The book is on the table,*

- **temporal**  
  *The post comes after nine o'clock,* or, for want of a better word,

- **circumstantial**  
  *I know nothing about him.*

Many languages have a fixed set of words which is used exclusively for this purpose, e.g., the German 'nach' after can never be anything other than a preposition. It can become part of a noun, e.g., 'Nachkomme' descendant or a verb, e.g., 'nachdenken' think but when it stands on its own it is always a preposition. Bengali works in a different way. The majority of Bengali postpositions are, in fact, nouns in the locative case, e.g., উপরে, ভিত্তি, পাশে, পরিবর্তে etc. Many of these are also used as ordinary nouns in nominative, genitive or locative case, e.g., বাড়ির ভিতরে থাকুন।

The inside of the house is very beautiful.

Nobody is allowed to sit on this side.

You haven't changed at all.

lit: There hasn't been any change in you.

Bengali postpositions are therefore not indeclinable.

In his book *Postpositions in a Dravidian Language* Radhakrishnan Mallassery sets out a list of criteria for identifying postpositions. One of these is that postpositions 'cannot be separated from noun phrases by morphemes other than coordinate conjunctions' (p136). This is true for most, but not all postpositions in Bengali. Both spatial and temporal postpositions can be preceded by adjuncts - this confirms Begum's test, mentioned on page 91. Examples for these are:

- **a little before midday**
  সুপ্রভাতের একটু আগে

- **after Eid**
  স্নাতক কয়েকদিন পরে

- **two miles behind the car**
  পাড়ির দূর খোলায় পশেন

- **high above the clouds**
  অনেক উপরে

Postpositions which allow this sort of structure are only those which can be used as adverbs without a preceding genitive. The fact that they follow a genitive in these examples shows that Bengali postpositions have to be seen under a different set of criteria from those Mallassersey proposes. Other postpositions like, জন্য for, সাথে with, মত like, সময়ে about, cannot be separated from the noun or pronoun preceding them.

Although it is quite easy to make a list of common Bengali postpositions, they do not represent a closed word class. If words like সময়ে about (Smith), যান except (Smith), নিয়ে about (both Smith and Milne), হিসাবে as (Smith) are listed as postpositions then why not add words like আপনার about, ফলে because of?

In order to establish a definition which is acceptable to native Bengali speakers the question we need to ask is which of the nouns used as postpositions are felt by a native speaker to be nouns and which ones are used predominantly as postpositions and so have lost their nominal character. Or, to take a step back, the question should be: is there a lexical category of postpositions in Bengali?
There are only very few postpositions which are derived from neither noun nor verb. Examples for these are like and for, without, towards. Another word until, is almost invariably used as a postposition, but it is also a noun meaning limit, end, extremity, eg. I have reached my limit.

All other words which function as postpositions in Bengali are either derived from a noun (often in the locative) or from a verb (often, but not always, in the past participle form). The conclusion of this is that there is no fixed, lexical category of postpositions in Bengali - instead verbs and nouns are used to fulfill the functions of postpositions.

Deverbal postpositions are fairly easy to define and to limit. The way they are used differs from their ordinary verbal use, eg.

आদি बाड़ि थंकेन एसेसिय. I have come from home.

In this sentence थंकेन can only be a postposition. The verbal form थंकेन having stayed would require the previous noun to be in the locative case. The sentence आदि बाड़िते थंकेन एसेसिय should be understood as Having stayed at home, I have come.

In this sentence is the past participle of थंकेन, not a postposition.

All deverbal postpositions must differ clearly from their equivalent verb forms in their syntactic or semantic environment.

The criteria for denominal postpositions are much more difficult to define. Whether or not a particular locative noun form should be classed as a postposition can surely not depend on its English translation but has to be based on the perception of native speakers and on semantic and syntactic features. If a particular noun is used almost exclusively as a postposition or if its use as a postposition affects its syntactic or semantic environment then it should be included in a potential definitive list of postpositions. Instances of these are आगे before, which is the locative of the noun आगे front, forepart. आगे is very frequently used as a postposition आगे आगे एसेसिय. I came before you.

or as an adverb आगे आगे एसेसिय. You go first.

The noun आगे front, forepart is locative in meaning, but आगे as a postposition or adverb is almost always temporal. The connection with the original noun has weakened and it has become a word in its own right.

The word संस with has moved away semantically from its root संस company, association, eg.

आगे आगे एसेसिय. I can't compare him with you.

Similarly, the word ऊपर top, upper part, though frequently used in contexts other than as a postposition has taken on a variety of idiomatic uses as a postposition, eg.

कारण ऊपर बांध करा be angry with someone

मुझे मास के ऊपर more than two months

आगे ऊपर शुल्किय I heard

These uses of locative noun forms clearly justify a separate dictionary entry and inclusion in the lexical category of postpositions. In other cases the decision is more difficult.

Smith includes
I doubt that native speakers would classify these words any differently from, for instance,

- as a result of, because of
- instead of
- for female education
- teaching English instead of local languages
- after two years
- about the girl
- about my parents
- as a dining room

We must take note, however, of Rashida Begum's comprehensive list, mentioned on p 91, the more so as it is not apparent what her criteria for choosing these postpositions were.

For learners of Bengali there is an obvious need for a lexical category equivalent to prepositions in other languages. However, it is important to recognize that

- the exclusion from or inclusion in this category is somewhat arbitrary-for instead Smith has instead, but not instead; Milne has instead, on instead and instead
- Bengali nouns which can be translated with an English preposition should not necessarily be considered a postposition. Some language-internal criteria should be fulfilled.
- the nouns which can function as postpositions can also be used in other contexts, i.e., as subject of a sentence, e.g., ঘরের ভিতরে থাকা সুন্দর! *The inside of the house is very beautiful.*
- verb forms which are used as postpositions are also used as normal verb forms.

**CHARACTERISTICS AND DISTRIBUTION OF POSTPOSITIONS**

Postpositions follow a noun phrase. This can be either a noun or a pronoun. The function of the postposition is to set this noun phrase into spatial, temporal or circumstantial relationship to the rest of the sentence. Most postpositions fulfil only one of these functions, e.g., নিচে *below, beneath*

is always spatial. Some postpositions can be used for more than one function, e.g., থেকে *from*

- spatial: এখান থেকে *from here*
- temporal: কালকে থেকে *from tomorrow*

Many postpositions, particularly those derived from nouns, require the preceding noun to be in the genitive, but there are exceptions to this. In his review of Smith's Reference Grammar Clinton Seely points to the difficulty for the learner of knowing which postposition goes with which case ending. Ramendrasundar Tribedi, in his article *কারণে কোনো সময়ে তাদের সবকথা বিহীন করে বলার নিয়ম নাই!* (Azad, p 404), is no fixed rule about case endings! He goes on to say that case endings tend to be dropped in colloquial language.

"কোনো মূখে প্রচলিত অধুনাতন্ত্রের বিভিন্ন চিহ্ন ব্যাপার করাই যুক্তি।" (p 405)
However, the number of postpositions where there is confusion about the preceding noun case is relatively small. Some postpositions distinguish between animate and inanimate nouns, ie with animate nouns an accusative ending is required, eg
animate (accusative) तकेने जिये कथा बलेिह। We talked about him.
inanimate (nominative) अत पण्ना जिये कि करवें? What will you do with so many ornaments?
The majority of postpositions is consistently used with only one case.

Derivations
In the following section I am dealing with the individual postpositions in their normal alphabetical order, so here is an overview of their derivations:

1. जोना, जोना for, थोरा through, नाय like, परस्य until, प्रति towards, विना without, मतज्ञन like, मारकत through, by
   All of these are not derived from any other word classes, but are postpositions in their own right. The very common जोना instead of जोना looks like a locative form but there is no such noun. परस्य is given in the dictionary as a noun limit, end but I have found no examples for this use. If परस्य was derived from a noun it would be most unusual for it to be in the nominative form.

2. छाड़ without, except, थोक से from, दिये by, through, थेर during, निये with, हइं from, हर through, via
   These are all derived from verbs but their syntactic or semantic environment has changed from the original verb forms to such an extent that they have become independent lexical items. छाड़ and हरते, हइं थे are unusual in that they appear in the verbal noun (छाड़) and infinitive (हर, हइं) form, not as perfective participles like the other deverbal postpositions.

3. All the remaining postpositions are derived from nouns. They can be divided as follows:
   a) spatial ऊपर on, above, निचे under, below
      साइडर out, outside of, भितर in, inside of
      सामने in front of, पिघने behind
      पाशे beside, काछे near, at, to
      में between, मासे between
      दिके towards
   b) temporal आगे before, परे after
   c) circumstantial सिक्के with, सम्बूचे about
      विरुध्द against, मध्‌में through
      पाके� for, बसले instead

Apart from these there are a number of locative noun forms which are used like postpositions but retain their nominal character to such an extent that they cannot really be considered postpositions. Some of these are listed on page 98, others are given in the conclusions to this chapter.
The structures
In this section I am going to look at the most common words which function as postpositions in Bengali. Since these words do not form a homogenous word class I have also included their non-postpositional uses as adverbs, nouns etc.

In order for a word to qualify as a postposition, at least one of the following criteria should be met:

• the word is an original postposition
• there is a semantic shift from the root word to the postposition
• there is a syntactic change when a word is used as a postposition - this will usually refer to the case ending of the preceding noun phrase
• use as a postposition is significantly more common than use of the root word
• The analysis of these postpositions aims to establish
  • the case ending of the preceding noun or pronoun
  • the relationship with the root word
  • the semantic range of the postposition
  • other, eg adverbial, uses

आং - before, ago  locative of noun आँ - front, forepart

When आং is used as a postposition the noun or pronoun preceding it takes the genitive ending.

e.g.

- याओয়ার आং before going
- সবার আং in front of everyone or before everyone
- রবিবারের আং before Sunday

but as an adverb it can also follow a noun in the nominative case, e.g.

- তিন বছর আং three years ago
- আং ফটো আং half an hour ago
- একবার আং once before

The last example is somewhat different from the other two because आং in this case is used as an independent adverb. It is equally possible to say:

- आং একবার once before

Other examples of this are:

- आँओँ खेल नाख। Eat first!
- एकটु आँओँ आसो। Come a bit earlier!
- आँ आँ जानताम ना। I didn't know(this) before.
- आँ अनेक आँ एসসह। I came a long time ago.

आँ is most often used in a temporal sense. As a postposition it has moved away from its nominal root, which is locative in meaning, and established its own use. In this temporal sense आँ can also be used nominally and followed by another postposition, as in:

- आँ। के तम as before
- आँ। के तम ভালো better than before
- आँ। থেকে since before
Colloquially, *where* is sometimes used in a locative sense, in the same way as सामने *in front of*, e.g.

आर एकड़ आशा तथापि...:  *I will stop a little further on.*

उद्देश्य - *in order to, with the purpose of*  locative of noun उद्देश्य aim, purpose

उद्देश्य usually follows a noun in the genitive, e.g.

स्त्री-लिंगकार उद्देश्य for female education (better: for the education of females)

उद्देश्य for the purpose of showing (both Smith)

Milne also gives the following example:

*On what occasion did you place a ring on her finger? With what intention?*

The locative (in Milne's example nominative) of उद्देश्य following the genitive of a noun does not differ syntactically from its root, nor has it changed or expanded its meaning significantly, i.e. it can invariably be translated as *for the purpose of*, e.g.

कीचड़ का यात्रा उद्देश्य for the purpose of going to Calcutta (Das)

किसा पाठ उद्देश्य in order to get a visa (Debsen)

Though उद्देश्य is frequently used following the genitive of another noun this is by no means its only use. Therefore I do not think that उद्देश्य should be classed as a postposition.

उपर - *above, over, on*  locative of noun उपर top, upper part

उपर, ओपर are variations

उपर requires the preceding noun with a genitive ending when it is used as a postposition, e.g.

मेघ के उपर above the clouds

टोबी के उपर on the table

नदी के उपर on the river

It can be used as an independent adverb, usually with the meaning *upstairs*, e.g.

उपर आराध्युण्ट घर। There are two more rooms upstairs.

आम उपर बाजु बना। I work upstairs.

उपर is spatial in meaning, but it has taken on a number of idiomatic uses where its original meaning is no longer felt, e.g.

तिन मास के उपर more than three months

आम उपर राग कर उठाया। He became enraged against me. (Milne)

आम तोमर के उपर प्रसन्न हूँ। I will be pleased with you. (Smith)

तार उपर शुभेच्छा... in addition to that I heard (Milne)

जेब लिख के उपर माया के बेटी a mother's love for her child (Milne)

बेडके उपर ग्रहणकरना research on grammar

Although उपर as a noun is frequently used, in its function as a postposition उपर has acquired independent meaning.

काछे - *close, near, by, on (a person), with locative of noun काछ nearness, proximity

काछे follows a preceeding genitive, e.g.
postpositions

Our house is near the river.
Sit next to me!
I don't go near him.
She is very close to me.

каছা can also be used as an independent adverb without a preceding genitive, eg
She can't see anything close by.

Stay close!

каছা is locative in meaning, but, like উপরে, it has developed a number of idiomatic uses, which justify its place among Bengali postpositions. Examples are:
I will ask father for the money.
What do you want from me? (Smith)
He didn't reveal anything to them. (Bandopadhyay)
I don't have any money with me.

The meaning of কাছা in these sentences stays closer to its original meaning than উপরে does but is still sufficiently different to warrant a separate dictionary entry.

ছাড়া - besides, without, apart from verbal noun/adjective form of verb ছাড়া leave
ছাড়া is an unusual postposition in that its form is equivalent to a verbal noun/adjective rather than a perfective participle form like most other deverbal postpositions. There seems to be some confusion about the case endings of nouns and pronouns preceding ছাড়া. Smith gives 'nominative, optional accusative with animates' (p 78). Bykova names all cases except the genitive as possibilities; Sutton-Page allows only the nominative. The logical and immediately obvious solution comes from Seely, in his review of Smith's Reference Grammar: ছাড়া can, in fact, be used with any case, depending on which part of the sentence the preceding noun or pronoun represents, eg

nominative আমি ছাড়া সনাঈ গিয়েছে। Everybody went apart from me.
accusative তোমাকে ছাড়া আমি বীচতে পারি না। I can't live without you.
genitive আমার ছাড়া সবার ভালো লেগেছে। Except for me, everybody liked it.
locative সকলে ছাড়া যেকোনো সময় আসতে পারে। You can come anytime except in the morning.

Apart from its unusual form equivalent to the verbal adjective - Chatterji calls it the passive participle - and the range of cases ছাড়া can combine with, semantically it is quite straightforward.

ছাড়া is used almost like a conjunction meaning apart from that, in addition, eg
He has fed me and apart from that he will buy me a pair of shoes.

জন্য, জন্য -- for, for the sake of, because of postposition

জন্য is one of the few Bengali postpositions which are not derived from other word classes but are just postpositions. The noun or pronoun preceding জন্য is in the genitive. I have found no explanation for the two forms of this postposition. Both forms are used in the same way.

জন্য has a wide range of meanings, ie
about: I worry about him.

for: I have bought a book for him.

because of: I am late because of work.

for the sake of: I have to stay for the sake of the children.

The word অনেকে অনেকে is used as a conjunction meaning therefore, because of that, eg:

২৫টি হচ্ছে, অনেকে বদিরে খাও না।

It is raining, so I am not going out.

This is the only example where অনেকে follows a nominative. The neuter pronouns এই and তা are used with অনেকে to express the same meaning therefore but both require a genitive ending, eg:

আমার জোর হয়েছে। তার জন্য আসতে পারি নি।

ছুড়েছেন, এই জন্য এখন তার কথা দেখা করতে পারবেন না।

He is asleep, so you can't see him now.

The same is true for the interrogative pronoun কে and the relative pronoun তার, eg:

বইটা কার জন্য কিনেছেন? For whom did you buy the book?

যার জন্য আমি কিনেছি সে দেখে না। The person (he whom) I bought it for won't take it.

- from, since

perfective participle of থাকা stay, remain

Used as a postposition থাকে generally follows the nominative. Smith points out that verbal nouns preceding থাকে take the genitive, eg:

কলনকে অন্য দিন করার থাকেই এই অভ্যাসটি হয়ে গেছে।

He has had this habit since he taught in college. (Smith)

থাকে can be used spatially:

জাপা থাকে from Dhaka, কোথা থাকে from where, এখান থাকে from here

or temporally:

তখন থাকে from then on, since then, এই মাস থাকে from this month onwards,

আজ থাকে from today

থাকে can be used in conjunction with পর্যন্ত until

সমুদ্রের থাকে শুল্কবর্ধন পর্যন্ত from Monday to Friday

to mark the beginning and end point of an event or in conjunction with দিন during

আজ থাকে তিন সপ্তাহ থাকে for three weeks from today

to mark the beginning and duration of an event.

The postposition থাকে can be clearly distinguished from the perfective participle of থাকা by the case ending of the preceding noun. If the verbal form is used spatially it requires the preceding noun to be in the locative case, eg:

আমাদের এখানে আর একটু থাকে যান। Stay with us for a bit longer.

থাকে is by far the most common of all the deverbal postpositions and it has moved furthest away from its verbal use. The following examples have no trace of the verbal meaning of থাকে left in them:

গুটা থাকে আমাকে মুক্তি দিও। Release me from that.

সেই থাকে কি যে হচ্ছিল তবে কানে। After that who knows what happened to him.

সেই থাকে আমি তার কিছু বলি নি। Because of that I didn't say anything more.
The last example shows that, like जाना for, थ्रें can have causal meaning in certain contexts.

With reference to human beings थ्रें is used together with काँहे near, close by, eg

बाबार काँहे थ्रें  from father
अमार काँहे थ्रें  from me

In these cases काँहे reverts back to being a noun, dropping the locative ending. The rule that थ्रें is used with non-human nouns and काँहे थ्रें with humans seems to be generally observed. I have found only one counter example:

बड़ रास्ता काँहे थ्रें  from the big road (Bandyopadhyay)

There is one other use of थ्रें. In comparative sentences it can be used in place of थ्रें than, eg

मैं थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें थ्रें

The preceding noun is in the genitive. In this use थ्रें is a conjunction rather than a postposition.

दिके - towards  locative of noun दिके direction

Like most denominal postpositions, दिके follows a noun or pronoun in the genitive. It is used mainly spatially, eg

बाड़े दिके चलन  went towards home (Pather Pancali)
अकाली दिके चलन  looking at the sky (Pather Pancali)
उच्छर दिके उठन  went in the direction of upstairs (Bandyopadhyay)
तार दिके दिके भालै  having looked at him (Bandyopadhyay)

but it can also be used temporally, eg

बैकल दिके  towards afternoon (Pather Pancali)
अबर दिके  towards dawn (Tagore)

दिके can also be used to express approximation, eg

पीर दिके  at about five o'clock (Prohhas Das)
सन मालेदी दिके  about ten miles (Prohhas Das)

With demonstrative pronouns, as also with तार and सब, दिके does not require a genitive, eg

एस दिके आमा  Come this way!
स ओই दिके গিয়েছে  He went that way.
সই দিকে নাথ রোকে  Pay attention to that.

চাপড়ো দিকে তাকিয়ে নজ্জু করে Looking all around he notices... (Bandopadhyay)
সে সবদিকে বিবেচনা করে।  He considers everything.  (Prohhas Das)

In all these cases दिके, together with the preceding pronoun, forms an adverb. It is interesting to note that though the demonstrative pronouns can precede दिके without a genitive ending, the neuter pronoun तौ, just as with जाना, retains the genitive ending, eg

तार दिके রাখা রাখা। I will keep an eye on him.

Even though दिके is also used as a noun, eg

The relationship is not through her husband's side.  (Bandyopadhyay)
its use as a postposition is very common and semantically it has expanded its nominal meaning, particularly in contexts like  about five o'clock, where it has a temporal meaning of approximately. I therefore think that this is a genuine postposition.

**postpositions**

**with**

perfective participle of সেদ্ধা give

As a postposition সিনে generally follows a nominative, but an animate noun preceding it is put in the accusative case.

**দিয়ে** can have the following meanings:

- with (instrumental)
  - কলম দিয়ে লেখা
  - বই দিয়ে স্তোত্র লিখা
  - রাখালের দিয়ে বাদাম
  - write with a pen
  - look through the window
  - go via Nator
  - go along this road
  - made from with flour
  - enter from there

- by means of,
  - বাবুকে দিয়ে অনুবাদ
  - translated with the help of Babu

Semantically, none of these meanings imply an act of giving, so from that fact alone the status of সিনে as a postposition is justified.

The use of সিনে with a preceding animate noun is not very common. Smith gives:

*He has the Mahabharata translated by a babu named Abinaschandra Ghos.*

In this sentence সিনে can also be understood as a perfective participle, ie

*Having given it to a babu named Abinaschandra Ghos, he had the Mahabharata translated.*

Another example without this ambiguity is

*আমি তাকে দিয়ে ফর্ম আনিয়েছিলাম। I got the form through him. (Probhas Das)*

The use of সিনে in these contexts would be more common, but this use of সিনে needs to be noted.

**দিয়ে** can be used in the sense of from. Examples are:

- মানুষটির কাপড় দিয়ে কাথ করছে। Sweat is dripping from the man's forehead. (Smith)
- সেখান দিয়ে এসে এলাম। I entered from there.
- সেই পাশ দিয়ে দেশ রাখা আরও হতো ছটে পালানো।

*From that side a fairly big rat suddenly ran out.* (Bandyopadhyay)

In all these cases দিয়ে would be more common.

**through, by means of** postposition

There seems to be some confusion about which case precedes this postposition. Both Chatterji and Smith claim that it is a genitive, but Smith also has

*পালানোর দিয়ে বিনিয়োগ এর প্রবর্তন পাওয়া চাই।*

*A special meaning must be revealed by means of the verses.*

Milne also has a nominative example

*মুরগীর দারা পৃথিবীর অর্থ উপকার হইল।*
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Much good to the world has been done by the press.

The genitive ending is certainly required with animate nouns or pronouns, eg

That is not to be accomplished by Rabi. (Smith)

I can’t get the writing right. (Dakshi)

Beyond this nothing can be done by me. (Milne)

With inanimate nouns the genitive ending seems to be optional. Two examples are given above with a nominative ending. An example with a genitive ending is given by Begum:

Not everything can be proved by argument.

Apart from that there is nothing I can do.

during  perfective participle of  go  hold, catch

follows a nominative noun, eg

for three weeks

all day long

for a year

It is most often used in a temporal sense to express a duration of time but can also be used spatially, eg

Let’s go by another path. (Smith)

He has begun to walk along the pavement in the opposite direction. (Smith)

Similarly to  above  remains close to its verbal root, for instance

We will have to take this road,

shows that the sense of  is still tangible even in its postpositional use and syntactically  cannot be distinguished from the perfective participle form. However, particularly in its temporal use it has moved far enough from the verb form to be considered a postposition.

under, underneath  locative of  underside, part underneath

is the logical opposite of  but it is much narrower in its use. Like  it follows a noun or pronoun in the genitive and it can be used adverbially. Examples are

under the tree

under the house

under the pillow

We live downstairs.

We have to go further down.

can only be used spatially and it does not have the range of idiomatic uses that  has.

According to our criteria for including a word into the class of Bengali postpositions  has little to commend itself. There are no semantic or syntactic features which distinguish it from its
nominal root. Logically, however, in order not to disturb the symmetry between opposites like आए – परे, बाईरे – जितेरे, सामने – निचे, निचे has to be included as the counterpart to उपरे.

निचे with, about perfective participle of निचे take
Like निचे follows a noun or pronoun in the nominative case except that animate nouns or pronouns are used in the accusative, eg
inanimate एक गली निचे चिता करा think about a story
animate बाबाकेनिचे समस्त problems with father
निचे is a very interesting postposition as in a lot of instances it stays very close to its verbal use.
Consider the following example from Bandyopadhyay:
आया, निचे तप्तने आजठारे फायर फायर नाह?

Can't you comb (your hair) properly with a mirror?
The sentence could equally be interpreted as
Having taken a mirror, can't you comb (your hair) properly?
So, in order to establish निचे as a postposition we have to look for examples without this ambiguity, ie sentences where no act of taking can possibly be involved.
Seely gives this example:
कि जानिकि निचे सुई भाईरे कूट नि पड़ा होयत होयत?

How do I know what the two brothers had a big fight about?
Smith has the following:
अमार मध बेटमक निचे केउएट भाए ना। No one else thinks about you as much as I do.
बाबा निचे बायल। They are self-absorbed.
बाबाकेनिचे तथा अमाबिनिचे करो? What will I do about father then?
Is there an element of taking in these examples? Neither Chatterji nor Milne list निचे as a postposition though they both have निचे. This might suggest that the use of निचे as a postposition is a more recent development. When निचे is used as a perfective participle it has to be followed by a finite verb form and in my research on compound verbs I have found that the only verbs following निचे are verbs of motion, ie यात्रा, आज, चल। Even if there is a trace of taking in the above sentences it is appropriate to distinguish the use of निचे in
तोमके निचे याखा। I will take you with me.
तोमके निचे जंघा करो! I will have a fight about you.
I would therefore accept निचे as a postposition which is in the process of establishing itself.

पंजे for, on behalf of locative of पंजे direction, side
पंजे requires a preceding genitive. Smith claims that पंजे and जने are used in the same way, but Seely points out the difference between them. Whereas जने implies the concept of other-directedness ie for the benefit of, for the purpose of, पंजे means on behalf of, from the perspective of. In fact, all of Smith's examples use पंजे in precisely this sense, eg
सेटाआमार पंजे बेटाने सहज हो वह। It wouldn't be easy for me to explain.
मेम्पांजे तो आज़ा खराबृ�। It's even worse for girls.
It is not possible for me to say.

In none of these sentences does পরে imply a benefit for someone else. However, it has to be added 
that in all these sentences জন্য could have been used instead of পরে. Though Seely's criticism is 
justified, it is clear that জন্য and পরে are not complementary to one another, as Seely would have 
it, but পরে has a range of meaning which is narrower than that of জন্য, eg it is not possible to say

*তারি ওর পরে আমি চা দিয়ে এসেছি।* 

I have brought tea for you.

Other examples with পরে are:

আমার পরে এক হাতের টাকা কিছু নয়। 

A thousand Taka is nothing to me.

তারি ওর পরে কাজ করা ভালো।

It is good for you to work. (Milne)

আমার পরে হাতে নেওয়া সত্ত্ব না।

It is not possible for me to take a holiday.

সে টাকা সংগ্রহের পরে খাওয়া যায়।

This money is enough for the family. (Das)

It is only in this last example that an element of benefit can be felt but it is not strong enough to 
defeat the argument. The reason for including পরে as a postposition is quite simply that the noun 
পরে is not often used. I have found the following example

কখনও সুখী এক স্ত্রীর পরে হইলে অন্য স্ত্রীকে সব্দা তাড়ন করে।

Sometimes the husband takes the side of one wife and punishes another wife.

Rameshchandra Moiumder, স্ত্রী জাতিকর অবস্থা}


goes after the locative of adj পরে another, other

পরে is sometimes used instead of পরে. There is no difference in use or in meaning.

পরে usually requires a preceding genitive but there are some exceptions to this. It is the logical 
counterpart to আগে before and, like আগে, can be used adverbially, eg

as a postposition

দুপুরের পরে after midday

বিকালের পরে after Sunday

তারিখে after that

with verbal nouns

কাজ করার পরে after doing the work

তারি চলে যাওয়ার পরে after he left

as an adverb meaning later আর একটু পরে যাও! Go a bit later!

সে পরে আসবে। He will come later.

দুই মাস পরে two months later

তিন ঘণ্টা পরে three hours later

As can be seen from these examples পরে is used temporally. There are a few exceptions to this. I 
have found a number of examples where পরে is used instead of উপরে. These are:

মেয়েদের পরে অতাতাতের চলছে।

Women are being oppressed.

নিজেদের পরে বিরক্ত হয় তার।

She was angry with herself.

মুখের পরে দু কেটা মাছি উড়ে পড়ছে।

One or two flies were on his face.

মানবের পরে অবিশ্বাস করেছে।

They have done an injustice to mankind.

(all from Bandyopadhyay)

This may be an idiosyncratic use of পরে as the examples are all from one author but it should be 
noted.
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postpositions

is used as a conjunction and can sometimes have consequential or even causal implications, eg

After that I didn't say anything more,

but it can imply Because of that, as a consequence, I didn't say anything more.

Equally, with a concessive তা, it can mean in spite of, eg

In spite of that, he didn't listen to me.

instead of locative of change, alteration

Morphologically is derived from the noun পরিবর্তন, which is also given in the Samsad dictionary, but seems to be narrower in meaning than পরিবর্তন. The conjunct verb change is always a postposition.

follows a noun or pronoun in the genitive, eg

will go instead of you.

Open the window instead of the door.

, as a postposition, differs semantically from the noun পরিবর্তন. Whereas the noun describes change, ie development from one state to another, the postposition expresses substitution, exchanging one thing for another. I consider this semantic shift significant enough to accept as a postposition.

can be used without a preceding genitive. This has to be interpreted as an elliptic use, eg

I bought two sarees instead of one.

Couldn't you go instead of me?

is an unusual postposition insofar as it is not a locative but a nominative form. The preceding noun is in the nominative. Often together with থেকে from, it can be used either spatially, eg

from head to foot (Samsad)

or temporally

from today until Sunday

When is used with verbal nouns the negative particle না is often, but not always, added either before or after the verbal noun. In these cases corresponds to as long as, eg

as long as it doesn't stop raining (Samsad)

until it is finished (Samsad)

until the train comes (Samsad)

can be used in contexts other than purely spatial or temporal. In these cases it is best translated as even, eg

I am ready to even give my life. (Milne)

They don't even have the right to express themselves. (Das)

Smith calls this use adverbial. This may be true for the English even, but syntactically in the following sentences is the same as in the examples above, ie it is still a postposition. Smith has
He doesn't even touch tobacco.

They even have TV sets in villages.

I didn't eat or drink anything - not even water.

Syntactically the postposition পাশ does not differ from its nominal homonym which is not frequently used. If the noun পাশ followed another noun the preceding noun would have to be in the genitive, e.g.

রাস্তার পাশ the end of the road

This alone is reason enough to accept পাশ as a postposition.

পাশ at the side of, next to
locative of পাশ side

পাশ is a spatial postposition and follows a noun or pronoun in the genitive, e.g.

রাস্তার পাশ by the side of the road
জানালার পাশ next to the window
দাদার পাশ at grandfather's side

Like নিচ under পাশ retains its nominal character and should be included in the wordclass of postpositions only because of its logical place alongside the other spatial postpositions (listed on p 99). It is frequently used as a noun with or without a preceding genitive, e.g.

এই পাশ বসত্ত পাহার। You can sit on this side.
চার পাশ পাহার water all around
কেউ দেই তার পাহার। There is no one at her side. (Das)

পাশপাশি is a variation of পাশ, but can also be used adverbially to mean side by side. It can be used as a postposition.

একবার তার পাশপাশি বেরিয়ে এলা দরজা নিয়ে।

as an adverb
মুজুনে পাশপাশি বসে আছে। The two of them are sitting side by side.

পিছন behind locative of পিছন back, behind

পিছন (sometimes পিছন) follows a genitive and is the logical opposite of সামনে in front of. It is spatial in meaning, e.g.

বাসার পিছন behind the house
গাড়ির পিছন behind the car
বাবার পিছন behind father

Occasionally, but not as frequently as সামনে, পিছন can be used in a temporal sense, e.g.

আমার পিছনে আরও দুইটি ভাই। After me there are two brothers. (Milne)

Like the other spatial postpositions পিছন can be used adverbially and is then best translated as at the back:

আমি পিছনে দাঁড়িয়ে থাকবো। I will stand at the back.
বোতামপুলো পিছনে রাখবো। Put the bottles at the back.

পিছন retains its nominal character, but has its logical place alongside the other spatial postpositions.
instead of, locative of exchange, substitute

is very similar in use and meaning to instead of. It follows a noun or pronoun in the genitive. There is a distinct difference in meaning between the two conjunct verbs exchange and exchange, swap, but the two postpositions are virtually interchangeable. Examples are

\begin{quote}
\text{The boy answered instead of Mariam.} \quad \text{(Bandyopadhyay)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{Instead of this Ram gave him nothing.} \quad \text{(Smith)}
\end{quote}

I will give rice instead of money. \text{(Milne)}

Milne translates this sentence with rice in return for money but I think this is wrong. In the following sentence exchange follows a nominative, but cannot be considered a postposition because one cannot exchange an unspecified saree for a blue one, just as it would be nonsensical in English to say *She bought a blue dress instead of a dress.‘

Instead of this Ram gave him nothing. \text{(Smith)}

\begin{quote}
\text{I will give rice instead of money.} \quad \text{(Milne)}
\end{quote}

There is a distinct difference in meaning between the two conjunct verbs change and exchange, swap, but the two postpositions are virtually interchangeable. Examples are

\begin{quote}
\text{The boy answered instead of Mariam.} \quad \text{(Bandyopadhyay)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{Instead of this Ram gave him nothing.} \quad \text{(Smith)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{I will give rice instead of money.} \quad \text{(Milne)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{Outside the house is a tubewell.} \quad \text{(Smith)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{He came out of the gate.} \quad \text{(Smith)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{He can't sleep outdoors.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{He is always out.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{beyond in more than just a physical sense}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{beyond my imagination} \quad \text{(Bandyopadhyay)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{beyond reach} \quad \text{(Samsad)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{Meet me in two days' time(after two days).}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{exception, omission}
\end{quote}

Smith gives the meaning of this postposition as after. His examples are

\begin{quote}
\text{after three months}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{after two years}
\end{quote}

Begum also has an example with this meaning

\begin{quote}
\text{after two days.}
\end{quote}
postpositions

*postpositions*

Any fruit can be eaten except for oranges.  
(Begum)

*postpositions* are also used in the sense of *except*, eg  

*except* for Shunayani he doesn't know the rest of the girls.  
(Pather Panchali)

*postpositions* follow a noun or pronoun in the nominative. The semantic shift from *except* to *after* justifies its inclusion in the category of *postpositions*.

*except, without*  

*postpositions* follow a noun or pronoun in the nominative. The semantic shift from *except* to *after* justifies its inclusion in the category of *postpositions*.

Milne has three examples with *postpositions* used as a *postposition*. Two of them have a preceding nominative, one has an accusative pronoun.

I have no other friend but you.  
Without religion life is naught. and  
Without him there is no need for me to go.

According to Seely this use of *postpositions* is outdated. In contemporary Bengali *postpositions* is used as a *postposition* followed by the locative form of the noun, eg

Who wants to give up happiness without a reason?  
*postpositions* in the *genitive*. Examples are

The decision went against him.  
I have a complaint against you.  
Perhaps (they) have plotted against him.  

The adjective *against*, from which this *postposition* is derived, is not frequently used and therefore *postpositions* should be accepted as a *postposition*.

*about*  

*postpositions* follow a noun or pronoun in the nominative. Examples are

Everybody is worried about you.  
There is nothing more to be said about him.  
We know nothing about the girl.  

The only reason for considering *about* a *postposition* would be the fact that it can be translated with an English *preposition*, ie a language-external feature. If *postpositions* is a *postposition* then *about* should also be eligible
From a language-internal point of view there is no syntactic or semantic reason to consider तित्तरे and कथा as anything other than nouns.

तित्तरे in, within locative of तित्तरे interior, inside

तित्तरे is the logical opposite of बाहर outside of. It is predominantly spatial in meaning, follows a genitive nominal and can also be used adverbially.

Postpositional uses are

रोड़की तित्तरे कुड़ सीता।

कलसी के तित्तरे के? What is in the jar?

It is very cold in the house.

Postpositional uses are

रोड़की तित्तरा कुड़ सीता।

कलसी के तित्तरे के?

What is in the jug?

What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?

Or What is in the jug?
According to his advice she goes once a month. (Das)

Malika bought a saree of her own choice. (Begom)

He entered the courtyard and, according to habit, called. (Pather Panchali)

According to your convenience (Advanced Bengali, p 270)

Very common is on time. Seely points out that সত্ত্ব can also be used with adjectives to make them into adverbs, e.g., সুখিত happily, আমলস well, নিকম properly. These are, of course, not postpositional uses.


egele between, among, in locative of মধ্য middle, centre

egele follows a noun or pronoun in the genitive, can be used spatially, temporally or figuratively and is sometimes used as an adverb. Examples are:

temporally: সন্ধ্যা ও সপ্তাহের মধ্যে between nine and ten o'clock
eএক সপ্তাহের মধ্যে within an hour

sols মধ্যে before evening (all Milne)

spatially: দশ মাইলের মধ্যে within ten miles

বর্ষের মধ্যে in the room (Milne)

সে মানুষের মধ্যে in that field (Smith)

figuratively: তোমার আরো মধ্যে between you and me

তার মনের মধ্যে in his mind

জানাঙ্গাজের লোকের মধ্যে যে ব্যবহার ভাষা

the language used among people of polite society (Advanced Bengali p 230)

ইনিউ ও পশিম পাকিস্তানের লোকের মধ্যে ভাষা

inequality between the leaders of East and West Pakistan

(Advanced Bengali p 272)

Because of these figurative uses, which are semantically removed from the noun, মধ্য has to be considered a postposition. Milne gives the following examples for an adverbial use of মধ্য:

There is water here and there.

He gets fever occasionally.

Milne has the sentence এর মধ্যে এসেছে translated as You have come very early.

I understand এর মধ্যে in this context to mean by now, in the meantime.


egele between, in the middle locative of মধ্য middle, centre

Variations of মধ্য are মধ্যে and মধ্যের. মধ্যে means the same as মধ্য and is also used in the same way, i.e., it follows a genitive and can be used adverbially. Of the two, মধ্যে is the more common postposition. All of Smith's examples are spatial, but মধ্যে or মধ্যের can also be used temporally. Examples are:

spatial: বলুকার সমুদ্রী মধ্যে in an ocean of dust
postpositions

in the river
in the middle of the room
in the Ganges (all Smith)

temporal
In the middle of Phalgun our Krishnashrub started blossoming. (Begum)
about the middle of this month

This use of _awake is used as an adverb meaning, sometimes, eg:
He comes here sometimes.

This use of _awake constitutes a shift from spatial to temporal meaning and justifies its place among postpositions.

through, by means of locative of medium

follows a genitive noun or pronoun, but it differs neither syntactically nor semantically from its root noun. In all cases it can be translated as through the medium of. Examples are

People keep their spines straight through hard work. (Begum)
The name was well known through books (Smith)
Having received the news through Saswati (Bandyopadyay)

As with _awake, I see no reason to consider _awake a postposition.

with locative of company

_and _are used in exactly the same way. Chatterji says that _ is the East Bengal version of _ , so I am treating them together here. _ follows nouns and pronouns in the genitive and is one of the most common postpositions in Bengali. The noun it is derived from means company and in company with is one of its regular uses, eg

I will go with you.

There is a relationship between society and language. (Advanced Bengali, p 235)

However, used as a postposition, _ has widened its meaning. Smith has

Is there a difference between society in Calcutta and Delhi?

I suggest that in this sentence it would be more common to use _ instead of _ , but this use of _ needs to be noted. A similar example is

compared to the soft colour of banana leaves (Bandyopadhyay)

Another use of _ is in an attributive sense:

Another
We want to say emphatically (with force)

We can say proudly (with pride)

There is no trace of company left in these sentences
There is no trace of company left in these sentences
postpositions

The pronoun  can refer to manner, eg

Everyone will receive you with love.  (Das)

The pronoun  can be used in the sense of in addition to, eg

two pieces of bread with the milk  (Bandyopadhyay)

The girl had a job in a primary school. Apart from that she worked in the progressive women's movement.  (Das)

But  can also be used as a postposition meaning as soon as:

As soon as Dipak finishes speaking, Sita comes and stands at the door.  (Smith)

As soon as the whistle sounded the train set off.  (Begum)

In spite of his large salary he cannot make both ends meet.  (Milne)

In spite of your going you did not meet him.  (Milne)

Although he is afraid of punishment he steals father's book and reads it.  (Begum)

Because of its syntactical feature of following a nominative noun or pronoun,  has to be considered a postposition. With verb forms the conditional participle with concessive  would be more common than the structure with  eg the first example sentence above would be

Although he is afraid of punishment he steals father's book and reads it.  (Begum)

Examples with are:

In spite of this Rita sometimes becomes miserable.  (Das)

Although he is afraid of punishment he steals father's book and reads it.  (Begum)

Because of its syntactical feature of following a nominative noun or pronoun,  has to be considered a postposition. With verb forms the conditional participle with concessive  would be more common than the structure with  eg the first example sentence above would be

Although he is afraid of punishment he steals father's book and reads it.  (Begum)

The doubled  is commonly used as an adverb meaning immediately, eg

You will have to come immediately.

In spite of the rain I will go to the river.

It is raining but I will still go to the river.

Examples with are:

In spite of this Rita sometimes becomes miserable.  (Das)

Although he is afraid of punishment he steals father's book and reads it.  (Begum)

Because of its syntactical feature of following a nominative noun or pronoun,  has to be considered a postposition. With verb forms the conditional participle with concessive  would be more common than the structure with  eg the first example sentence above would be

Although he is afraid of punishment he steals father's book and reads it.  (Begum)

Because of its syntactical feature of following a nominative noun or pronoun,  has to be considered a postposition. With verb forms the conditional participle with concessive  would be more common than the structure with  eg the first example sentence above would be

Although he is afraid of punishment he steals father's book and reads it.  (Begum)

Because of its syntactical feature of following a nominative noun or pronoun,  has to be considered a postposition. With verb forms the conditional participle with concessive  would be more common than the structure with  eg the first example sentence above would be

Although he is afraid of punishment he steals father's book and reads it.  (Begum)
about, concerning  locative of  relationship, connection, concern

about, concerning  locative of  relation, connection

These two postpositions are virtually interchangeable, so I am treating them together here. Smith claims that সম্পর্কে governs a preceding nominative or genitive, সম্পর্কে a preceding nominative. Clinton Seely says about সম্পর্কে "With this postposition, the genitive case is optional on preceding nouns and required on preceding personal pronouns" (line 156). The same is true for সম্পর্কে, but I would amend Seely's statement slightly to say that with inanimate nouns the nominative is required, with animate nouns either nominative or genitive can be used, and with personal pronouns the case ending is genitive. Examples are:

inanimate nouns with nominative

The government established a new policy regarding ethnicity. (Smith)

You know best about the country's situation. (Advanced Bengali, p 266)

Many others are becoming aware of the plight of women. (Advanced Bengali, p 255)

There is no need of argument about this matter. (Milne)

animate nouns with either nominative or genitive

You have no right to speak about my parents. (Smith)

That's why I never worry about others. (Smith)

There is a poem by him about Tagore. (Begum)

personal pronouns with genitive

What are they saying about me? (Das)

I don't know anything about them.

is frequently used as an ordinary noun in contexts other than following a preceding genitive,

I have nothing to do with him.

I don't know anything about their relationship.

as a noun, is not very often used, except in its meaning genitive, whereas as a postposition it is quite common. Syntactically, the fact that both these words are preceded by nominative forms make them different from their nominal uses, which would have to be preceded by a genitive.

This justifies their inclusion among genuine postpositions.

in front of  locative of  front, forepart
postpositions

postpositions is the logical opposite of পিছন. It follows a noun or pronoun in the genitive, can be used adverbially and has predominantly spatial meaning. Examples are

ঘাড়ির সামনে in front of the car
তাদের বাড়ির সামনে in front of their house
রাজার সামনে in front of the king

পিছন as the logical opposite of পিছন can be used either spatially or temporally, eg

ঘাড়ির সামনে I will get off a bit further on.
বাড়ির সামনে There is another shop further on.

temporally এই সময়ের মাঝে একটি কাজ There is a lot of work this next month.

সে সময়ে পর তার চাকরি ছেড়ে যেতে। He will give up his job next year.

It is interesting to note in this context that there is an overlap in Bengali between adverbs and nouns, ie in the above sentences সময় can be seen as either. This is true in varying degrees for all the spatial and temporal postpositions which can be used as adverbs. I will come back to this point later (see Conclusions).

পিছন has its logical place among the other spatial postpositions and so, in spite of nominal uses, has to be considered a postposition. পিছন is used adverbially to express face to face, but can also be a postposition, eg

আমাদের পিছনের চাকরি তাঁদের আছে। He is standing in front of us. (Begum)

হত, হইত from infinitive of হওয়া be, become

হইত is the old sadhu bhasha equivalent of হত and like হইত it follows a nominative. The modern calit bhasha form হত is rarely used as a postposition, but Smith has the following examples

ভয় হইত মুক্তি পাবার in order to be freed from fear
আন্দোলন হইত since time immemorial
কথা হইত from where

In all these cases হইত would be more common, but since the form exists it has to be seen as a postposition. It is both syntactically and semantically quite different from the verb form. Examples with হইত are:

সে বাড়ি হইতে বাহির হইয়াছে। He came outside from the house. (Pather Panchali)
কাল হইতে আমার অসুখ হইয়াছে। I have been unwell since yesterday. (Milne)

তাহার নিকট হইতে আমি অনেক উপকার পাইয়াছি।

I have received great assistance at his hands. (Milne)

In modern Bengali হইত হইতে হইতে উদ্ধার হইবে যেখানে.

গত দুই বৎসর হইতে সুন্দর চলিয়াছে। Interest has been running for the last two years. (Milne)

The following is an example of হত used as a conjunction instead of মাছো:

রায়া হতে লিখিতা অনেক বড়। Lolita is much bigger than Radha. (Begum)

হত as, for, via, through perfective participle of হওয়া be, become
Like হয়ে হয়ে used as a postposition is quite distinct from the verb form. It usually follows a nominative but personal pronouns take the genitive. It has two different meanings. The first is purely spatial via through, eg

ঢাকা হয়ে কলকাতা যাছি। I am going to Calcutta via Dhaka. (Begum)

সেখান থেকে বসরা হয়ে বোম্বাই এসে having come from there to Bombay via Basra (Smith)

The second one is on behalf of, in the capacity of, for

তিনি আমার হয়ে বললেন। He spoke for me. (Begum)

আমি তোমাদের বড়ু হয়ে এসেছি। I have come as your friend (Smith)

This sentence could be understood as Having become your friend, I have come. In surface structure this could also be translated as I have come as your friend, but with হয়ে a perfective participle. In comparison with the following sentence it seems odd that হয়ে is preceded by a nominative in one case and a genitive in the other.

আপনি আপনার কোম্পানির হয়ে বাণিজ্য চালান।

You run the plantation for your company. (Smith)

This makes it more likely that হয়ে in তোমাদের বড়ু হয়ে is a verb form, not a postposition.

হিসাবে as locative of হিসাব account, reckoning

হিসাবে, sometimes হিসাব, follows a preceding nominative. Smith has

আলাদা একটি ঘর খাবার ঘর হিসাবে ব্যবহৃত হয়। A separate room is used as a dining room.

Other examples are

সরকারের সমন্ত শাখা আমাদের অধিবিরল পরিচালক হিসাবে প্রধান করা হয়েছে।

All government divisions have been accepted as our legitimate leaders.

(Advanced Bengali, p 272)

সুমীর সংসারের নিজের সঙ্গে হিসাবে প্রধান করে।

They accept their husbands' families as their own. (Das)

মানুষ ও সুমীর হিসাবে খারাপ ছিল না। Manob, too, hadn't been bad as a husband. (Das)

বিদেশী কবি হিসাবে নজরুল ইসলামের কাছাকাছি কেউ কি মেঝে পেরেছে?

Has anybody been able to come close to Nazrul Islam as a rebel poet? (Begum)

Though হিসাবে, as a postposition, stays very close to its nominal root, there is a semantic shift. In the Bangla Academy dictionary এই হিসাবে and কোন হিসাবে (both nominal uses) are given, respectively as on this account, in this sense and on which account, at what rate, by what logic. The postpositional meaning is closer to in the role of, or simply, as. Syntactically, also, there is a change from a preceding genitive, when used as a noun, to a preceding nominative as a postposition. হিসাবে should therefore be accepted as a postposition.
SUMMARY
In this chapter I have tried to define the word class of postpositions according to semantic and syntactic features. However, in the course of this research, the difference between word class and sentence function has become steadily more apparent. Since most words which function as postpositions in Bengali are nouns, verbs or adjectives and are also used, in other contexts, as nouns, verbs and adjectives, the category postposition in Bengali should be seen as a sentence function rather than as a word class.

I have rejected as postpositions because they do not show any features which are anything other than nominal. They could be called nominal pseudo-postpositions. Other such pseudo-postpositions are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bengali</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Bengali</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Bengali</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>আস্তি হতে</td>
<td>because of</td>
<td>কারণে</td>
<td>because of</td>
<td>কারণে</td>
<td>at the time of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>পাহ্যে</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>জয়দায়</td>
<td>instead of</td>
<td>তলায়</td>
<td>underneath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>কাচাগায়</td>
<td>comparative to</td>
<td>ঘলনে</td>
<td>in the grip of</td>
<td>পথে</td>
<td>towards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>পালে</td>
<td>as a result</td>
<td>ফাঁকে</td>
<td>in between</td>
<td>বিপরীতে</td>
<td>against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>বিকে</td>
<td>in the middle of</td>
<td>বায়াগারে</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>মাথায়</td>
<td>on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>বিসরা</td>
<td>at the root of</td>
<td>সাহচর্যে</td>
<td>with the help of</td>
<td>হাতে</td>
<td>by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spatial postpositions like কিছুতের, বাইরে, উপরে, নিচে, সামনে, পিছনে are given a special status because they form a logical system, ie they should all either be accepted or rejected as postpositions. Some of these spatial postpositions have developed a number of idiomatic uses like উপরে as in তিন মাসের উপরে more than three months, others, like নিচে, remain strictly spatial in meaning. However, because of their logical relationship to one another, all spatial postpositions have to be given the same status, ie they should all be accepted.

The work done in this chapter shows that Bengali word classes are organised in a different way from word classes in English. We say that আমি বিভক্ত যান is an adverbial use of বিভক্ত but it could just as accurately be described as a nominal use. We finish up with an overlap of word classes, a blur between their boundaries. In the sentence আমি শুক্র তথ্য করে কারণ আমার মাথা বুঝছে। I will lie down because I have a headache, কারণ is seen as a conjunction. কারণ is, of course, a noun and there is nothing wrong in acknowledging that Bengali word classes work differently, ie in Bengali fewer word classes fulfil more sentence functions. This is true not only for the function of postposition through nouns and verbs, but also for conjunctions, eg the sentence হয় তুমি যাবে না হয় আমি যাবো। Either you go or I will go, uses verb forms in a conjunctional role.

At the beginning of this chapter there was some ambiguity as to which case precedes which postposition. This can now be cleared up. The majority of postpositions combine with only one case.

Consistently used with the nominative are:

from, during, until, after, except, in spite of, about, by, as.
Consistently used with the genitive are (this does not include adverbial uses):

- before, above, near, for, towards, underneath, for, for, after, instead, beside, behind, outside, against, inside, like, as, within, with, in front of.

Some abstract nouns preceding like remain in the nominative case, e.g. taste, sound and are usually written in connection with as one word.

Used with a nominative (inanimates) or genitive (animates):

- through, about, through, on behalf of.

Used with a nominative (inanimates) or accusative (animates):

- with, through, with, about.

without is used as a preposition followed by a locative case.

without can be combined with any case, depending on its position in the sentence.

This is a rough overview. It does not take into account adverbial uses or special structures like all around, therefore. These uses are listed under the individual postpositions.

Attachments to this chapter:

Appendix 1 Rashida Begum: List of Postpositions
Appendix 2 Smith, Milne, Chatterji: List of Postpositions
Appendix 3 Postposition Chart
CHAPTER 4
TENSE IN BENGALI AND SOME ASPECTS OF TIME ADVERBIALS

The use of Bengali tenses is a topic which is primarily dealt with in course books, grammars and introductions intended for learners of Bengali. In teaching a language we try to keep things clear and comprehensible, so as not to discourage the students; and there is sufficient overlap in tense use between English and Bengali to make it tempting to say 'This tense is used as in English' (Milne and Wenger about future tense, Milne about past continuous). This may be good enough for new learners of Bengali, but a closer look reveals that the future tense in Bengali, for instance, has a lot more modal uses than in English. In any case, the purpose of this study is not to relate Bengali to English tenses, though some comparisons will be made, but to look at the Bengali tense system as a whole, at the way Bengali tenses divide time between themselves and how they relate to one another.

Some research has been done on aspect in Bengali (Alibha Dakshi, Bengali Verb - an Aspectual Approach and R. Chatterji, Aspect and Aktionsart in Czech and Bengali), but very little non-teaching-related work has been done on Bengali tenses.

This chapter is not on verb morphology. Morphologically speaking, English has only two indicative tenses, the present and the past tense (Longman, p 159). All other tenses are periphrastic, ie they are formed with the help of modal and auxiliary verbs (I will go, he has been saying etc). Similarly, in Bengali it may be said that the past continuous and the past perfect tense are formed with the past tense forms of the incomplete verb অহং, eg আমি বসে - ছিলাম. Quazi Din Muhammad points out that 'these independent finite verbal forms of the stem আহং / ছি should not be confused with the endings formed from this stem' (Muhammad, p 28). The stress pattern in spoken language makes the difference between the two forms perfectly clear.

past perfect: আমি বসেছিলাম। ami bo'sechilam I sat down. and
perfective participle + ছিলাম আমি বসেছিলাম। ami 'bose 'chilam I was sitting down.

Another morphological issue are the forms for present continuous and present perfect. The modern calit bhasa forms are আমি করছি for present continuous and আমি করেছি for present perfect. However, particularly in Bangladesh, the shortened sadhu bhasa forms are also very commonly used, ie আমি করতেছি for present continuous and আমি করাছি for present perfect. Verbs with consonant-vowel stem use the full sadhu bhasa forms, eg হইতেছে, হাটতেছে instead of হচ্ছে and মাছে. Some examples in this chapter, specifically those by older authors, are given in these forms.

In this chapter I propose to take a closer look at the following features of the Bengali tense system:
1. time in language - tense in time
2. Bengali tenses in use - authors and examples
1. TIME IN LANGUAGE - TENSE IN TIME

Time can be seen as a linear entity, which stretches from the distant past to the distant future, passing the present moment somewhere in the middle. Any utterance in any language is made at a particular time, the time of speech (S). We can choose to talk about the future or the past but human languages are structured in such a way that we are bound to refer to time with almost every statement we make. Most languages have verbs - and every finite verb form is tense-bound. Tense, as a grammatical category of the verb, has the function of linking the verb meaning to a particular time, eg in I went the verb content go is linked to, say, the present moment and, by using the past tense, defined as preceding it. This is a very crude interpretation of an extremely complex linguistic and philosophical phenomenon, but it gives us a starting point. Linguistically, a very simple deictic relationship can be seen to exist between the time of speech (S) and the time of event (E), ie E can be either before (past), after (future) or simultaneous with (present) S. One look at, for instance, the English tense system immediately reveals that this binary system is insufficient and that a third 'time parameter' (Reichenbach, 1966) is needed to account for tenses like the past perfect. In the sentence I had just finished my breakfast when my mother walked in, the event (E) I had just finished my breakfast, is linked, not to S, but to a point of reference (R) in the past tense. This third time parameter is needed not only for past perfect, past continuous or future perfect (By tomorrow I will have finished this) but also for past and present participles, very commonly used in, for instance, Bengali, eg ভাত খেয়ে সে শুয়ে পড়ল। Having eaten he lay down, with R in the past tense or বাজারে গিয়ে আম কিনিয়ে। When I go to the market, I will buy mangoes, with R in the future tense.

Comrie (1985, p 35ff) makes a distinction between absolute and relative tenses which is roughly along the same lines, ie a relative tense "is quite strictly one which is interpreted relative to a reference point provided by the context", whereas an absolute tense "specifies the present moment as reference point." (p 58) Comrie's terminology has been questioned by more recent studies, eg by D.N.S.Bhat (1999) who says "We may use the terms 'deictic' and 'non-deictic' in order to differentiate between (i) tenses which have the utterance time as the reference point and (ii) the ones which have some other event as the reference point, respectively. Traditionally these are called 'absolute' and 'relative tenses' [cf Comrie 1985, p 36] but the difference between the two does not depend upon one of them being relative and the other one non-relative (absolute); both are relative to a reference point; the difference between the two is only that the former uses a deictic event (connected with the speech act) as the reference point whereas the latter uses some other event for that purpose." (Bhat, p 14) He goes on to show that in deictic use no overt reference needs to be made to TU, whereas in non-deictic (Klein: anaphoric) use a reference point has to be given in the text. An English example for this is

He had breakfast two hours ago. (deictic)
He had breakfast two hours before anyone else. (non-deictic)

The time of everyone else having breakfast is the reference point TT = topic time (Klein).

In English, the past perfect, by definition, precedes the past tense. 'The main use of the past perfect is to show which of two events happened first.' (Longman English Grammar) This means that the past perfect is a non-deictic tense with a reference point in the past tense. The following diagram is taken from Hans Kamp and Christian Rohrer, *Tense in Texts* (1983), showing the distribution of time parameters in English tenses.

E = point of event, R = point of reference, S = point of speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Bengali</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past perfect</td>
<td>I had seen John</td>
<td>আমি করেছিলাম</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>I saw John</td>
<td>আমি করলাম</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present perfect</td>
<td>I have seen John</td>
<td>আমি করেছি</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future perfect</td>
<td>I will have seen John</td>
<td>আমি করেছি</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not to imply that all three phrases have the same meaning or can be exchanged for one another, but the differences between them do not relate to points of reference. The past perfect and the present perfect in Bengali, as well as the simple past, can be used in the English past tense meaning, and in this sense the terms *past perfect* and *present perfect* are not really appropriate for these Bengali tenses. In Bhat's terminology, the Bengali present and past perfect cannot be interpreted as non-deictic tenses. They can be used on their own with direct reference to the utterance time. What the above shows is that the way English tenses are connected to time and to one another is only one possible organizational system and for a language like Bengali other criteria will have to be found. I'm not dealing with non-finite verb forms in this chapter but from a deictic/ non-deictic point of view the Bengali perfective and present participle are by definition always non-deictic.

A word on terminology. The above terms E (point of event), R (point of reference) and S (point of speech) are from Reichenbach (1966) and also used by Comrie (1985) and by Kamp and Rohrer (1983) in their essay *Tense in Texts*. Wolfgang Klein (1994), whose book *Time in Language* has been one of the main influences on this chapter uses the following terms: TU (time of utterance) = S, TT
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(topic time) = R and Tsit (time of situation) = E. I will use these terms for the remainder of this chapter.

2. Bengali tenses in use - authors and examples

The general consensus seems to be that there are eight tenses in Bengali: simple present আমি খাই, present continuous আমি খাচ্ছি, present perfect আমি খাবার ছিলাম, future আমি খাবো, simple past আমি খেলাম, past continuous আমি খেলার ছিলাম, past perfect আমি খেলার ছিলাম, past habitual আমি খেলাম. The simple present and simple past are often referred to as present and past tense, respectively, but logically it has to be recognized that the present continuous is as much a present tense as the simple present. The difference between the two tenses is one of aspect, progressive vs non-progressive, which means that the simple present should not be seen as less marked than the present continuous. I would therefore suggest simple present for আমি খাবি, simple past for আমি খেলাম and the terms present tense and past tense to refer to either simple or progressive tense.

Milne uses the terms imperfect definite and indefinite perfect for the past continuous and the simple past respectively, but both these terms are debateable as to their criteria, and Milne does not explain in what way he sees the past continuous as more definite than the simple past.

In this section I am going to discuss tense uses, as defined by the following authors: W. L. Smith (S), W.S. Milne (M), Wenger (W), A.G. McLeod (McL), Brother James (BJ), W. Radice (WR). TYB (for Teach Yourself Bengali by William Radice) is used when sentences are taken out of texts rather than given as examples for tense use. Smith's listings of tense uses are generally the most detailed, so I will give his definitions and then point out where other authors differ or add something more. Unattributed examples are mine.

i) simple present
• habitual action or general 'timeless' truth
   আমারা হাতে খাই। We eat with our hands. (S)
   সংকল্প করা চাও উপকারী হয়। Honesty is the best policy. (M)
• historical present, to make a past narrative vivid
   রাতে হুমেল কোলে করে নতুন পুত্তে ছিল, সকালে বিকেলে উঠে দেখে হুমেল মাই। The woman slept that night with her son in her arms, in the morning she wakes up and sees that the boy isn't there. (S)

Smith has rolled two separate uses of the simple present into one here.

সে বৎসরই তার জন্ম হয়। He was born in that year, (BJ) is an example of historic present. Smith's example shows how the use of a present tense in a past narrative can have a dramatic effect. The term historic present is widely, but often not very accurately used when referring to tense changes from past to present tense in a narrative text. I would suggest that the term historic present is reserved for cases where past events are reported in the simple present, eg
The use of a present tense (either simple or continuous) within a past narrative could be called scenic present - this is what the equivalent use in German is called in the Duden Grammar. It seems apposite to make a distinction between these two uses as one of them involves a change in tense with dramatic intent.

- action or state begun in the past and continuing into present
  
  "I have known you a long time." (S)

- 'subjunctive' contexts §29.3.8
  
  "Why, there's no saying what might happen when." (S)

Milne adds to this that the simple present can have the force of an aorist. One example he gives is

"What am I to do?" (M)

Brother James calls this use 'deliberation or possibility', which I find more appropriate than the term 'aorist' in this context. In fact, the term 'aorist' is burdened with what Trask calls 'great terminological confusion' (p 17) and is probably best avoided.

- quotation, eg
  
  Jesus said (BJ)

Particularly in spoken language, the simple present can also be used to express wish (Smith), intention or imperative, eg

"His own wish was that he calm everyone." (S)

"Let us sit here for a little." (M)

The following sentence is an example for modal use, where we would more likely expect a future tense form:

"Where would you find the time to tell them beforehand?" (Guha)

The simple present in Bengali, unlike in English, can also be used for present action when there is no particular emphasis on progressiveness:

"What are you doing? I'm working." (S)

ii) present continuous tense

- continuous action in present
  
  "What are you doing?" (S)

- immediate or planned future actions or events
  
  "I'm going to close the door." (S)

- continuous action begun in the past and continuing into the present
  
  "I have been thinking about a matter for a few days." (S)

- to lend vividness to a past narrative
  
  "I had opened the book and sat down, but it didn't interest me at all." (S)

Brother James adds to this
As can be seen from these examples, there are a number of uses the simple present and the present continuous share, but there is an aspective difference in these uses.

where English uses the present perfect continuous

He has been studying Bengali for a long time. (BJ)

Brother James gives a list of stative verbs love, hope, like, choose, understand, feel etc, which are ‘not usually used in the present continuous tense’ (BJ). However, like in English, I am hoping that she will come tomorrow, I am feeling tired etc, Bengali can also bend the rules, eg

I am enjoying the film very much.

I don’t understand the game.

In this last sentence, the continuous tense expresses ongoing puzzlement, ie the process of not being able to follow.

The 3rd person present continuous form of be, become can be used in copular sentences in a defining sense, eg

This boy is my grandson. (S) This will be dealt with in greater detail in chapter 5, section 2.5.

iii) present perfect

• an action begun in the past which affects the present

I have come here just today. (S)

• to describe a present condition

It isn’t evening yet. (S)

Smith says that the present perfect is used to lend vividness to a past narrative and gives the following example, which contains both past tense and present perfect

I lit a cigarette as I turned the pages of the newspaper. Yesterday afternoon a bank robbery took place in Calcutta. (S)

This, surely, has nothing to do with vividness in a past narrative, but is simply the present perfect being used in a past tense sense. Brother James has the following example for the same use

He swept my room this morning. (BJ)

Other uses of the present perfect

• where English uses am, is, are with an adjective or past participle (BJ)

The door is closed. (BJ)

The work is done. (BJ)
This use is also very common with the 3rd person form of go, which adds a sense of finality, e.g.

The rice is finished (used up).

The children are grown up.

- for past actions where the exact time is not significant
  
  आपसे कि आमीरिका गईंहै? Have you been to America? (WR)

iv) future tense

Smith has the following:

- future action or state
  
  ना, ले किस्मत ना। No, he won't buy it. (S)

- propriety or ability
  
  में, एकदा कथा बनवे? Sir, may I say a word? (S)

- desire or intention
  
  आमी चा खाँ। I want to drink tea. (S)

- probability or presumption
  
  तुमुं आमंके निमं ना। You wouldn't know me. (S)

- command or injunction
  
  तुमुं शुनिया थाकु। You may have heard. (M)

- in the honorific form to express a polite request
  
  तार संधे मेंता हले ताके बलवे। If you see him, will you (please) tell him? (BJ)

The Bengali future tense, in fact, fulfills many of the functions that modal verbs have in English, e.g.

एकदा कथा? May I sit down, चा खाने? Would you like some tea, etc, which gives it a wonderful directness compared to English. Whereas in English we are quite used to exchanges like Would you like a cup of tea? - Yes, I would love a cup of tea, in Bengali we have just four words: चा खाने? हाँ, खाब।

Munshi Azad, in his Japanese Bengali course (1990), suggests two additional, periphrastic future tenses, the future continuous, formed by the infinitive (more likely present participle) of any verb followed by the future tense of stay, and the future perfect, formed by a perfective participle followed by the future tense of stay, e.g (the examples were given to me by the author)

future continuous आमी बखल जांट करेंग थाकब तब्ते आमंके निरुध करबे ना।

Don't disturb me when I am (will be) working.

future perfect आमी चाके बखली बला थाकव। translated as I might have said this to him. or
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To accept these two forms as Bengali tenses would make for beautiful symmetry in the tense system, but that cannot be a serious consideration. The structure: present participle + থাকা also exists in other tenses, eg

সে কাজ করতে থাকে। He keeps on working.

সে সব সময় যুক্তে থাকত। He used to sleep all the time.

If the future tense version of this structure were to be considered a tense in Bengali, then how would these other structures be interpreted? Azad gives two forms for the future perfect, one with the future of থাকা for probability and one with the future of ফেলা for definiteness. ফেলা throw, in compounds with transitive verbs, adds to the meaning of these verbs not so much definiteness, but completion, thoroughness etc. ie it adds an aspectual feature. It does not constitute a tense in Bengali - the structure is not fully productive - there are any number of verbs which cannot compound with ফেলা. The structure with থাকা (both with the present participle and the perfective participle) needs to be given more serious consideration since this does seem to be fully productive in Bengali. থাকা can be used with stative or active, transitive or intransitive verbs, but, again, it adds an aspectual feature in all tenses and there is no reason to single out the future tense use of this structure.

v) simple past

• main narrative tense in storytelling (WR)

This is true particularly for written narrative - in spoken language the past perfect is also used. Smith gives the use of the simple past

• for the immediate future

কোমরা কথা বল, আমি শুরুতে চললাম। You people talk, I'm going to lie down. (S)

Smith says that this use is most common with চলা in the first person, but other verbs are just as frequent

আমি ফেলাম। I'm off!

কোমার মুখি ফেলাম। I'm taking your umbrella.

জেনাসকে এই বই ফেলাম। I am giving you this book. (BI)

Milne has the following sentence with a third person subject

এই বাক্য যেলে পড়ল। translated as The fellow will fall into the water, presumably by Milne himself. Native Bengali speakers interpret this sentence as meaning that the fellow has already fallen. However, I quote 'sometimes we say, especially when a person or a guest tries to leave our house hurriedly despite request of taking a cup of tea or passing some more time with us; then you suppose one person in hall room and other or others are in kitchen or anywhere else in the house then the person in hall room may inform the other by a loud voice that Mum/Dad/Brother - Uncle/Apa/Dulabhai cole gelo.' This sounds wholly convincing to me - thank you, Arif!

Milne adds to this the use for
• actions which have just taken place or took place very recently

- He has just gone. (M)
- I have just finished my meal. (M)
- I got your letter this morning. (WR)

Sentences of this kind almost invariably contain time adverbials like just, a little while ago.
Both uses, for immediate future and immediate past, are particularly common in spoken language.
Smith and Milne mention the defining use of the 3rd person past tense form of হওয়া, eg

- সাহিত্য হল সাহিত্য।
  - Literature is Literature. (S)
- আজ আমার বয়স হল ছয়গৌড়।
  - Today I am thirty-six. (S)

I will come back to this in chapter 5.

vi) past continuous
The past continuous is the simplest and also the least used of Bengali tenses. Smith defines it as describing

• a continuous action taking place in the past, sometimes one taking place simultaneously with another

- Standing silently awhile, Byomakes observed and listened to everything. (S)
- আমি এ সময় আশীর্বাদ দিতে পড়িলাম।
  - I saw him just as I was coming this way. (M)
- At that time I was sleeping. (BJ)

Past continuous verb forms are very frequently accompanied by time adverbials like মধ্যে – তখন when, সময় then etc.

- আমি যখন যেখানে আমি ছিলাম তখন তার সময় দেখা হল।
  - I met him as I was going home. (BJ)
- রাজশাহী টাউন সেদিন শ্রীমুনিনের মত দেখা ছিল।
  - Rajshahi town that day looked like a cremation-ground. (TYB p 236)
- তিনি আমাকে আঘাত করিয়েছিলেন, ইতিমধ্যে তুমি উপস্থিত হইলে।
  - He was striking me, just then you came up. (W)

vii) past perfect
The general consensus seems to be that the past perfect is used for actions concluded before other actions in the past (S) or for actions in the remote past (M, W, McL).

- আমরা তাদের দিনে তাদের আশীর্বাদ দিয়েছি কেননা বাড়িতে তার উপর দিলেন না।
  - No landlord answered any of the letters Apara had mailed. (S)
- আমি সেখানে যেখানে থাকি ছিলাম কিন্তু রামকে না পাইলে চলিয়া আসিলাম।
I went there but came away because I did not meet Ram. (M)

Smith, however, also has the following example

তাহকে সেখানে পাওয়া গেল না। আমি তাকে বাচে দিয়ে উঠে চলে যাবে।

Then I thought that the plane would fly off without me. (S)

There is no reason to think that this is an event in the distant past - it may have happened on the same day. Brother James has

আমি কাল সেখানে গেছিলাম। I went there yesterday,

and it is equally possible to say আমি সকালে গিয়েছিলাম। I went this morning. All the sentence implies is I am now back. The past perfect in Bengali, just like the present perfect, can be used on its own to express simple past meaning. It does not have to precede another past action and it is not confined to the distant past.

Both Milne and Wenger recognize the possible confusion between simple past, present perfect and past perfect and set out to explain the differences between these tenses. Their explanations are almost verbatim (difficult to believe that Milne hadn't seen Wenger's grammar when he wrote his!), so I will just give Wenger's explanation here:

preterite (simple past), perfect (present perfect), pluperfect (past perfect)

'They may differ as measures of the distance of time; the preterite states what happened just now, or a little while ago; the perfect, that which happened some time ago; the pluperfect, that which happened long ago. They differ as to the objects to which they draw attention. The preterite directs attention not so much to the act or event itself, as to its attendant circumstances, such as time, place, manner, rapidity, recency or to that which followed next. The perfect directs attention to the fact itself, as being either historically true or still important. The pluperfect directs attention to the statement as a mere fact; it is often used in the beginning of a narrative, the subsequent verbs in which are put in the preterite. Or it may imply that the fact is of an old date, or no longer of any great interest or importance.' (p 85) He gives the following demonstration for the sentence He came by boat.

তিনি দৌড়েছিলেন। (simple past) 'This is either the latest news, or a fragment of a narrative; or else attention is directed to the mode of conveyance, he came by boat, not by land.'

তিনি দৌড়েছিলেন। (present perfect) 'Here attention is directed to the fact of his having come by boat, as one that admits of no doubt, or that it is still important to the hearer, or that he is still here.'

তিনি দৌড়েছিলেন। (past perfect) 'This may be a simple statement of fact standing by itself: or, it may be simply that his having come is an old story, or no longer of any great importance; or else that the fact has been superseded by some other fact.' (Wenger, p 84)

Vague as these definitions sound, it may be difficult to improve on them.

Verbs of physical movement, such as যাওয়া go and আসা come, are not ideal in trying to demarcate these tenses against one another because of their obvious 'afterstates'. আমি যেখানেছিলাম (past perfect) has to imply I am now back, তিনি এসেছিলেন implies he has left again. If we take the present perfect, simple past and past perfect of a verb like দেখা see it becomes much harder to define differences in meaning.
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আমি প্রশ্নীণীটা দেখেছি (present perfect) / দেখলাম (simple past) or দেখেছিলাম (past perfect) can all be translated as *I saw the exhibition*. The exact connotations and aspcetual features of these verb forms can only really be established in context.

viii) past habitual

The past habitual is used for

- regular or habitual actions or states in the past (S)
  
  রতনা একবার মেঝের অকাটা। *Once Ratna used to play the sitar.* (S)
  
  আর্যস্যা সূর্য পূজা করত। *The Aryans used to worship the sun.* (BJ)
  
  তিনি সেই সময় ধাতিডিন আমার নিকটে অস্তিত্বন। *At that time he used to come to me daily.* (W)

- hypothetical situations (S)
  
  কি জবাব দিতাম তাদের? *What answer would I give them?* (S)
  
  আমি যাইতাম নিপুণ অবকাশ পাইলাম না। *I would have gone, but had not time.* (W)

- wishes or suppositions (S)
  
  সেই আলাদারিতা যদি এখানে থাকতো। *If only that cupboard were here!* (S)
  
  Longing for a cupboard?! Both these uses can be considered subjunctive.

- where English uses simple past (BJ)
  
  আমি যখন এই বিদেশে পড়তাম তখন এই বাসায় থাকতাম।
  
  *I stayed in this building when I was studying in this college.* (BJ)
  
  তেলিগড়ের আমি ইলেখাতি কথা কথা ওপর থাকতাম না।
  
  *I couldn't speak English as a child.* (WR).

It is important to note that the Bengali past habitual has a much wider use than the English used to structure.

3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TENSES -

COCCURRENCE OF TENSES IN SAME OR ADJACENT SENTENCES

In English there is a strict dividing line between present and past tenses, the present perfect cannot cooccur with time adverbials of the past (Comrie 1985, p 78), (yesterday I heard (not have heard), there is sequence of tense for indirect speech (he said he would (not will) come), adverbial clauses of purpose (I arrived early so that I would (not will) get a good seat), after verbs expressing wish (I wish you would (not will) hurry up.), in conditional sentences (What would you do if you lost (not lose) your job?) - the list goes on.

Bengali has no such restrictions, except in conditional sentences. Smith (p 99) gives the following example sentence which contains verb forms in present perfect, present continuous and past perfect:

পরে শুনেছি তার না আসার কারণ হচ্ছে তিনি শুনেছিলেন পার্টী সুন্দরী।

*Later I heard the reason for his not coming was that he had heard that the bride was beautiful*

Notwithstanding the slightly illogical content of this sentence, as I pointed out earlier the third person form of হচ্ছে *be*, both in the present continuous and in the past tense has a special defining function.
An isolated sentence like this does not perhaps show very much. The following passage is taken from Shefaly Nandy's *Bengali for Foreigners* (p 74-5) - unfortunately, Mrs Nandy does not say who wrote it. I have left out the sentences which contain no verb forms, which may make the passage seem a bit disjointed. The text is about Rabindranath:

1. তিনি আমাদের এই বাংলা দেশে জনিয়াছিলেন। (past perfect)
2. রবীন্দ্রনাথের পিতার বাসভবন ছিলো মানপা কালগঞ্জ। (simple past)*
3. আমি তাঁর বিরুদ্ধে রবীন্দ্রনাথের পিতার বাড়িটি দিয়ে কাজ করেছি। (simple present)
4. হৃদ্য পরিবারের লোকের এ বিষয়ে উৎসাহিত করেছিলেন। (past habitual)
5. রবীন্দ্রনাথের পিতা বিশেষতঃ জগতের নিকট ভুলিয়ে ধরিয়েছিলেন। (simple past)
6. জগতের তের বৎসর বয়স হইতে আরম্ভ করিয়া তত্তাব্দিতে বৎসর বয়সে নগ্ন পূর্বদিন পর্যন্ত তিনিরচনাকরিয়া বিয়াছিলেন। (present perfect) [sic] Tagore actually died aged 80!
7. শেষ জীবনে তিনি যুদ্ধের বিলীনের জন্য ভারতীয়দের সাথে যোদ্ধা বলে মনে হিজ কাহার প্রতিকী মানুষ জানান। (simple present)
8. তিনি জনিতেন শান্তির পূজার এই সম্বন্ধে মানুষের মেথিকো সমবায়ে বাপোর। (past habitual, future)

A rough translation, disregarding the Bengali tenses, is as follows:

1. He was born in this our Bangladesh.
2. His father’s home was in an area of Calcutta called Jorasanko.
3. Rabindranath started writing poetry at an early age.
4. The people in his family encouraged him in this.
5. Rabindranath brought Bengali poetry to the world.
6. From the age of thirteen until the age of 83, until the day before his death, he kept on writing.
7. At the end of his life he called to his countrymen to warn them to prepare for the horrors of war and for the struggle to survive it.
8. He knew that this ordinary person devoted to peace would save humankind.

A sudden change from past tense to present tense in a text is usually attributed to making a past narrative more vivid, eg

> Kolan followed the Nepali boy quickly. Rita was lying on the bed, very weak, almost like a dead person. (Das, p 132)

The events are dramatic and the change to the present tense emphasizes that. Our passage about Tagore, on the other hand, is a factual, informative piece of writing, hardly the stuff of dramatic happenings. The change from past to present tense in sentence 3 could suggest a change from background information to the beginning of 'the story', but is immediately countered by the use of the past habitual in sentence 4. This makes it difficult to see any particular importance in the present tense.
use in sentence 3. *The use of simple past here is lexically determined since আছে – only has simple present and simple past.

I suspect that the use of Bengali tenses and the way authors change from one tense to another is, quite simply, more arbitrary than we would like to think.

But let us look at some more examples. The questions that need to be asked at this stage are:

Which tenses can occur together?

Are there any tenses which do not occur together?

Is there any kind of predictability in Bengali tense use?

Can we establish any, if not rules, then regularities in the way tenses are used?

o) Example sentences with more than two tenses in one sentence or adjacent sentences

o-a) simple present, past cont, simple past

"Having said that Chorada looked at his sister-in-law with a sidelong glance. Up till now she had been concentrating on her knitting. Now she stopped knitting and said..." (Debsen, p 139)

This is taken from a story (Elizabethan System) which consists predominantly of dialogue and whose main narrative tense is the simple present with a few simple past forms. There is no apparent reason for the change between the two tenses. The past continuous in this sentence, used with the time adverbial এতদিন, describes an action which is parallel to the main action in the sentence, which is in the simple present.

o-b) simple past, present perfect, present cont

"As he was leaving Pabitra saw that Babu and Tuni had sat down to eat, joking with one another. (Kar, p 74)

o-c) simple past, past cont, present cont

"Tuni didn’t say anything and looking at her it was impossible to know what she was thinking." (Kar, p 81)

o-d) past perfect, present cont, future

"Pabitra thought that having seen which way the water flowed he would drown himself about a month after Puja." (Kar, p 76)

The narrative tense in 'Uttorer hawa' is the simple past, but throughout the novel there are sudden changes to simple present or present continuous. Sometimes these represent changes from 'action' to 'thought', sometimes from 'background' to 'foreground', at other times they seem quite arbitrary. What is noticeable, however, - and I suspect that this is true for a lot of modern Bengali fiction - is that it is rare for a whole paragraph to be written in just one tense, ie the almost constant change in tenses is
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Part of the style of Bengali writing and serves to liven up a text. In sentence o-c) the sequence of past and present continuous simply sounds better than two past continuous forms so close together would have done. That is to say that in Bengali tense changes occur for 'beauty of language', as one of my first Bengali teachers once put it.

o-e) simple past, present perfect, simple present

At last, there was the exam. Rita's exam went very well. Kolan didn't go to Rita's house anymore. (Das, p 41)

o-f) present cont, simple present, present cont, simple past

This room is his study where he reads and teaches with an annoyed expression on his face. If it takes him a long time to put on tight boots or shoes he gets furious with them. (Tagore, Letters from Europe, TYB p 228)

o-g) past perfect, simple present, present cont, past perfect

One day I was a bit late for dinner and saw Mrs B rebuking Mr B because, among his other faults, he had taken too many potatoes with his meat. (Tagore, Letters from Europe, TYB p 229)

Tagore's use of tenses in this paragraph is such that it is impossible to determine an 'underlying' tense. There are constant changes between simple past, simple present, past habitual and the occasional past perfect. In the sentence before o-g) in the text Tagore uses the simple past to describe a similar event:

I did not hear very well what they said and then they fell silent again. I felt very uncomfortable between them.

In sentence o-g) he changes to the past perfect as the underlying tense with the two present tenses in the middle of the sentence for a more immediate effect.

I think these examples show fairly conclusively that tense changes in Bengali are used as stylistic tools as much as relating to temporal points of reference. In sentence o-e) Das could just as easily have used the simple past for the second sentence, but, avoiding the repetition of "had", the present perfect is stylistically better. Having established this 'gay abandon' (WR, p 231) of tense use in Bengali, in the next section I will give examples for tense combinations, most of them taken from contemporary Bengali novels or stories, in order to see what patterns emerge.

i) cooccurrence with simple present

i-a) simple past, simple present

Pabitra started eating. He eats fast. (Kar, p73)
The simple past refers to a particular incident, the simple present to a general habit.

d) simple past, simple present

This could be considered a modal use of the simple present, following verbs of wishing. The topic time (TT) in this sentence is the simple past.

d) simple past, simple present

In this sentence TU and TT fall together and form the reference point for the preceding verb form.

The simple past here can be substituted by verb forms in the present continuous, present perfect, past perfect or past continuous without significantly changing the meaning of the sentence.

Combinations of the simple present and future tense are easily found, eg

In both these sentences we have two parallel main clauses describing simultaneous actions. An awkward, but more accurate translation of ii-c) would be I was eating. It is interesting to note the affinity between present continuous and simple past in these sentences, particularly as there is no strong feeling of immediacy here. The second clause in both sentences defines TT (topic time) (past) and, through this, the present continuous loses its own tense properties.

iii) cooccurrence with present perfect

In both sentences it can be inferred that the taking hasn't yet taken place.
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iii-b) past perf, present perf

I was able to understand from Bimu's letter that he had said a great deal to Tapu. (S)

In this sentence, on a time scale, the present perfect actually precedes the past perfect, which may be an unusual tense sequence but confirms Wenger's interpretation that 'the perfect directs attention to the fact itself' (quoted on p 131) without consideration for the time of the event. We can see here a real difference in meaning between the present perfect and the simple past. If the sentence read

I was able to understand from Bimu's letter that he had said a great deal to Tapu.

the act of speaking would have taken place at a particular time, in a particular place, whereas the present perfect version just refers to the fact that something has been said.

iii-c) simple past (হওয়া), present perf

The English made themselves masters of Bengal about 150 years ago. (M)

iii-d) simple past (হওয়া), present perf

I came here a week ago. (M)

iii-e) simple past (হওয়া), present perf

Two years ago I called his own, Niharika, went away two years ago. (Guha, p 142)

In all these sentences the main tense is the present perfect with all the past tense forms of হওয়া being used in a postpositional sense, equivalent to আগে. In iii-e), again, there is the sense of the present perfect directing 'attention to the fact itself'. In this case, of course, a precise time of the event is given in দু বছর হল two years ago but the verb form itself has an effect of finality that a simple past form would not have.

iv) cooccurrence with future tense

iv-a past cont, future

She wondered how she should introduce herself to her father. (Das, p 113)

He said the day before yesterday that he would set off in the morning. (TYB, p 235)

iv-c) past perfect, future (modal use)

Had Sakuntala any thought for who was coming or going? (TYB, p 215)
It is clear from these examples that the future tense can function as a direct 'aftertime' for any of the other tenses. For examples with the past habitual, see under viii).

The difference between sentences iv-b) and iv-c) is that in iv-b) TU is situated between the two parts of the sentence, i.e. the setting off is still in the future (the same applies to iv-a)), whereas in iv-c) the whole discourse precedes TU and the function of the future tense here is not to point to a future event but to bring in a modal element.

v) cooccurrence with simple past
v-a) simple past, past cont

Father objected. The boy had already given Mother the money. And even though Mother supported me, she couldn't do anything against Father's opinion. (Das, p 88)

The past continuous verb form here emphasizes an ongoing, if futile, effort on the mother's part, and phonaesthetically, offers a welcome relief after a series of simple past forms.

v-b) past perfect, simple past

I had seen Dr Amal, where did he go? (S)

v-c) past cont, simple past

Tumi spoke just as Pabitra was about to say something. (Kar, p 73)

These two sentences are almost perfect examples for the 'traditional' definitions of the past perfect preceding the simple past (v-b)), and in v-c) for the past continuous describing an action parallel to that of the simple past, though in this case the action described by the simple past just precedes the past continuous, as indicated by the use of before that.

As noted under ii) there seems to be a special affinity between the simple past and the present continuous.

vi) cooccurrence with past continuous

Example given earlier:

iv-a) with future tense

She was wondering how she should introduce herself to her father. (Das, p113)

The narrative tense in 'He, nari, akash hou' is the simple past, but with frequent changes to present or past continuous. In this instance, the use of the past continuous indicates an ongoing thought process.

The sentence following iv-a) in the text is entirely in the past continuous:

She thought of various plans, but didn't like any of them. (Das, p 113)

vi-a) past cont, simple past
You were talking about your friend and her husband, but they haven't come.

(Das, p115)

vi-b) past cont, future tense

It occurred to Kolan that spicy, rich hotel food would not be right for Rita today.

(Das, p 137)

See also examples v-a) and v-c) above. It is apparent from these examples that the past continuous is not as limited as it may have seemed from section 2) of this chapter. It is not just an accompaniment to the simple past but can stand on its own and can also be combined with other tenses, eg simple present, future tense, past habitual.

vii) cooccurrence with past perfect
vii-a) past perfect, simple past, future tense

My throat had gone dry, I thought I would eat an ice-cream. (S)

vii-b) past perfect, future tense

I understood that he was leaving. (Bandyopadhyay)

See also examples iii-b), iv-b), iv-c) above and the two example sentences given earlier (p 9)

No landlord answered any of the letters Apara had mailed.

(A)

I went there but came away because I did not meet Ram. (M)

where the past perfect combines with the simple past. In looking at these tense combinations, it always has to be kept in mind that all the example sentences given here are taken from written language and an analysis of spoken language might produce quite different results, ie the simple past in spoken language is used mainly for immediate past or immediate future and the past perfect is the main tense for narrating past events. In combination with the simple past the past continuous and past perfect seem to be alternatives to one another. I did not find any examples of them being used together.

viii) cooccurrence with past habitual
viii-a) present continuous, past habitual

Even boys wouldn't be capable of what your daughter is doing. (S)

This sentence could be used almost as a pattern to show that the past habitual can actually be combined with all other tenses by substituting the present continuous verb form with other tenses, eg future tense, simple present. Possible examples are:

viii-b) simple present, past habitual
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viii-c) future tense, past habitual

I didn't know that you could eat chilli. (M)

viii-d) past perfect, past habitual

I was so angry that I might have killed that editor. (S)

viii-e) past habitual, simple past

They could have bought land and it wouldn't have been impossible to make a home there. (Kar, p 77)

viii-f) present perfect, past habitual

It was very late - he should have been brought to the hospital much earlier.

(Bangla Journal 3,p 78)

Conclusions

In order to evaluate the findings (or non-findings!) of the previous sections, it has to be remembered that the analysed material is of limited scope, taken only from teaching manuals and contemporary Bengali novels. Spoken language has not been taken into account.

In spite of these shortcomings, there are some results. As I said at the beginning of this chapter English tenses are organized in such a way that some tenses are subordinate to other tenses, eg the English past perfect must always have a past tense reference point, ie it is anaphorically bound to the simple past and cannot deictically relate to TU (time of utterance). Though it is possible in English to say I don't know what he did, it is not possible to say *I don't know what he had done. In Bengali all tenses are equal. This is not to say that the past perfect or the past continuous are not used with reference points in the past tense (their main use in English), but they can also have a direct deictic reference to TU, eg I saw her this morning. The difference between this sentence and the same sentence with a simple past or a present perfect verb form is one of emphasis, not one of reference.

The consequence of this 'equality of tenses' is that in a text the author has a choice between two, sometimes even three tenses, and the decision about which tense to use is often made according to phonesthetic criteria, hence the almost constant tense changes in many texts. A string of simple past tense verb forms কল, দিল, বলল, কামল, তাল soon becomes very monotonous and the liveliness of a text depends on the occasional present continuous, simple present or present perfect form.

Bengali tenses do, of course, have temporal implications. Both the simple present and the present continuous can be used to add immediacy in a past tense discourse. The present perfect tends to state the fact of a past event without referring to the time of the event (eg sentence iii-b), whereas the simple past is much more concerned with accompanying circumstances. This is in line with Wenger's
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statement, quoted on p 131, but has been seen to be valid for verbs other than गाया go and आया come with their obvious afterstates. In the examples I have studied the great majority of sentences with a present perfect verb form do not have a time adverbial in the sentence, whereas simple past forms are regularly accompanied by time adverbials. This again may be to do with written versus spoken language as the simple past in spoken language is not used very much to refer to past events. In statements about past events where the actual time of the event is not significant the present perfect is used.

The future tense in Bengali, apart from being used in a modal sense, can function as the 'aftertime' for all other tenses, though the connection with the past habitual is somewhat tenuous and restricted to particular sentence structures (see under viii-c).

The past habitual has two distinct meanings in Bengali - it can either refer to habitual events in the past आमি সব সময় গোটাই যেতো। I used to go there all the time. or it can express a subjunctive आমি এই কথা বলতাম না। I wouldn't say that. In this second function, like the future tense, the past habitual can combine with all other tenses. Conditional sentences have not been dealt with in this chapter, though they constitute a Bengali sentence structure which does have sequence of tense. After careful consideration I decided that to include them would seem like a desperate attempt to find some rules when the findings of the previous sections are quite capable of standing on their own. In any case, conditional sentences ought to be dealt with in a chapter on Bengali sentence structure, not in a chapter on tenses.

4. BENGALI TIME ADVERBIALS - CLASSIFICATION

In this section I aim to establish a tentative classification of Bengali time adverbials, particularly in so far as their use is restricted to particular tenses. As far as I know, no such classification has been done before for Bengali. Some combinations of time adverbials and tenses are, as in English, immediately seen to be impossible, ie a past tense time adverbial like গতকাল yesterday does not combine with future tense forms of a verb *গতকাল আমি তার সঙে দেখা করবো। *I will see him yesterday; but in many cases the restrictions are much more difficult to establish. The term adverbial, as opposed to adverb, is used in a functional sense. Adverbials can be syntactically realized as lexical adverbs (এখন now), adverb phrases (খুব আসলে আসে very slowly), noun phrases (অনেক রাতে late at night), postpositions (আছে, পরে) postpositional phrases (আজ পর্যন্ত until today), adverbial clauses (আমি কখন আসবো when I come) or, and this is particularly significant for Bengali, non-finite verb phrases (তুমি চুলনা দিয়ে when you have gone to Khulna). These syntactic realizations of adverbials are adapted from Trask (p 10).

The criteria used in the classification of time adverbials are taken from Wolfgang Klein's book Time in Language (pp 142 - 150). He offers a complex semantic analysis of some English time adverbials, but they are dealt with individually and not seen in relation to one another.

Every time adverbial (TADV) can be defined in terms of deixis, ie whether or not it stands in direct relationship to TU (time of utterance). In Bengali, as in English, some TADVs are always deictic.
Having established that all tenses in Bengali can be used deictically, time adverbials in Bengali have a somewhat different function from in English. Whereas in English the tense alone gives us a possible reference point (TU or TT), in Bengali time adverbials can be used to establish the deictic or anaphoric relationship.

In English we have the contrast between *ago*, deictic, ie preceding TU and *before*, anaphoric, ie preceding TT. In Bengali, we have *সে একটু আগে* এই কথা বললে, which can be either deictic, as in

*He said this a little while ago.* or anaphoric, as in

*He didn't say anything before that.*

The same is true for *later* (deictic) or *after* (anaphoric).

This is fairly straightforward, but consider the following two sentences:

*আমি সকালে লেনু এনেছিলাম।* I brought lemons THIS morning. (deictic)

*আমি যখন বাজারে গিয়েছিলাম তখন লেনু আনলাম।* I brought lemons when I went to the market. (anaphoric), according to Klein's criteria (see below). Syntactically, তখন gives a topic time which is removed from TU but semantically these two examples show that the fixing of reference points (Klein, Bhat, Comrie) and, to some extent, the distinction between deictic and anaphoric relata are much less relevant in Bengali than in English. In both the lemon sentences the time adverbials (সকালে and তখন) define a point prior to the moment of speech, they can refer to the same moment in time and can be exchanged for one another. The second New Market sentence above, on the other hand, has neither a deictic nor an anaphoric point of reference. These are the only two categories Klein allows whereas Bhat with his distinction between deictic and non-deictic would be able to include this and other sentences which come roughly under what Smith calls 'regular or habitual actions or general truths' (p 99).

Apart from establishing tense restrictions for particular time adverbials, some aspective categories will be taken into account. Comrie (1976, p 16ff) gives the following aspective contrasts, with English examples:

- stative vs dynamic (active), ie a verb like *know* vs a verb like *run*,
- atelic vs telic, ie verbs with no in-built end point (like *sing*) vs verbs that assume an end point like *cooking dinner*,
- punctual vs durative, eg *switching the light on* vs *reading a book*,
- imperfective vs perfective, ie viewed from inside a situation, eg *was going* vs viewed as a whole, eg *had gone*. 
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This last parameter is a straight tense distinction in English, but not likely to be quite so simple in Bengali, eg the simple past can be used perfectly as in আমরা এইমাত্র ভাত খেলাম। We have just eaten, or imperfectively, as in আমরা সে সময়ে ভাত খেলাম। We were eating at that time. This use of the simple past can perhaps explain why the past continuous is relatively rare in Bengali.

Klein distinguishes between the following functional types of time adverbials (TADVs)

i) positional temporal adverbials (yesterday, before the autopsy, at five o'clock, in the night)
ii) adverbials of frequency (often, once in a while, rarely, always, three or four times a year)
iii) adverbials of duration (briefly, for a while, within one hour, during the autopsy)
iv) adverbials which can indicate the position of a situation in a series of (possible) situations (at the beginning, eventually, at last)

v) still, already, again (these are deemed by Klein to be unclassifiable)

In order to take a closer look at the semantic properties of Bengali TADVs, I would also like to take the following questions into account:

a) is there a direct relationship to TU or to TT (deictic or anaphoric relata, Klein, p 66), and, if so, can this relationship be described as preceding, coinciding with or following TU or TT eg আজকে today, কালকে tomorrow (deictic) or আগের after that, তার আগে before that (anaphoric)?

b) can the before-, simultaneous- or after -relationship to either TU or TT be specified any further? Cf the difference between আগে a long time ago and কিছুদিনে a little while ago is one of distance to TU.

c) is the lexical content of the TADV either left-bound (ie has a fixed starting point) or right-bound (ie has a fixed end point)? eg in Bengali আগের after that is left-bound, whereas এই পর্যন্ত until now is right-bound. Many adverbials, of course, are not bounded at all, eg ফোটে ফোটে again and again.

d) are there any tense restrictions?

e) are there aspectual restrictions?

Not all of these criteria apply to every time adverbial, but the adverbials need to be looked at one by one in order to establish some classification. The list of time adverbials is, by necessity, selective and restricted and does not take into account adverbial clauses or non-finite verb phrases. What I am concerned with mainly is the tendency of time adverbials to associate with particular tenses according to their semantic properties. Bengali tenses can be seen to have primary and secondary uses. The simple past is used for narrating past events (primary use) and also, in spoken language, for immediate past and immediate future (secondary use). The simple present and present continuous in past tense contexts (scenic present) also constitute a secondary use of these tenses.
5. TIME ADVERBIALS AND THE TENSES THEY ARE USED WITH

এখন (now)

As a positional time adverbial, cooccurrent with TU, এখন can extend over a matter of minutes, eg

আমরা এখন খাবে। We will eat now.

or a matter of months, even years, eg

সে এখন শেখাল যায়। He goes to school now.

উনি এখন অবসরপ্রাপ্ত হয়ে গেয়েছেন। He has retired now.

This sentence shows that এখন is left- but not right-bounded, ie he will stay retired for the rest of his life. Because of its direct link with TU, এখন is not used with either the past continuous or the past perfect. The past habitual can be used in the subjunctive mood, eg

আমি পালালে এখন যেতাম। If I could, I would go now.

এখনই (এখনই) just now

This is a positional time adverbial, left- and right-bounded, deictic and very close to TU, referring either to the immediate future or the immediate past. Its extension in time is much narrower than that of এখন. In spite of its proximity to TU it is not often used with the simple present, but present continuous, present perfect, future tense and simple past (secondary) are regularly used. Examples are:

with future tense

এখনই এখন যাবে। He will turn up at any minute. (Un Nobi, p 28)

with present continuous

আমি এখনই তার কাছে যাবি। I am going to see him right now.

with simple past

এখনই একটা ঘর খালি হল। A room has just become vacant. (S)

(with past continuous)

আমার এখনই দেখতে দেখতে ইচ্ছা করছি। I wish I could see them right now. (Das, p 109)

At first glance, this seems unusual but there is, in fact, hardly any connection between এখনই and the finite verb form. The sentence could also read

আমার ইচ্ছা করছি (তাঁদের) এখনই দেখতে।

which makes it clear that এখনই belongs with the infinitive দেখতে. এখনই is therefore not used with past continuous or past perfect.

তখন (then)

তখন is the anaphoric equivalent to এখন, ie it has the same relationship to TT that এখন has to TU. তখন is rarely used with simple present verb forms, but present continuous forms can be found in a scenic sense within a past tense context, eg
When I entered the huge office block, my heart was pounding. (S)

Other examples are:

with present (or, more likely, past) perfect

When I entered, the office block was huge.

Remember that Bangladesh wasn't yet divided then. (S)

and in a positive sentence

That's when the accident happened.


tāthen is frequently used with its correlative tāthen, e.g.

with simple past

When father died I was away. (M)

with future tense

When you come we will play cards.

The past habitual with tāthen can be either subjunctive, e.g.

Even if I had known this I wouldn't have given her money then.

or used in its past tense sense:

I didn't know that then.

today

is, like tāthen, positional and deictic, but it is left- and right-bounded and has a precisely defined relationship to TU. tāa today has no tense restrictions.

Bhat, in his discussion on time adverbials in Kannada, holds that the Kannada equivalent to tāa 'ivattu' has to be seen as non-deictic as it can be used with either past or future tense forms. This is of course also true in Bengali but the parameter seems to me to be one of directionality rather than of deixis. The meaning of tāa stretches in both directions from TU, whereas both yesterday and tomorrow are one-directional.

yesterday, last month, last year

All of these are positional, deictic and defined as preceding TU in a precise relationship. They differ according to their extension in time and are left- and right-bounded. By nature of their semantic properties they do not combine with future tense verb forms. The following sentence with a simple present verb form may, at first, seem unusual:

Mita couldn't remember a fight like that in the last fifteen years. (Debsen, p 150)

But the discrepancy between the adverbial and the verb tense is explained by the split of the sentence into two parts. A better English translation would be

Mita has no memory that there was ever a fight like that in the last fifteen years
tomorrow, next month, next year

These are the post-TU equivalents to tomorrow / next month / next year etc. They do not combine with simple past, past continuous and past perfect verb forms.

tomorrow, yesterday

This is in contrast to today (cooccurent with TU), but, like today, it is left- and right-bounded and in a precise relationship to TU, with its meaning determined by the verb tense. There are no tense restrictions.

at dawn, in the morning, in the afternoon, at night

These nominal, positional time adverbials can be deictic, either preceding or following TU, depending on the verb tense, eg

He came this morning. or

He will leave tomorrow morning.

They can also be non-deictic when they are used with a simple present verb form, eg

The children go to school in the morning.

There are no tense restrictions. The same properties apply to the days of the week, months etc.

in the day

Although this is a positional time adverbial which is left- and right-bounded, there is no obvious deictic or anaphoric relationship. The most common tense used with in is undoubtedly the simple present, eg

He sleeps in the day time.

This could well be the only really acceptable tense, as for everything else in that day, referring to a specific day, should be used. on its own, is used deictically in sentences like

I will go in the day time,

contrasting with at night, to distinguish between night and day buses in Bangladesh, but this is a rather idiosyncratic use.

at that time (on that day)

This is a positional time adverbial cooccuring with TT either in the future or, more commonly, in the past. There is no boundedness and the time span at that time refers to can vary, eg

within the same day

Porimol arrived just then. (Kar, p 113)
or years before or after TT

स त त समय आहि सेनेर वाढेर हिलाम। I was abroad at the time.

स त त त, on the other hand, though it can be positioned in the past or the future, is both left- and right-bounded. Examples are:

with future tense

टिकट वेदिन पावेन, तेस तिन यावेन।

They will go on the day they get a ticket. (Das, p 107)

with simple past

वेदिन एह घटना हाय वेदिन तूम्ही कोणाप्रमाणे होले।

Where were you on the day this happened? (M)

with past perfect

वेदिनव बदेकादेकादेकाल बांड थिंडले होले।

On that day also he visited all sorts of people. (Bandyopadhyay, p 157)

स समावेर तेस तिन are not used with the simple present but the present continuous can be used in a scenic sense. All other tenses are possible.

अंतर आघे before that

A right-bounded positional time adverbial, अंतर आघे precedes a TT either in the future or the past, eg

परिब में किस बले याह्याॉलॉ तेस आघे टुनि कथा बलॉ।

Tuni spoke just as Pabitra was about to say something. (Kar, p 73)

वू माझार्या आसवे। अंतर आघे किसतू टेलिफोन करबे।

He will come on Friday, but he will phone before that.

अंतर आघे refers to a point in time (removed from TU) which has to have been defined in the preceding context. It can be used with all tenses, but the use of simple present and present continuous is restricted to scenic use in past tense contexts.

अंतरपरे after that

अंतरपरे has the same semantic properties as अंतर आघे, except that it follows a TT and is left-bounded. Examples are:

अंतरमें क्षमे मोजेर घरे गिया खुब कागंडeea, अंतरपरे एकसमा उठे चोख्या छोपे ओपरे जेलॉ।

At first she went to her room and cried a lot. Then at one point she got up, wiped her eyes and went upstairs. (Bandyopadhyay, p 79)

अंतरपरे एक्साम तेसा लाले ... After that we will see ... (Kar, p 113)

All tenses are possible, but, again, simple present and present continuous can only be used in past tense contexts.
These two positional time adverbials could be considered to be in contrast to one another, i.e.

- **at this moment** and **at that moment**

These two positional time adverbials could be considered to be in contrast to one another, i.e.

- **at this moment**, **at that moment**

Both normally have a narrow time range. Examples are:

- *I can't think about anything else at the moment.* (Un Nobi, p 17)
- *And just at this moment this amazing thing happened.* (Bandyopadhyay, p 77)

The use of **at this moment** is restricted by its close proximity to TU. I found no examples with present perfect, past continuous or past perfect. **at that moment** is not used with simple present and present continuous, except possibly in a scenic function.

**a bit later**

This can be either deictic, as in

- *I will phone a bit later.*

or anaphoric, as in

- *A bit later Janki sat up.* (Debsen, p 43)

In both cases Tsit comes after TU or TT, but the time range is fairly narrow. **a bit later** can be used in all tenses, but use with the simple present is rare.

**a long time ago**

As **a bit later**, this is a positional deictic adverbial but with Tsit preceding TU, i.e. right-bounded, and a longer time span involved. Whereas **a bit later** is restricted to a matter of minutes after TU, **a long time ago** can refer to hours

- *The tea went cold a long time ago.* or years
- *He died a long time ago.*

**a long time ago** can also be used with an anaphoric reference point

- *You will have to finish the work long before he comes.*

**a long time ago** is not used with simple present or present continuous verb forms, except colloquially, when **a long time ago** is understood as **early**, e.g.

- *I get up very early in the morning.*

**just now**

This is a positional deictic adverbial (the last one!) which refers to a moment immediately preceding TU, linked with **just now** which immediately follows TU. The only two tenses used with **just now** are the simple past, e.g.

- *I get up very early in the morning.*
A simple solution has just been found for a difficult puzzle. (Debsen, p 148)

and the present perfect

আমি এইসার গুলি থেকে উঠেছি! I've only just woken up.

always

(Debsen, p 148)

describes the repeated occurrence of an action, whereas

আমি সব সময়ের পেটের অসুখেই ভুরি। I am always suffering from indigestion.

(Bidhubhusan Dasgupta, p 149)

is a durative use of সব সময়. It is not always easy to decide from the verb form alone whether an event is frequentative or durative. In the following sentence we have an active verb চলা move, go but the sentence as a whole describes a state of mind, not a repeated action:

There were these constant questions and answers going on in her mind.

(Debsen, p 146)

is neither right nor left-bounded and naturally combines with simple present and present continuous verb forms. Future tense use, eg

আমি তোমাদের কথা সব সময় মনে রাখি। I will always remember you.

is possible, as is a past habitual use, eg, both as a subjunctive

If he hadn't got the letter he would always be worrying. and as a past tense

সে সব সময় এই গান বাইতো। She always used to sing this song.

It is difficult to imagine contexts where সব সময় could be used with present perfect, simple past, past continuous or past perfect verb forms, and I have found no such examples.

sometimes

Sometimes he doesn't feel like returning. (Pal, p 22)

with present continuous

Actually, she sometimes has problems recognizing her husband. (Debsen, p 146)

sometimes is a frequentative time adverbial, describing events that occur at fairly long intervals. As with সব সময়, association with simple present and present continuous verb forms is natural and there is no boundedness. Examples are:

with simple present

সে সব সময় ফিরিতেও ইচ্ছা করে না।

Sometimes he doesn't feel like returning. (Pal, p 22)

with present continuous

Actually, she sometimes has problems recognizing her husband. (Debsen, p 146)
tense and time adverbials

The following examples, however, show that "every now and then" is less restricted in its use than

with past habitual

Jayadeb used to read foreign monthly magazines now and then. (S)

with future tense

You will come to see me sometimes, won't you? (Bandyopadhyay, p 81)

with present perfect:

Sometimes Rita thought that Kolan had forgiven her all her wrongdoings.

(Das, p 142)

This last (unexpected) example with a present perfect verb form leads to the question of whether "used to" can also be used with the simple past, past continuous or past perfect, eg

When I was in Rajshahi I sometimes went to the river bank.

The immediate impression is that the past habitual form would be more appropriate in this sentence. However, I cannot entirely rule out the other past tense forms.

never

Failing any other criteria, these will have to be classed as frequentative time adverbials with a frequency factor of zero. The obvious consequence of this is that they are not used with continuous tenses but can be used with either stative or active verbs. Examples are

with present tense

He never shows his anger. (TYB, p 228)

with simple past

She had never had the experience of a joint family. (Debsen, p 153)

with present (or past) perfect

Tarapod had never spoken out about anything to his son. (Kar, p 118)

with future tense

I will never write anything on this subject again. (Kar, 139)

The past habitual use is in subjunctive mode:

He would never go on a rickshaw.

every day, daily
A frequentative time adverbial which can be used with active or stative verbs. Where बार बार refers to recurring events at indefinite intervals, here they are clearly defined. For semantic reasons there is an affinity with simple present and present continuous verb forms, eg

रोज छुप्लेका त्यो त्यो क्रियारूप। Krishan phones twice every day. (Debsen p 151)

से आतिनिर्देश यहाँ। He goes to the mosque every day.

Other tense uses are possible, but only when another adverbial like तब then is added, eg

आम्र रि कलकत्तार छाल रि आति आतिनिर्देश शाळी परसङ्गाला।

When I was in Kolkata I wore a saree every day.

and the verb tense in this sentence is actually determined by the positional तब, not by आतिनिर्देश.

एकबार, दुबार, बार बार etc once, twice, again and again

Like बार बार these are indefinite, non-deictic frequentative adverbials which nonetheless also have a positional quality to them. The verb tense defines the position of occurrence(s) as either before or after TU but not including it. There are no tense restrictions. Examples are

with simple present

किंतु सोटाका बार बार चाचेक्र सामान एन रि-बुढकाँश करो।

But thinking about this again and again, don't regret it. (Kar, p 139)

बार बार शिक्षादीन रिभिये मरि आर की।

This constant slipping is going to kill me. (Bandyopadhyay, p 116)

with simple past

एकबार एकटा बार रि चिड़ियाखाना त्यो केल पालिये।

Once a tiger escaped from his zoo. (S)

with future tense

तोमाका अनुष्ठ दुसरे पड़ते हुए। You will have to read (it) at least twice.

These time adverbials are used with punctual, but not with durative verbs.

एकेन और still, एकेन ना not yet

These are the usual translations given, but एकेन is, of course, a combination of एकेन now and the concessive particle ०, so a closer translation would be even now. The Samsad dictionary also gives till now, even in this state, even after this, notwithstanding this. Semantically, these two adverbs are difficult to classify. Rightboundedness, up until the present moment, sounds like a possibility, but examples such as

जस कि एकेन आबार सबै देखा राखर। Will he still meet with me?

show that the time span of एकेन can extend into the future. As far as Klein's categories are concerned, there is a deictic element, situated prior and including TU and possibly
tense and time adverbials

extending past TU. The use of the simple past in the following sentence strikes me as unusual

Who would have thought that a wound could still be so raw after fifteen years?  
(Debsen, p 152)

particularly when it precedes this sentence which is structured exactly the same, except for the difference in tense.

Who would have thought that she could still get so upset?  (Debsen, p 152)

The use of the simple past in the first of these two sentences could be determined by the fact that the incomplete verb आय only has simple present and simple past forms, but the sentence would be just as grammatical if the आय was simply dropped.

The organs keeping him alive are still more or less working. (Kar, p 140)

The past habitual can be used in its subjunctive sense, especially in elliptic conditional sentences, eg

He would still be illiterate.

He doesn’t go to school yet.

and use with the simple past is rare, but I have found the following example

Can you still not stop your bickering? (Kar, p 120)

in the meantime

Both of these are often translated as already but, semantically, they cover a time span reaching from a point in the past to either TU or TT, which means that they are durative, deictic/anaphoric and right-bounded. They can be used with stative or active verbs and have a perfective aspect, eg
In the meantime, Basanti had finished cooking. (Kar, p 81)

In the meantime, Amit's wife brought them tea. (Das, p 109)

They are not used with simple present, present continuous or future tense.

**এই পর্যন্ত until now**

Similar to 'এই রাত্রি' and 'এই সময়' this is a durative, right-bounded time adverbial, but less easily removed from TU, unless it is connected to other time adverbials, eg with simple past

ঠাকুর তার আগে পর্যন্ত গোলার কাছে ফেলায় না।

*I didn’t go near him until it was time to set off.* (Bandyopadhyay, p 84) or with future tense

তার না আগা পর্যন্ত এখানে থাকতে হবে। *We have to stay here until he comes.*

এই পর্যন্ত naturally combines with the present perfect, eg

এই পর্যন্ত কাজ করেছি। *I have been working up till now.*

and is unlikely to be used with simple present, present continuous, future tense, past continuous and past perfect. The past habitual can be used in a subjunctive sense, eg

আমি এই পর্যন্ত থাকতে পারতাম। *I could have stayed until now.*

এই পর্যন্ত is used with durative verbs.

**এতক্ষণ for so long**

এতক্ষণ is a durative time adverbial which can be either deictic (up until the present moment) or anaphoric (for a stretch of time in the past) and is right-bounded. The time span it refers to is relatively short, ie not likely to stretch over more than a few hours. For longer stretches of time the word 'এতক্ষণ literally for so many days' would be used. Examples are

with simple past

এতক্ষণ দেশ ভাগ আলাদা হয়েছে। *We’ve had a good talk until now.* (Dasgupta, p 154)

এই বাধা ফুকে দূরিয়ে তুই এতক্ষণ কাটালি?

*Have you spent so long hiding all this pain inside?* (Das, p 111)

with past cont

বেয়ারেখা এতক্ষণ চুপ করে দাঁড়িয়ে বস দেওয়াছিলেন।

*Standing silently awhile, Byomakes observed everything.* (S)

with past perf

সেটা এতক্ষণ চুপ করেছিলেন। *Sheba had been silent so far.* (Das, p 121)

এতক্ষণ is unlikely to be used with either the simple present or the future tense, though the present continuous is possible, eg

এতক্ষণ যাচ্ছি, কেন সময় পৌঁছবো?
We've been going for so long. What time will we get there?

Milne has the following example with a present perfect verb form, translating এতক্ষণ with by this time. Both the example and the translation sound unusual, if not wrong, to me.

এতক্ষণ তিনি মরে গিয়েছেন। He is dead by this time. (M)

I would have thought that এইরূপস্থা in the meantime would be more common in this context.

সারাদিন, সারারাত all day, all night

These are durative time adverbials which have no tense restrictions. When used with any tense but the simple present they have a deictic relationship to TU, ie they can only refer to the same, the previous or the following day, eg

তুমি সারাদিন কিছু কর নি। You didn't do anything all day. or, with the future tense

তুমি সারারাত জেগে থাকবে। He will stay up all night.

With the simple present the deictic relationship is gone.

সে সারাদিন বাদে থায়। He eats peanuts all day long.

does not refer to today, but, more likely, to every day.

The only kinds of verbs which can be used with these adverbials are either stative or atelic dynamic, ie it is not possible to say

*আমি সারাদিন খুধনা গিয়েছিলাম। * I went to Khulna all day.

আবার again

আবার is semantically difficult to classify. It expresses the repetition of a previous event (either in the past or the present) but there is no explicit deictic or anaphoric relationship.

The only comment on the relationship between আবার and TU is that the event to be repeated has to come before TU. There is a sense of left-boundedness (ie after the event that is to be repeated) but this is also not explicit. Klein claims that again in English is not classifiable, but I think that আবার could be defined as indicating 'the position of a situation in a series of possible situations' (Klein, p 149), similar to শুরুত্ত at the beginning, শেষ at the end etc. The difference between শুরুত্ত and শেষ on the one hand and আবার on the other is that শুরুত্ত and শেষ have a situation-external referent, whereas আবার (sit2) is defined by its relationship with (sit1). This can be shown in the following graph:

```
<p>| | | | |</p>
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```

আবার has no tense restrictions and can be used with active or stative verbs.
These, and the following three time adverbials, can be described in Klein's terminology as "indicating the position of a situation in a series of possible situations" (Klein, p 149). However, both 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>expected time</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no deictic/anaphoric relationships and no tense restrictions. Examples are

- *I finished the work early.*
- *They eat very late.*

Neither of these two adverbials are likely to be used with stative verbs.

**at first**

As the above, *at first* is non-deictic and has no tense restrictions, but there is an element of right-boundedness, ie it has to refer to an event preceding another. Examples are with simple past:

- *At first she went to her room and cried a lot. Then at one point she got up, wiped her eyes and went upstairs.* (Bandyopadhyay, p 79)
- *Pobitro didn't understand at first what was being said.* (Kar, p 107)

**at the beginning**

The difference between *at the beginning* and the previous *at first* is that *at the beginning* is used for events which have a fixed time span and presuppose following stages of the event, ie a middle and an end, whereas *at first* does not have the same restriction. *at the beginning* can of course also be followed, as in the sentence above, by other events, but there is no implication of a fixed end point.

*at the beginning* can be used in all tenses, but use with the present tenses is unlikely. Example with simple past

- *He explained everything to you at the beginning.*  

The verb form in this sentence could equally be in future tense, past continuous or past perfect.

Past habitual use is in a subjunctive sense:

- *I would have told her at the beginning that...*

**at the end, finally**

An appropriate adverbial to finish with! *at the end* has much the same properties as *at the beginning*, but can also refer to the end point of a period of waiting rather than an actual event, eg
tense and time adverbials

Use with the present perfect simple, past and future tense are common, but a present continuous is also possible, as in

He has finally paid off his debt.

Now I finally understand!

Neither শুনেই, nor শব্দ are likely to be used with stative verbs.

SUMMARY

I am fully aware that there are many more time adverbials which could have been taken account of in this study. If I include এখন now, এখনই just now, এখনও still, why not include their equivalents with তখন then, যখন when (correlative), কখন when (interrogative)? My choice of time adverbials represents the attempt to identify significant and typical semantic and syntactic features of Bengali time adverbials as a whole, on the assumption that the difference between এখনই just now and তখন then is the same as that between এখন and তখন. The features of মাঝে মাঝে sometimes are likely to be valid also for আমারই often and সাধারণত usually, with only a difference in frequency of occurrence. Similarly, by including একটু পরে a bit later and অনেকে আসে a long time ago the opposite combinations are also covered.

I've had some disagreements with some Bengali friends about tense use for some time adverbials, eg এই পর্যন্ত, until now which I was told could be used in all tenses. I agree that a context can be created where people will say, eg

এই পর্যন্ত আমরা কোথাও খবর শুনি নাই। (simple present)

Until the post came this morning, we haven't had any news.

where এই পর্যন্ত actually refers to a point of time in the past tense, ie this morning. The same tendency to use deictic (referring to the time of speech) instead of anaphoric (removed from the time of speech) forms can be seen in pronouns এটা this instead of সেটা that, adverbs এখানে here instead of সেখানে there, even though these forms are semantically imprecise.

A different point is the one I made under the entry for প্রতিদিন (p 28), where the addition of other time adverbials expands tense use and, in effect, takes over the role of determining tense. That is why I have tried to look at Bengali time adverbials strictly one by one in order to establish their tense restrictions.

This rather elaborate exercise in connecting time adverbials with the use of tenses in Bengali was meant to take us away from the idea that there are 'no rules'. Yes, in Bengali the use of a particular tense is sometimes a stylistic device and yes, we find sentences with past perfect and future tense used together, but the tense restrictions accompanying the use of time adverbials show clearly that there is a system behind the 'gay abandon' (WR, p 231) of Bengali tense use. The following statements can now be made:

1. There is a frequent contrast between present and non-present tenses. The simple present, and only the simple present, can assume a tenseless quality in referring to events which are always
true or occur regularly, eg বর্ষাকালে বৃষ্টি হয়। It rains in the monsoon, সে রাজ বাজারে যায়। He goes to the market every day.

In other contexts, the simple present tense is very much tied to TU, and time adverbials which expressly exclude TU are not used with the simple present. These time adverbials have a varied range of semantic boundaries, for instance positional: পাঁচ পাঁচ suddenly, আগাছিল tomorrow, তখন then, সে সময় at that time, পরে/আগে after/before, এই সাথে just now, adverbials describing a time span এইসময় in the meantime, এই পর্যন্ত until now, একক for so long, or adverbials which serve to position an event within a process, such as প্রথম at first, শেষে at the end.

2. There is a logical contrast between simple and continuous tenses which affects 'no-time' adverbials such as কখনও না never, এখনও না not yet, কখনও নিঃসেই never. These adverbials are not used with continuous tenses.

3. Both the future tense and the past habitual have a wide open field in Bengali and there are very few contexts where their use is restricted (see 1.). The future tense is quite simply the post-tense for all other tenses except in subjunctive contexts, where the past habitual is used.

A successful study of tense use in Bengali in connection with time adverbials depends above all simply on the accumulation of example sentences. Though assumptions can be made as to which time adverbials are used with which tense, the first and crucial step is to look at and list their occurrences, wherever we find them in written texts or spoken language. Only with a substantial body of language material will it be possible to describe semantic and syntactic parameters accurately. Tense use, in any language, is an area where language changes occur and where differences between written and spoken language are particularly noticeable. We have seen, for instance, that the simple past tense has different functions in spoken and in written language. This type of situation could also influence the use of time adverbials, eg the use of এখনই with simple past tense is very much a spoken language use. In order to do justice to these occurrences, a proper survey of spoken language needs to be done.

Appendix: Time Adverbials
CHAPTER 5

VERBS OF BEING AND HAVING IN BENGALI

Any new student of Bengali will pick up very quickly that Bengali has no verb *to have*, and instead of

*I have a brother* in Bengali you say *আমার ভাই আছে* i.e. *Of me a brother exists.*

This is a sufficient equivalent for new learners who will want to be able to express simple sentences like the above early on in their learning stages. Looking up the verb *to have* in the 'proper' English-Bengali dictionaries, i.e. the Samsad, Progressive and Bangla Academy dictionaries, one finds entries like

*to hold in possession or control*
*to contain*
*to obtain*
*to experience*
*to endure, undergo*
*to have had it.*

There is no mention in any of these entries of the so crucial incomplete verb *আছে*. In the Bengali-English parts of these dictionaries the forms of *আছে* are given as the verb *to be* in English. Thus we have, from the beginning, an overlap of the concepts of *being* and *having* in Bengali which needs to be tackled. The fact that the verb *have* does not as such exist in Bengali raises the question of how the concept of *having* is realised in Bengali or whether, indeed, such a concept exists.

Apart from the possessive meaning of *have*, which in Bengali is expressed through an existential structure, English has a variety of non-possessive uses of *have*. Here are some examples with their Bengali equivalents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English with <em>have</em></th>
<th>'replaced' English verb</th>
<th>Bengali equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have a cup of tea!</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>এক কাপ চা খান।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will have some more rice.</td>
<td>eat / take</td>
<td>আমি আর একটু ভাত খাব / নেব।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We had a nice day.</td>
<td>spend (time)</td>
<td>আমারা সুন্দর একটা দিন কেটেছি।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was having a bath.</td>
<td>be engaged in</td>
<td>আমি গা বৃড়েছি।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many other examples of this sort of transliteration and in each case the equivalence is not literal but rather a metaphorical or symbolic representation of the concept in question. The fact remains, however, that the concept of *having* is not as such expressed in the Bengali language and that this raises the question of how the concept is realised in the Bengali language or whether, indeed, such a concept exists.

In conclusion, it can be said that the concept of *having* is not as such expressed in the Bengali language and that this raises the question of how the concept is realised in the Bengali language or whether, indeed, such a concept exists.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English with <em>have</em></th>
<th>'replaced' English verb</th>
<th>Bengali equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He had an accident.</td>
<td>happen</td>
<td>তার একসিডেন্ট হয়েছে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She has a cold.</td>
<td>catch</td>
<td>তার সাইড যেলেছে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will have the letter tomorrow.</td>
<td>get, receive</td>
<td>তুমি চিঠিটা কালকে পাবে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She has a serious illness</td>
<td>suffer from</td>
<td>তার কাঠিন রোগ আছে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He has no time to talk.</td>
<td>set aside</td>
<td>তার কথা বলার সময় নেই।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I won't have smoking in my house.</td>
<td>tolerate, permit</td>
<td>আমার বাসায় সিগারেট খাওয়া নিষেধ।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of my objectives in this thesis is to interpret Bengali language structures from a language-internal rather than from a translation point of view. To start from our semantic concept of 'verbs of being or having' and fit the Bengali structures around this would make a language-internal interpretation impossible. I have therefore decided to start from the Bengali structures, namely the verbs হওয়া *be, become*, আছে *be, have*, the so-called zero verb, and to a lesser extent the verb থাকা *stay, remain* and look at their different uses. This means that uses of these verbs which are semantically removed from the concepts of *being* or *having*, eg the use of *আছে* following an infinitive to express permission, will also be taken into account.

**The Authors**

There is an - albeit almost 30 year old - series on verbs of being *'The verb *be* and its synonyms'* edited by John W.M. Verhaar in the Foundations of Language series which deals with the concept in many different languages, including Bengali. The article by Charles Ferguson on *'Being in Bengali'* is excellent. It has had a considerable influence on my thoughts in this chapter and has been referred to throughout, so there seems little point in discussing it separately here.

Another article, by Julia Sableski, published in *Language*, Vol 41 (1965) has the promising title *'Equational clauses in Bengali'* and aims to provide *a full description of equational clauses for Standard Colloquial Bengali* (p 439). Sableski distinguishes between equational (subject + complement) sentences which do not contain a verb form, on the one hand, and existential sentences (subject + complement + *আছে* eg এখানে অনেক লোক আছে। *There are many people here.*) on the other. She supplies the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sentence types</th>
<th>affirmative</th>
<th>negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>equational independent</td>
<td>zero-verb</td>
<td>ন- or ন।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equational dependent</td>
<td>হওয়া</td>
<td>ন।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sableski does not give examples for each of these sentence types, but from the verb forms given we can assume that the sentences below (with their negative counterparts) are representative. There are different types of dependent clauses in Bengali, such as a great variety of relative clauses, clauses with so that, with so that, with as if and so on. Not all of these elicit the features which are required here. Conditional sentences do have these features in that they require a verb form and in that आह- is replaced by थाका. Sableski herself gives conditional sentences as examples elsewhere in her article, so I have used them here; but they are just one possibility for this type of structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Bengali (example)</th>
<th>English (example)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>equational independent</td>
<td>সে আমার বাঘবিয়।</td>
<td>She is my friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equational dependent</td>
<td>সে আমার বাঘবি যখনি হয় ...</td>
<td>If she is my friend ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existential independent</td>
<td>তার একটি ছেলে আছে।</td>
<td>He has one son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existential dependent</td>
<td>তার ছেলে যখনি থাকে ...</td>
<td>If he has a son ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If these are her intended sentence types, then the negative form for equational dependent clauses is wrong. It can only be সে বলি আমার বাঘবি না হয় ... if she is not my friend ... not * সে বলি আমার বাঘবি না হয় ... Sableski's method of analysis is to provide two native speakers with a corpus of 25, initially defined as affirmative independent equational, sentences and to ask her informants to give her the corresponding negative independent and the affirmative and negative dependent clauses. This does not in itself sound too difficult and an expected pattern (this is with equational sentences only) would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Bengali (example)</th>
<th>English (example)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>independent affirmative (given)</td>
<td>সে আমার বাঘবি।</td>
<td>She is my friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent negative</td>
<td>সে আমার বাঘবি না।</td>
<td>She is not my friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependent affirmative</td>
<td>সে আমার বাঘবি যখনি হয় ...</td>
<td>If she is my friend ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependent negative</td>
<td>সে আমার বাঘবি যখনি না হয় ...</td>
<td>If she is not my friend ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, Sableski's two informants contradict themselves and one another and make it impossible for any clear conclusions to be drawn. The main point of disagreement seems to be about the possible omission of আছে in sentences like এখানে একে লোক (আছে). There are many people here. (see also the comparison of sentences 1.6.7 and 1.7.2 below, p 172). On the basis of these interviews, and somewhat arbitrarily, Sableski changes her definition of sentences which can contain আছে- from equational to existential. The sentences in question are along the lines of

আমার ভাইয়ের মুটি মেয়ে। My brother has two daughters.

রঙ্গুলীতে পাঁচ পাঠা। There are 500 pages in the book.
These are sentences where can be added and an existential/possessive/locative (see under 1.3.)
interpretation is certainly more logical. The main problem with Sableski’s article is her inability to
draw any conclusions from her informants’ responses due to her own lack of knowledge of Bengali,
which is apparent from some very elementary mistakes like if she is my friend ... where she puts if in the one position it cannot occupy. However, her categories of
independent vs dependent and affirmative vs negative sentences are useful and can be applied further.

E. M. Bykova deals with copulative sentences in Bengali by looking at which word classes can be used
with which copular verbs. The following verbs are seen to be able to function as copulas - the
translations are hers -:

- आছे to be, to exist, to be available
- थাকা to be, to remain
- রওয়া (রয়া) to remain, to be available
- হওয়া to be, to become
- পড়া to fall

and, added to these, ‘the negative link-verb না হওয়া and the negative element নহে / ননে’ (p 131).

Word classes that can combine with these copulas are distributed in this way:

- noun (pronoun) + आছे, थाका, রওয়া, হওয়া, না হওয়া
- Sanskrit participle
- eg উপমূলক, উপমূলক etc + आছे, थाका, রওয়া, হওয়া
- verbal noun + आছे, थाका, রওয়া, পড়া
- form ending in -iya (e) + आছे, थाका, রওয়া
- form ending in -ite (te) + थाका

Even though Bykova does not give examples for these proposed structures, it appears that her
definition of ‘copula’ is not the accepted ‘semantically empty formative, which (...) serves to link a
subject NP to a predicate’ (Trask, p 64). In sentences with, for instance,

- a) verbal noun बইটের টেবিলের উপরে রাখা আছে। The book is (has been put) on the table.
- b) perfective participle উপরে রাখেন। He is asleep. or
- c) infinitive তুমি হটে দিতে থাকবে। You will keep sneezing.

the verb forms clearly do not fulfil a copulative function, i.e. there is no equational factor in them. In
sentence a) आছे has an existential / locative (see under 1.3. below), in sentence b) a stative function.
थाका in sentence c) adds an iterative aspect.

Bykova offers a good explanation about the difference between आछे, थाका, রওয়া on the one hand and
হওয়া on the other: ‘If all the three verbs denote the existence of a certain feature, or of a certain state of
the object, হওয়া specifies the development, the forming of the feature, the emergence of the state’ (p
132). She gives the following examples to show the aspective difference in the uses of आछे and হওয়া
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Everything is ready here. (perfective aspect) and
Bhubon’s mother was saddened. (imperfective aspect)

I agree with her interpretation but cannot follow her conclusion from this that হওয়া is 'the most common copula'. Again, this may be due to her particular undefined understanding of the term 'copula'.

Bykova discusses the semantic differences between আছে and থাকা when used in structurally similar sentences, with থাকা conveying 'the shade of habitual, iterative action' (p 132). Her examples and translations are:

আমার টাকা আছে। I have money.
আমার টাকা থাকে। Sometimes I have money.

This is not immediately convincing but her point is nevertheless valid. A better example, showing the habitual aspect of থাকা, may be

সে কলকাতায় আছে। He is in Kolkata.
সে কলকাতায় থাকে। He lives in Kolkata (but may be elsewhere at the moment).

She also points out the aspectual implications of the perfective participle with আছে in contrast to the finite verb forms (present continuous, present perfect, past perfect, past continuous). The finite verb forms express 'action in progress' eg বসেছে he sat down, whereas the combination with আছে shows the actual state: আছে is (in the state of) sitting down. Combinations of perfective participle with থাকা indicate 'habitual action or state that repeatedly occurs within a certain period of time'. (p 133)

Bykova's passage on combinations with copulas offers some interesting suggestions, but also has some inconsistencies. Particularly baffling to me is that in discussing copulas there is no mention of the zero verb which I consider to be more common as a copula than হওয়া.

THE STRUCTURES

As mentioned earlier, I intend to use as a starting point for this chapter not the supra-linguistic concept of 'being', but the Bengali verbs which can be used to express this concept though their semantic potential can also extend further. The verbs and their possible meanings are:

1. আছে be, be present, exist, (have)
2. zero verb be (in copulative uses)
3. হওয়া be, become, happen, take place, turn out
4. থাকা be, continue to be, remain, stay, keep on

If we want to apply the overlapping circles image (Venn diagram) to these structures, then we would have four partly-overlapping circles - the exact extent and the nature of overlap needs to be defined through analyzing the semantic properties of individual sentences. The supra-linguistic concept of being would be represented by a circle which overlaps with and is at the same time contained by the
four verbal circles, i.e. no part of the *being* circle can be outside of them. A visual representation could look like this:

*Figure: Four verbal circles with intersection points labeled.*

Bykova also gives the verb ṭurwā - the verbal noun form given in the dictionary is ṭavr, but it conjugates the same way as ṭurwā - which deserves at least a mention. The Samsad dictionary gives it as 'same as ṭākā', but this is not quite accurate. ṭurwā is often used in the present perfect tense to refer to something or someone remaining behind, being left over, e.g.

There is a lot of rice left (over).

Mother stayed (behind) at home.

ṭākā cannot be used in this sense. The closest equivalent is with ṭā onto but this does not have the same dynamic aspectual nuance. The future tense of this use would, however, be formed with ṭā onto - I don't think I have ever heard ṭurwā being used in the future tense. Since ṭurwā does not, as far as I can tell, in any context express a simple state of existence (be), I am not including it in my discussion.

The same is true for pūr ṭaela, which Bykova postulates as a copula indicating 'a sudden, unexpected change in the object's state' (p 132). She gives as an example:

*All about was covered with a colourless pall.* (p 132)

This does not exactly suggest a 'sudden, unexpected change', but, in any case, I would not consider it a copulative use as there is no equational factor involved.
1. uses of আছে-

1.1. 'auxiliary' use

One of the most basic uses of আছে- is its morphological function in the formation of Bengali compound tenses. In the present and past perfect tense the appropriate finite form of আছে- follows the perfective participle of any verb - the initial আ- a is dropped: eg করে + আছি > করিয়াছি > করেছি I have done, দেখে + আছিলেন > দেখিয়াছিলেন > দেখেছিলেন he had seen. Present and past continuous tenses are formed with আছে- following the high stem of the verb and dropping the initial আ- a, eg যাতে + আছে > যাছে you are going and দেখতে + দেখিলাম > দেখিয়াছিলাম I was learning.

Ferguson calls this an auxiliary use. This is not entirely undisputed. Muhammad says the forms of আছে- and the formation of compound tenses should be seen as separate on the grounds that there is a difference in stress between আমি গিয়েছিলাম amī gi'yechilam and আমি গিয়েছিলাম amī 'giye 'chilam. (Verbal Structure, p 28) (see also under 1.4.)

However, Ferguson validly points to the negation of present and past perfect with present tense verb forms and নি (historically both নি and নেই were expressed by নাই), so the connection between forms of আছে- and the formation of compound tenses remains. Negation of �ছে- is invariably নএ, negation of present and past perfect is the present tense form with নি, ie নি contains the verbal �ছে- as well as the negative element (Ferguson, p 90), though this leaves the continuous tenses' negative forms (তুমি যাচ্ছ না you are not going, আমি নির্ধারিত না I wasn't learning) unexplained. The past continuous negative form is, in any case, very rare.

This morphological function of আছে- has become lexicalized and is not productive, so it does not need to concern us further here.
1.2. with definite subjects

आছ- is predominantly used in a variety of impersonal constructions with no or indefinite grammatical subjects, but it can also be used with definite subjects, including proper names and pronouns. There is usually a locative component in these sentences. Ferguson points out (p 84) that there is a change in word order [subject + locative + verb], whereas with indefinite subjects the word order is [locative + subject + verb], eg

with indefinite subject  
1.2.1 टेबिलेने उपरे बनी आछ।  
There is a book (are books) on the table.

with definite subject  
1.2.2 टेबिलेने उपरे आछ।  
The book is on the table.

The simplest sentences with definite subjects are those consisting of a personal pronoun and the appropriate form of आछ-: आमि आছি, তুমি আছ এক্স. The meaning of these sentences is defined by the context. They can be locative, answering questions like কে আছে?  
Who is in the room?, though the more natural answer in this context would be a simple আমি without a verb form. Ferguson mentions this and goes on (p 85): 'The sentence আমি আছি asserts something like I'm present, I belong to the group, or I'm to be kept in mind.' I can only add that in my experience this sentence is often used in a wonderfully competent and reassuring way to imply I'm here, I will see to it, there is no reason for anyone else to worry. The negative of this states very much the opposite, as in

1.2.3 এই ব্যাপারে আমি নেই।  
lit: I am not in this matter.

often used to express:  
I want nothing to do with this.

Other examples for the use of आছ- with definite subjects are

1.2.4 কলিচান দস আছেন?  
Is Kalicaran Das here? (Smith, p 114)

1.2.5 তুমি কোথায় আছ?  
How are you?

1.2.6 পানিবারে কোথায় এলেন?  
Where were you on Saturday?

1.2.7 সে কি তোমার সঙ্গে নেই?  
Isn't he with you?

1.2.8 তোমি কি আছেন? না, তিনি নেই।  
Is he here? No, he isn't.

(all Ferguson, p 84)

1.3. existential / locative / possessive uses

This includes what we tell our students is the 'possessive' function of आছ- and which is best translated with have, eg

1.3.1. আমার দুই ভাই আছে।  
I have two brothers. (lit: my two brothers exist)

This use is closely linked with the locative function of आছ-; in fact, the sentence above

আমার দুই ভাই আছে।  
My two brothers are here,

could equally mean

depending on the context of the statement. As we have seen, the 'possessive' interpretation of आছ- is largely a concession to English thinking, whereas Bengali uses an existential concept.
One of the questions that arises with this kind of use is whether आছे- can be used in a purely existential sense. At first sight this seems unlikely, as there tends to be a locative component present, e.g. the question आছे? is unlikely to mean Do ghosts exist? but Are there ghosts here/there? An enquiry after the existence of ghosts is in Bengali more likely to be

आছे কি সত্যি (or আছেন) হয়?  
lit: Do ghosts really 'occur'?

However, a sentence like 1.3.1 ‘আমার দুই ভাই আছে’ can be seen, from a Bengali point of view, as just such an instance, i.e. a statement of existence. The locative possibility (my two brothers are here) is a contextual alternative which does not invalidate the original existential reading. The following sentences suggest that an ontological use is possible:

1.3.2 এদের সাপ আছে যার হেলায়ের শেষ অংশ তোমার মেঝে।

There is such a snake whose tail is thick and blunt at the end. (Smith, p 114)

1.3.3 পাপ ও পুত্র আছে।

Evil and virtue exist. (Ferguson, p 83)

1.3.4 আছে মৃত্যু, আছে মৃত্যু ...  
there is sadness, there is death

(Tagore, p২৪৭)

1.3.5 আছে পেশাসন, আছে প্রদত্ত আয়, আছে ধর্ম, আছে ধর্ম, এক্ষেত্রে আছে, ধর্মে অর্থ আছে।

There's no pension, no gratuity, at the last place there wasn't even a provident fund. (Smith, p 114)

1.3.6 অত্যন্ত অসম এক বছর, রায় লাভ আছে, রায় লাভ নেই, ভালবাসা আছে, প্রতিজ্ঞা নেই।

A strange, unequal friendship: there is liking but no responsibility, there is love but no promise. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 108)

The initial unease in accepting आছे- in a purely existential sense is due to a possible overlap with होता be, become, happen, occur. The semantic properties of होता seem to be more suitable for a purely existential use while आছे- is more readily associated with the here and now, which can, however, be expanded almost indefinitely to include, for instance, यह जीवन in this life, यह जীবন on this earth, यह সামাজিক in this world as in sentence 1.3.4. Sentences 1.3.5 and 1.3.6 undoubtedly contain a locative element and sentence 1.3.3 would be equally, if not more, acceptable as পাপ ও পুত্র হয়।

In order to demonstrate further the overlap between existential/possessive and locative features in the use of आছे-, Ferguson has the following examples

1.3.7 আমার বই বই আছে।  
translated as My books are at home.  and

1.3.8 আমার বই বই আছে।  
translated as I have some books at home.

Though both of these interpretations are possible, the crucial difference between the two sentences is that in sentence 1.3.8. there is no claim of ownership of the books. A more accurate translation would be

There are (some) books at my home.

In connection with section 1.2. above, the two sentences can be seen as 1.3.7. containing a definite and 1.3.8. an indefinite subject. This interpretation undermines Ferguson's rules for word order - the required word order for sentence 1.3.7. according to his rules would have to be आमार বই বই আছে, which is perfectly possible. I would therefore suggest modifying his rules to say that in sentences
containing an indefinite subject, verb and locative element, the subject cannot precede the locative, whereas definite subjects can either precede or follow the locative, eg

with definite subject, either

বাড়িতে আমার বই আছে। or আমার বই বাড়িতে আছে।

with indefinite subject

আমার বাড়িতে বই আছে। but not *বই আমার বাড়িতে আছে।

আছ- (or সেই-) in sentences with definite subjects can precede these subjects for emphasis, eg in locative sentences:

1.3.9 তোলা পড়ে আছে শীতকাল বরফের টুকরা।

_There was_ (lit: *lay fallen*) _a piece of ice in the bottom* (of the glass).

(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 101)

1.3.10 সেখানে না আছে ঘর-দর, না আছে কিছু।

_There aren't any houses and the like there, not anything at all._

(Ferguson, p 102)

Compared to the expected সেখানে ঘর-র দর, কিছু নেই। the difference in emphasis is immediately obvious. In view of sentences like this and the following, the claim that আছ- is invariably negated by নেই is no longer tenable. We can say that আছ- is usually negated by নেই, but in order to lay stress on the factor of absence আছ can be negated with না; and not only can the verb precede the subject, but না can be placed before the finite verb form.

Similarly, in sentences with existential/possessive meaning, eg

1.3.11 চট্টগ্রামে নাই আবাসিনী, নাই সম্পত্তি, না আছে কোনো থাকার জায়গাও।

_In Chittagong she had no family, no relatives, nowhere to stay._

(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 94)

as also in sentence 1.3.10, the positioning of the negative particle adds emphasis but also has a phonaesthetically pleasing effect. The sentences have an almost biblical ring to them.

1.4 uses with participles, adjectives and verbal nouns/adjectives

আছ- is not used as a copula connecting nouns in present tense sentences. These sentences have zero verb, eg শুশির হ্রদ। _Shushil is a lawyer_.

and many equational sentences with adjectives also use the zero verb rather than আছ-, eg

রাসায়নিক হ্রদ। _The house is small_.

পথিকোত্তর। _The tree is beautiful_.

etc (see under 2.1)

but with some adjectival participles আছ- can function as a copula. Ferguson has the following:

1.4.1 তারারায়টি উদ্ধৃত আছে। _The window is open_.

1.4.2 টেবিলে বইটি রাখা আছে। _The book is lying on the table_. (p 88)
The verb form रहा in this sentence, according to Ferguson, is the past passive participle having been put (also referred to as a verbal adjective), but the dividing line between this use and the use of आह- following a verbal noun is not very clear. Ferguson gives this sentence to demonstrate verbal noun use:

1.4.3 आमार एই बইটা पড़ा आছ।  
This book has been read by me.

He classifies this sentence under existential uses but considers the preceding example a copulative use with a passive participle. I cannot see a functional difference of the verb forms in these two sentences. Smith has the following example, classed under verbal adjectives

1.4.4 सव तो तार जाना आছ, या किना मानुषक जाना दरकार।

Everything a person needs to know is known to him. (Smith, p 129)

I consider जाना in this sentence to be a verbal noun. तार जाना आছ and तार जाना दरकार are typical examples for verbal nouns as subjects of sentences. The syntactical connections in the first clause are somewhat unclear as सव could also be considered the subject. The contrast between adjectives and nouns becomes more relevant in the discussion about zero verb versus omission of आह- (see below, section 2.) but in this case the distinction is less important. Other examples for the use of आह- with verbal noun forms are

1.4.5 आमार तাকे से कथा बला आছ।  
I have told him that. (Ferguson, p 86)

1.4.6 आमार तासाके जाना आছ।  
You are well known to me.  
(Ferguson, p 86)

1.4.7 ता किना आमारह जाना छिल ना।  
But we didn't know that. (Smith, p 45)

In all of these verbal forms, be they nouns or adjectives, there is a passive or at least a stative, as well as a perfective, element. In the following sentences, on the other hand, the genitive verbal noun forms qualify the sentence subjects and are directed towards future action.

1.4.8 आमारके आपनार अनेक काज करबार आहे किना?  
Do you have a lot of work to do today? (Ferguson, p 85)

1.4.9 आपनारके आमार एका कथा बलबार आहे?  
I have something to say to you. (Ferguson, p 85)

1.4.10 किना का करार आहे आमारहे? किना का करार ने!  
Is there anything we can do? There is nothing we can do.  
(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 94)

In sentences 1.4.8 and 1.4.9 the genitive verbal noun form ending in बार is used. This is sometimes referred to as the future verbal noun (McLeod, p 63) and though it is no longer very commonly used (viz sentence 1.4.10, where the regular verbal noun form is used) its semantic implication of purpose and forward direction is very visible here.

The present and past tense forms of आह- can be used, following the perfective participle of particular verbs to express the stative aspect of these verbs, eg

1.4.11 आम बस छिलाम।  
I was sitting down. (stative)  
compared to

1.4.12 आम बसेछिलाम।  
I sat down.  
This involves a change of state.
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This use is mentioned by Mukherji, who sees it as restricted to intransitive verbs (chapter 14, p 7), Smith as restricted to stative verbs, Ferguson to verbs of bodily motion. He lists:  স্থান আছে is standing, জুড়ে আছে is asleep, খেলো আছে is awake, শুরু আছে is lying down, পাড়ে আছে is lying fallen, বেঁধে আছে is alive, তাকিয়ে আছে and চেয়ে আছে is staring.

Ferguson says about চেয়ে আছে is staring 'This [...] is a good illustration of the semantic limitations of the class of verbs which are used in this construction: চেয়ে occurs in the meaning stare but in its common meaning want it does not occur in this use'. (p 88)

Both Milne and Muhammad also accept active/ transitive verbs for this structure, e.g.

1.4.13 বৈরা ধর - তাতা ধরেই আছি।

Be patient - Why that's just what I'm doing! (Milne, p 191)

1.4.14 আমি চেয়েছিলাম।

I ate. but

1.4.15 আমি চেয়ে ছিলাম। I stayed after the meal. (Muhammad, p 29)

This use of আছে with active verbs is perhaps not very common but it can express a stative aspect which would not be present in the continuous verb forms. It can also have illocutionary force, e.g.

1.4.16 আমি কাজ করে আছি। though semantically the same as

1.4.16 a) আমি কাজ করছি। I am working.

can be used expressly to imply Go away! I'm busy! I see no reason not to accept these uses.

In direct contradiction to Ferguson's statement about চেয়ে Milne has

1.4.17 আমি কেবল চাহিয়া আছি।

But I merely live in a state of expectation. (Milne, p 191)

Judging by his translation (not always very reliable) Milne considers this to be the transitive verb want even though there is no object in the sentence. A clearer example would be:

1.4.18 আমি কেবল ঈশ্বরের দয়া চেয়ে আছি।

I merely live in expectation of God's grace.

As mentioned above, most subject - complement constructions involving adjectives do not contain a verb form in the simple present. Ferguson, interestingly, points out that both স্বাভা good and ঠিক correct can be used with আছে to convey a meaning which is different from the zero verb copulative use, i.e

1.4.19 with আছে  সে ভাল আছে। He is well (in good health).
1.4.20 with zero copula  সে ভাল। He is good (in character).
1.4.21 with আছে  ঠিক আছে। That's all right.
1.4.22 with zero copula  ঠিক। That's correct.

Ferguson says 'Apparently no other non-participial adjectives are used with আছে (p 89). This is not quite true as there are a number of adjectival subject - complement structures where আছে can, but does not have to, be added. Bykova gives

1.4.23 এখানে ছাগের সমস্ত প্রাণ আছে। Everything is ready for tea here. (Bykova, p 132)

The following examples (and translations) are from Sabeski, p 441:
verbs of being and having

1.4.24 आज ठंडा (आहेत)। It's cold today.
1.4.25 आज शीत (आहेत)। It's cold today.
1.4.26 तार अँधा जाना आहेत (आहेत)। It is necessary to know the meaning of it.
1.4.27 तुम्ही वजनचा वेष होतो (आहेत)। The gist of what he says is important.

A more accurate translation of this last sentence may be He has a lot that's worth saying.

Comparable to these, and probably more common, are (my examples):

1.4.28 तुम खूंखूं बनतो (आहेत)। He is very busy.
1.4.29 माझ्या संस्कृत (आहेत)। Mother is satisfied now.
1.4.30 बाबांच्या गुण्यां (आहेत)। The children are happy.
1.4.31 तांबात नात्ता निरः (आहेत)। Your breakfast is ready.

Mukherji (chapter XIII, p 7) points to a difference in meaning between

1.4.28 दरवाजा बंद। The door is shut, and
1.4.29 दरवाजा बंद आहे। The door is shut (not open).

Though there may be a difference in stress between these two, neither they nor Sableski's sentences are comparable to the above examples with भाल and ठिक, where the combinations with or without आहेत have completely different meanings.

1.5 following an infinitive

आहेत- can follow the infinitive of another verb to denote 'that it is permitted by law, religion or custom to do the act expressed by the main verb' (Milne), eg

1.5.1 बिहू विहू करत सांगत नाही, किती बिहू विहू करत सांगत आहे।

Widow marriage is forbidden to Hindus but permitted to Christians.

1.5.2 विहू संग मलेल पय पय चालत नाही। It is not proper to begin a journey without provisions. (Milne, p 190)

1.5.3 ना फालत के नेही। You must not say no. (Milne, p 216)

Smith has

1.5.4 एकाच फिक येते आहेत। Is it permitted to go there?
1.5.5 अलकुंडूळे मेंदर्देन चिम येते नेही। Unmarried girls shouldn't eat eggs.

(Smith, p 148)

(Where does he get these example sentences from?!) Milne's use of the nominative बिहू (1.5.1.) is questionable. In all other examples the logical subject, where it isn't omitted, is in the genitive which has to be the correct form in an impersonal construction like this.

1.6 with modal and other abstract nouns

आहेत- is used in sentences 'in which the subject noun has some kind of modal force' (Ferguson, p 86), eg

1.6.1 तुम्हाचे आम्हाचे दरकार आहेत। We need him.
1.6.2 तुम्हांचा अनुराग आहेत। He is fond of studying.
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1.6.3 He has no respect for religion. (all Ferguson, p 86)

1.6.4 Sukumar's father was supposed to retire. (Smith, p 127)

In fact, can be used with any number of abstract nouns, with or without modal force. The logical subject of the sentence is in the genitive. Most of the following examples could also be classified under the existential use of আছে, ie আমার সন্তান আছে. I have doubts, is syntactically the same as আমার সন্তান আছে. I have a bicycle, but I think that because of their semantic homogeneity these uses with abstract nouns should be in a class of their own. Examples are:

1.6.5 There is a big difference between what he says and what he does. (Ferguson, p 85)

1.6.6 I have a complaint against you. (Smith, p 85)

1.6.7 There are a lot of similarities between being a good teacher and being a good father. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 90)

1.6.8 The bad times spent have a huge significance in one's life. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 92)

1.6.9 I should like to understand. (Bykova, p 102)

1.6.10 There was no way to understand it. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 114)

1.6.11 Other abstract nouns which can be used in similar structures are:

- courage, fear, right, time, chance, opportunity, habit, news, responsibility, purpose, difference, problem, strength, power, influence, limit, objection, possibility, rule, system, arrangement etc. The list is open-ended.

1.7 omission of আছে-

It is difficult to pin down rules for the possible omission of আছে, which, in any case, is restricted to affirmative present tense sentences. Looking at the above sentences with modal and other abstract nouns আছে can be omitted in 1.6.1. তার বিদায় করার কথা. We need him, 1.6.4. if transposed into the present tense আছে প্রতিবাদ করার কথা. He is supposed to retire, 1.6.6. আমার বিদায় করার অবিশ্বাস. I have a complaint against you. Similarly, sentences can be constructed with other abstract nouns, eg আছে প্রতিবাদ করার কথা. He may come, আমার মুক্তি অনেক প্রবাদ। There is a big difference between them, বাচ্চাদের জন্য আমার দায়িত্ব। I am responsible for the children, etc. The sentence order in

1.7.1a) আমার বিদায় করার কথা. He is supposed to retire, 1.6.6. আমার বিদায় করার অবিশ্বাস. I have a complaint against you. Similarly, sentences can be constructed with other abstract nouns, eg
Moni needs to become acquainted with dangerous things.

(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 105) is unusual.

From the more normal version

1.7.1b) তেজারাস যাপায় গুলোর সাথেই মনির পরিচয় হওয়া দরকার।

it is clear that this is a sentence of the type discussed in 1.6, with আছে omitted after দরকার need.

Sentences like 1.6.7 to 1.6.9, on the other hand, sound wrong without আছে. Presumably the presence of the definite determiners একটি and একটি effects the need for a sentence-final verb form. If we compare

1.6.7 ভাল শিক্ষক ও ভাল পিতা হওয়ার মাঝে প্রবল একটি ছিল আছে।

There are a lot of similarities between being a good teacher and being a good father. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 90)

1.7.2 আমার সাথে আমার ছোট বোনের চেহারা খুব ছিল।

You look a lot like my younger sister. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 100)

we see that the difference between the two sentences is the presence of the definite determiner একটি in 1.6.7 and its absence in 1.7.2. However, in looking at examples of this type we have to be aware of a certain amount of arbitrariness and the author's individual preferences as determining factors. আছে can undoubtedly be added in sentence 1.7.2, though I am less sure about its omission in 1.6.7. The deciding criterion in this seems to be the native speakers' intuition, which is, as Sableski's analysis shows, not a reliable basis for postulating grammatical rules.

The situation is different for existential/possessive/locative structures. Ferguson holds that আছে can be omitted in locative sentences with definite subjects only, eg বইটা চেয়েনার উপরে। The book is on the table, সেঁয়েরা বাড়িতে। The girls are at home etc. The same goes for existential/possessive structures, ie আছে can be dropped only when a definite subject is given, eg আমার দুই মেয়ে। I have two daughters, but in আমার মেয়ে আছে। I have a daughter, আছে cannot be omitted.

More research ought to be done in this area on a much more substantial body of material and with a greater number of native speaker informants, but judging from my own experience and articles like Julia Sableski's it seems unlikely that definitive rules can be found. Milne has a wonderfully telling statement, made in a different context: 'It may be noted here that Bengali grammarians [my italics] usually pay more attention to the logical meaning than to the form of the words'. (p 299) There is nothing wrong with putting logic above grammar, but it would be a sorry state of affairs for learners and scholars alike if grammarians did not pay attention to the 'form of the words'!

2. uses of the zero-verb

Why talk about a zero verb? Bykova makes no mention of it in her discussion on copulative sentences. Smith says 'In equational sentences no verb is usually employed. It is also usually omitted in sentences containing a locative adverb' (p 99). Brother James puts the same concept into slightly different words: 'The verb to be is often omitted where it is understood (present tense) - unless there is only the subject and predicate or when to be is emphasized' (p 19) Similarly MacLeod: 'In Bengali, when the copula
verbs of being and having

in the present tense, it is omitted' (p 24) And, finally, my own inadequate statement in Essential Everyday Bengali: 'In the present tense the verb can be omitted because it is understood' (p 26).

The reason for postulating a zero verb as a grammatical element in Bengali is precisely that it does not represent an omission of anything. Ferguson puts the case very succinctly to distinguish the zero verb from an omission of আছে:

1) no verb can be supplied to replace it in the normal verb position without a change in basic meaning,
2) it is negated by the negative copula না, and
3) it is invariably present tense or tenseless in meaning. (p 93)

The distinction between sentences with a zero verb and sentences where আছে has been omitted is crucial for the understanding of these structures, i.e., the zero verb represents a positive presence in present tense and tenseless sentences, not an absence or omission of anything. Negation of the zero verb is provided by the forms of the incomplete copula না (the Samsad dictionary gives only the sadhu bhasa form না) which has only present tense forms (না, না, না, না) and no non-finite verb forms. In colloquial speech the invariable না is often used instead of the না forms. Ferguson says on the use of the two forms: 'The only observation which seems certain is that the use of না is less frequent than that of না, which seems to be the unmarked or 'normal' negative copula' (p 97). Brother James does not share this view: 'Although না is used in writing at times, the second form is always used in colloquial Bengali' (p 21). This divergence of opinions may be due to a difference in usage between West Bengal and Bangladesh. Ferguson refers to a conditional participle না, না, otherwise, if not, which is used as an alternative to, but perhaps not as common as, না, না. In tenses other than the simple present, in conditional sentences and for all other non-finite uses, forms of হবার and, for the simple past, the past tense forms of আছে are used. (see also under 5.)

2.1 copulative uses (equational)
The zero verb has a number of copulative uses, i.e., in subject - complement structures which have the following range (all examples from Ferguson)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>noun-noun</td>
<td>লোকটি কার্যকর।</td>
<td>The man is a clerk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun-adj.</td>
<td>লোকটি ধর্মী।</td>
<td>The man is rich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>মে কাঁদালি।</td>
<td>He is Bengali.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>গাছটা ছোট।</td>
<td>The tree is small.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun-noun</td>
<td>এরা আমার মেয়ে।</td>
<td>These are my daughters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>আমারা দশজন।</td>
<td>There are ten of us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'definition'</td>
<td>গাছ ফাঁচ।</td>
<td>A tree is a tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'equation'</td>
<td>আজ কুক্কুর।</td>
<td>Today is Wednesday.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these sentences are simple one-to-one equations. The distribution of definite/ indefinite subjects and complements in the following diagram shows only a logical rather than a grammatical distinction. A definite statement about an indefinite subject (*A tree is my favourite.*) is illogical and therefore grammatically unacceptable. All other combinations are possible.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject</th>
<th>complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td>definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>definite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is comparable to the position of definite and indefinite subjects in locative sentences (see sentences 1.3.7 and 1.3.8, p 9).

Sentences of this type can be extended by adverbs, adverbial or postpositional phrases, eg

noun - noun 2.1.9 নামু অনেক বছর আগে থেকে আমাদের দায়িত্ব ধারণ।

Thes old man has been our guard for many years.

noun - adjective 2.1.10 কলকাতা শহরটি মেয়েদের পক্ষে বিপজ্জনক।

The city of Kolkata is dangerous for girls. (Smith, p 47)

2.1.11 অপমানের চেয়ে বরং রুখ ভাল।

Rather death than dishonour. (Milne, p 340)

pronoun - noun 2.1.12 আমি ও তিনি মুহুর্তে ভারি শক্ত।

*He and I are deadly enemies.* (Milne, p 342)

pronoun - adjective 2.1.13 এটা একেবারে পড়ে। *This is completely rotten.*

(Brother James, p 144)

2.1.14 এটা আমার পক্ষে খুব কঠিন।

This is very difficult for me. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 124)

'definition' 2.1.15 বটগাছ এখানে সবচেয়ে বড় গাছ।

*The banyan tree is the biggest tree in this country.*

(Brother James, p 123)

2.1.16 ভুমির পশ্চিম মধ্যে হার্টি সর্বজনীন রুপ।

Elephants are the largest of all land animals. (Milne, p 112)

'equation' 2.1.17 গান গাওয়া আমার সবচেয়ে বড় অনিম্ন।

Singing is my greatest pleasure. (Brother James, p 11)

The zero copula is used in interrogatives with question words (my examples) like

2.1.18 এটা কি? *What is this?*

2.1.19 ও কে? *Who is this?*

2.1.20 তোমার নাম কি? *What is your name?*

2.1.21 তোমার বয়স কত? *How old are you?*

2.1.22 নাম কত? *How much (what price) is it?*

In looking at these sentences - not mentioned by Ferguson- it becomes a bit clearer how Sableski's informants could have ended up with such contradictory statements. তোমার বয়স কত? *How old are you?* is an example for zero verb, but sentences like তোমার মা কেসেন? *How is your mother?*, or তোমার...
verbs of being and having

Where is your car? which syntactically look very similar are, in fact, examples for omission of আছে. A possible way to establish the difference between these two types of sentences is to put them in the negative, where omission of আছে would yield নেই whereas zero verb sentences would take a form of the negative copula নেই. But this can only be done with statements, not with questions such as the above.

There is, however, a semantic consideration. The question word কেমন, how has two distinctive uses. It is often added at the end of a sentence to express not a question but a suggestion, eg আমার একসময় থেকে কেমন? How about going together? This looks like a zero verb use, but is, in fact, more likely to be an elliptical use with হওয়া, ie একসময় থেকে কেমন হত?

In তোমার মা কেমন? How is your mother?, on the other hand, the expected answer is ভাল well or a variation thereof and as we have seen under 1.4. ভাল can be used with আছে when it expresses physical well-being as opposed to character qualities or moral values (which require the zero verb), eg sentence 2.1.11. It seems at least likely that this is the reason for the presence of আছে (whether overt or not) in this use of কেমন. These examples show how easy it is to misinterpret sentences without overt verb forms.

The case of কোথায় in তোমার গাড়ি কোথায়? is less complicated as there is always an underlying আছে in verbless sentences with locative adverbs, including question words like কোথায়, কেমন আছেন হায়া, etc (see Smith p 99)

2.2 copulative uses (possessive and with postpositional phrases)
As we have seen in 1.3. the English possessive I have a brother/ a photo/ doubts, is expressed through existential structures in Bengali, eg

2.2.1 আমার ভাই / ছবি / সন্দেহ আছে।

A predicative possessive as in English The book is mine, is in Bengali বইটি আমার with zero verb. Bengali possessive attributive adjectives (English: my) and predicative pronouns (English: mine) have the same form.

In Sableski's article there was some confusion between existential and copulative structures. The difference between them can be seen clearly here.

• Existential sentences (with আছে as in 2.2.1) make statements about single entities, be they objects (ছবি photo), people (ভাই brother) or abstract concepts (সন্দেহ doubt). This can range from stating existence, eg sentence 1.3.3 পাপ ও পুনস্ত আছে। Evil and virtue exist to positioning in place or time, eg sentences 1.2.6 শনিবারে তোমরা কোথায় ছিলে? Where were you on Saturday? or কালকে হরতাল। There is a strike tomorrow.

• In equational, or copulative, sentences (with zero verb) two entities are set in relation to one another, for instance in saying that 'A is B' (as in sentences 2.1.1 to 2.1.22) or that A is (in whatever way) related to B, as in sentences 2.2.2ff. This relationship can, in some cases, be easily defined, eg in বইটি আমার। The book is mine or in এটি আমার বই। (zero verb) This is my book we have more truly an expression of ownership than in any sentence with আছে. In sentences 2.2.8 to
2.2.10 (with postpositional phrases) the precise semantic relationship between A and B may be more complicated, but the element of linking two entities remains.

In offsetting these two sentence types against one another and comparing their structures, a convincing case can be made for the zero verb as the true copula in Bengali. Ferguson's examples for copulative uses of আছে- are a farrago of different structures ranging from locative uses, eg

1.4.2 বইটি বসে আছে। The book is lying on the table. (p 88)
to participial structures like ছেলেটি বসে আছে। The boy is sitting down., which has no equational element in it. His examples with ভাল আছে- (sentences 1.4.19 and 1.4.21) are convincing examples of আছে- functioning as a copula, but I think they should be considered lexical exceptions, not a means of creating new grammatical categories for the possible uses of আছে.-

Zero verb equational structures occur in interrogative sentences, eg

of the A is B type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>এটি কি?</td>
<td>What's this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>উনি কে?</td>
<td>Who is he?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>শব্দটি সানে কি?</td>
<td>What does this word mean?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the A is related to B type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5</td>
<td>জামিনি কারে?</td>
<td>Whose is this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6</td>
<td>কোনটি আপনার?</td>
<td>Which one is yours?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.7</td>
<td>টিক্কিটটি কি হামার?</td>
<td>Is the ticket yours?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Postpositional phrases are also used without a verb form in the present tense:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.8</td>
<td>এটি কোমার জন্য।</td>
<td>This is for you. (Brother James, p 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.9</td>
<td>এটি তাদের যুদ্ধনের জন্য।</td>
<td>That's between the two of them. (Milne, p 255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.10</td>
<td>ফ্রেট, ভালবাসা এসব আমার জন্য।</td>
<td>Love, affection, all this is not for me. (Smith, p 79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It could be argued that these are, in a way, elliptical sentences, eg sentence 2.2.8 may be short for

2.2.8 a) এটি কোমার জন্যে এনেছি। I brought this for you.

but since all these sentences can be negated with the negative copula না- (as in 2.2.10) they should be accepted as zero verb structures. Surprisingly, Ferguson does not mention either of these uses.

2.3 with modal adjectives

Ferguson says 'The zero copula is regularly used with a verbal noun in -a as subject and an adjective of modal value as complement.' (p 94) The example he gives is with the much-laboured উচিত expressing moral obligation or ought. The range of possible adjectives in this structure is, however, rather wider than that. Examples are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>কোমার বাঙ্গা উচিত।</td>
<td>You ought to go. (Ferguson, p 95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>মাতার সাবধান হওয়া উচিত।</td>
<td>Mothers should be careful. (Milne, p 219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td>বলা সহজ, করা কঠিন।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It's easy to say but hard to do. (Brother James, p 60)

This sentence could also be classed under simple one-to-one copulative uses (as in sentences 2.1.7 and 2.1.8) but the verbal noun form and also the modal nature of the adjective complements make it suitable to be classed here.

2.3.5 It is impossible for oysters to live for very long out of water. (Klaiman, p 60)

2.3.6 It is dangerous to sleep outdoors at night.

2.3.7 It is necessary to vaccinate him. (oral communication)

2.3.8 Talk like that is unsuitable. (oral communication)

Other adjectives which can be used in structures like this are appropriate, worthy, possible, good, and probably a number of others.

2.4 with evaluative nouns

Similarly, verbal nouns as subjects occur with a rather limited number of abstract noun complements which have an evaluative, not to say an ethical, component. Ferguson does not mention this use and I am somewhat hesitant to include it here because some of the examples may be more appropriately considered to be omissions of rather than genuine zero verb uses. They can all, however, be negated with which indicates a zero verb structure. Syntactically, these are one-to-one equational sentences comparable to sentences 2.1.1ff the man is a clerk) etc, (p 16), but with verbal nouns as sentence subjects which preclude the use of a copula (see below). All examples are mine.

2.4.1 It is wrong to tell lies.
2.4.2 Such behaviour is crazy.
2.4.3 Murder is a great sin. (Milne, p 176)
2.4.4 It is perfidious to cheat others.
2.4.5 It is cowardice not to tell her the truth.
2.4.6 To talk like this is hypocrisy.

The addition of at the end of these sentences is not unimaginable but would imply a different aspectual character from what we have in these kind of prescriptive moral pronouncements, eg sentence 2.4.6 would translate as something like leads to or results in or constitutes hypocrisy. The sentence has a dynamic, developmental component which is not felt in the original statement.
2.5 use of a pro-copula

Having claimed all along that the zero verb constitutes a positive presence in copulative sentences and cannot be replaced by other verb forms, we now come to the one exception to this. According to Ferguson, the simple present, present continuous or simple past forms of be, become, can, in simple one-to-one equational sentences, be inserted between the subject and the complement. This unusual position - hence the name pro-copula - is presumably the reason for Ferguson to list this use under the zero verb rather than under the uses of be, become. Instead of

2.5.1 ছেলেটি ছাত্র। The boy is a student.

there are these three possibilities with the same present tense or tenseless meaning:

2.5.2 ছেলেটি হচ্ছে ছাত্র।

Ferguson states that the pro-copula 'may indicate emphasis, hesitation while searching for the right word for the complement, or other stylistic variation' (p 95). He is rather vague about the cases in which the use of a pro-copula is appropriate but this is entirely understandable considering that one of Sableski's informants 'was willing to accept it in any zero copula sentence she submitted to him' (p 95).

Before looking at some sentences to examine these pro-copula uses more closely, there is a question on the actual verb forms. Is the simple present tense form really used like this?

2.5.3 সুজন হচ্ছে আমার ভাই।
2.5.4 সুজন হল আমার ভাই। Sujon is my brother.

both sound acceptable, but

2.5.5 সুজন হয় আমার ভাই।

though perhaps not expressly wrong is certainly a lot less common than either of the other two variants, at least in this position.

2.5.6 সুজন আমার ভাই হয়।

is perfectly acceptable and constitutes a special use of be, become in defining family or other relationships, eg

2.5.7 সে তোমার কি হয়? lit: What is he of you?

is regularly used to enquire after familial relationships, ie How is he related to you? But as a pro-copula it is questionable. Interestingly, Ferguson postulates the three tenses as being able to provide pro-copulas, but in the course of his discussion the simple present tense form is quietly dropped and the choice remains between present continuous and simple past only. A pro-copula is, according to Ferguson, more likely in cases where the complement is a noun, less likely when it is an adjective, eg

2.1.1 (procop) লোকটি হল ক্লর্ক। The man is a clerk.

is more likely than

2.1.2 (procop) লোকটি হল বস্তী। The man is rich.

But we also find the following
verbs of being and having

2.5.8  এরা হচ্ছে চালুক।  They're clever.

2.5.9  এরা হচ্ছে খুব সৌখ।  They're very stupid. (TYB, p 154)

In these sentences we get a clearer impression of the semantic range of a pro-copula. The element of emphasis as well as 'hesitation' is present in this kind of story-telling mode. The term 'hesitation' is not really appropriate here; what the story teller does is to deliberately draw out the sentence, undoubtedly adding a pause after the pro-copula, in order to establish an element of expectation or suspense.

If we look again at the sentences in 2.1 some guidelines may be established. Keeping in mind Sableski's all-including informant, the point here is to find the examples where a pro-copula is likely to occur rather than ruling out its possible occurrence in other sentences.

In simple one-to one equations (sentences 2.1.1 to 2.1.8) the most likely occurrence of a pro-copula would be in sentences like

```
noun - noun 2.1.1 (procop) লোকটি হল কেরানি। The man is a clerk.
'definition' 2.1.7 (procop) গাছ হল গাছ। A tree is a tree.
'equation' 2.1.8 (procop) আজ হল বুধবার। Today is Wednesday.
```

It is possible but less likely in:

```
pronoun - noun 2.1.5 (procop) এরা হল আমার মেয়ে। These are my daughters.
noun - adjective 2.1.3 (procop) সে হচ্ছে সাঙ্গালি। He is Bengali.
```

This is perhaps an indication that সাঙ্গালি should be considered a noun here - it is certainly much more acceptable than any of the following

```
noun - adjective 2.1.2 (procop) লোকটি হচ্ছে ধনী। The man is rich.
noun - adjective 2.1.4 (procop) পাটি হল ছোট। The tree is small.
```

```
2.1.6 (procop) ? আমরা হচ্ছে দশজন। There are ten of us
```

This is relatively straightforward, though at least partly based on language intuition. In more complex sentences (2.1.9 to 2.1.17) a pro-copula is most likely to occur in defining sentences, eg

```
'definition' 2.1.15 (procop) বন্ধুর পশুর মধ্যে হাতি হচ্ছে সবচেয়ে বড় গাছ। The banyan tree is the biggest tree in this country.
(Brother James, p 123)

2.1.16 (procop) সাধারণ পশুর মধ্যে হাতি হচ্ছে সবচেয়ে বড়। Elephants are the largest of all land animals.
(Milne, p 112)
```

```
'equation' 2.1.17 (procop) গান গাওয়া হল আমার সবচেয়ে বড় অনন্য।
Singing is my greatest pleasure. (Brother James, p 11)
```

The following sentence is equational but with a different word order. The postpositional phrase অনেক বছর আগে থেকে for many years between subject and complement makes the use of a pro-copula less likely than in the above sentences and creates the dilemma of positioning the pro-copula either before or after the postpositional phrase. Neither solution is very satisfactory.
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This suggests that a pro-copula is most appropriately used in sentences where it can be inserted directly between the subject and the complement/predicate.

Sentence 2.1.12 is a pronoun-noun structure without postpositional phrase interference and should therefore be at least as acceptable as 2.1.9, but the pro-copula versions sound dubious to me:

- present continuous
- simple past

The first person present continuous form হাসি (as also in sentence 2.1.6 above) is, in fact, quite rare (the same goes for the second person familiar হাসি). It can be used in sentences like আমি হাসি। I am winning, but its sentence-medial position in 2.1.12 sounds unusual. The simple past pro-copula caused me some problems as I felt that it conveyed a past tense meaning. I have since been corrected on this point and accept that a past tense pro-copula with first and second person subjects does indeed exist and has no past tense meaning. My puzzlement on this point is perhaps an indication that pro-copula uses in these types of sentences are very rare. Logically, of course, there is little need for definitional sentences with first or second person subjects. The fundamental difference in meaning between tense-neutral pro-copula and normal tense-related uses lies entirely in the positioning of the হাসি form, eg

- 2.5.10 a) এখন হাসি। It is now evening.
- 2.5.10 b) এখন হাসি। It is now becoming evening.

Equally

- 2.5.11 a) আমরা হাসি। We are friends.
- 2.5.11 b) আমরা হাসি। We became friends.

The remaining sentences 2.1.10, 11, 13 and 14 all have adjectival complements, and though the use of a pro-copula is not, strictly speaking, wrong, eg

2.1.11 (procop) ?আমাদের চেয়ে বরং মৃত্যু হল ভাল।

Rather death than dishonour. (Milne, p 340)

the sentences, all other things being equal, sound much more idiomatic without it.

A pro-copula cannot be used in interrogative sentences (2.1.18 to 22). Negation of pro-copula structures is the same as for zero verb sentences, namely a form of the negative copula না. This is a further justification for classifying this structure here rather than under uses of হাসি.

And, after all this searching and deliberation, we come across a sentence like:

2.5.12 এদের ওর নাম হাসি।

Her name is Esther. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 102)

The verb form হাসি, which shouldn't be there at all, is in the wrong place but in the right tense to be considered a pro-copula. In order not to admit defeat, we can only declare this sentence to be an example for the triumph of living language over grammatical rules!
3. uses of হওয়া

হওয়া is what Ferguson calls a 'high-frequency, basic' verb in Bengali which has a variety of uses and meanings and can function as a copula in sentences where the complement is either a noun or an adjective.

Ferguson separates the uses of হওয়া into absolute, copulative and auxiliary uses. Instances of absolute uses are 'happen, turn out and modal values' (p 97). This includes passive structures, ie হওয়া with verbal nouns as subjects, eg আমার যাওয়া হবে না। lit: My going will not happen, ie I won't go, and also হওয়া following the infinitive of another verb to express obligation. Copulative uses include meanings of becoming, eg

3.1.1 চরা রুদ্ধ হল। The farmer became old. (Ferguson, p 101)

I am having the same difficulty here as I had with sentences 1.4.2 and 1.4.3 (p 10) to understand Ferguson's criteria for separating absolute from copulative uses. If

3.1.2 শেয়ালের চুল সুখ হল। The jackal grew very sad. (Ferguson, p 99)

is an absolute use of হওয়া describing a change of state, how can sentence 3.1.1 be seen as anything different? In sentence 3.1.1 we have a nominative subject with an adjective complement, whereas in 3.1.2 the logical subject is in the genitive and the complement-cum-grammatical subject is a noun. This constitutes a purely syntaxical variation, but in both sentences we have the same semantic component of change or becoming and I see no reason not to class these sentences together.

3.1 basic uses

হওয়া is an intransitive verb which has a dynamic dimension as one of its main semantic features. In the following sentences it can mean happen, take place, turn out. Examples are:

with the meaning happen

3.1.3 কি হল? কিছু হয়েছে? What happened? (Ferguson, p 98)

3.1.4 তোমার হয় বি... This didn't happen...

(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 91)

It can take a genitive complement, eg

3.1.5 তোমার কি হয়েছে? What happened to you? (Ferguson, p 98)

or a locative element:

3.1.6 ওখানে কি হয়েছে? What is happening over there? (Ferguson, p 98)

with the meaning take place

3.1.7 একটি পাত্রকত্ব অর একটি স্ত্রীলোকের মধ্যে কথা হয়েছে। A conversation is going on (taking place) between a man and a woman.

(Smith, p 86)

3.1.8 একটি অনুষ্ঠান হয়েছিল। A function took place.

(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 95)
verbs of being and having

with the meanings grow, become, turn out or describing a change of state

Both sentences 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 belong here. Also:

3.1.9 राजा बड़े हुए है। The king became very happy. (Ferguson, p 101)

3.1.10 অতীত মাঝে ফাঁকটিতে পেড়ের নেকরা বড় সুন্দর হয়।

If you write on good paper with a fountain pen it will turn out very beautiful. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 93)

3.1.11 মেরুক হলো মারিয়া। Maria became angry.

(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 102)

3.1.12 বড় ফুঁকারে দেখাতে ইচ্ছা হল। Iit: The wish to show it to her aunt 'occurred'.

She wanted to show it to her aunt. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 104)

3.1.13 অনেক রাত হল, ঐক্যায় ঘর খালি হল, শেয়ার সময় হল।

It's very late at night, a room has become empty, it's time to go to bed.

(all Smith, p 103)

All of these are regular uses of হওয়া, as mentioned by Bykova who points to the dynamic aspective properties of হওয়া which are not shared by the stative আছে or থাকা (see p 3?? ??). Ferguson says about হওয়া, and I agree with him: 'The notion of becoming in Bengali is expressed simply and regularly; it is the notion of being, including both existence and static identity, class inclusion, and the like, which is lexically and morphologically anomalous' (p 100) A number of the above sentences could also be used with আছে as the main verb, but their meanings would be quite different. I will come back to this in section 5.

3.2 following a verbal noun

Third person familiar forms of হওয়া in all tenses can be used following the verbal noun of any other verb to form what are essentially passive sentences in Bengali. The difference to English passive structures is that in Bengali intransitive as well as transitive verbs can be passivized, eg

3.2.1 আমার যাওয়া হবে। lit: My going will be, ie I will go.

3.2.2 তার সঙ্গে আমার একবার ও দেখা হয় নি।

I haven't even seen him once. (Ferguson, p 99)

Examples with transitive verbs:

3.2.3 মেয়েটিকে আম্বালুনো হাসপাতালে পাঠানো হয়েছে।

The girl has been sent to the hospital in an ambulance. (Smith, p 143)

3.2.4 নতুন বউকে কাজ করতে কলা হয়েছিল।

The new wife had been told to work. (Smith, p 143)

3.2.5 এখানে কাপোকপি করা হয়। Photocopying is done here. (Das, p 9)

In these sentences the dynamic, becoming component of হওয়া is no longer felt. The main purpose of this type of structure is to draw attention to the action and, with transitive verbs, away from the agent. When the agent is mentioned it is expressed in the genitive with the postposition দ্বারা by. Bengali passives are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 6.
3.3 with adjectives and some abstract nouns

होता is used in combinations with abstract nouns and some adjectives to form intransitive conjunct verbs. There is often, but not always, a transitive counterpart with करा make, do. Ferguson calls this an auxiliary use and says: 'होता combines with preverbs of various kinds to constitute compound verbs' (p 101). The term 'auxiliary' is usually associated with grammatical 'categories such as tense, mood, aspect or agreement' (Trask, p 25) and loss of lexical meaning. This is not the case with होता.

Ferguson's term 'preverbs of various kinds' is not only vague but wrong. The lexical items preceding होता (or करा) are nouns and adjectives which can be used as components in conjunct verbs but are otherwise quite independent. Semantically, होता in these combinations has a passive but also a dynamic happening element in it, ie it retains at least part of its own lexical meaning. Consequently, some conjuncts with होता can be juxtaposed not only with their transitive counterparts (with करा) but also with a stative structure formed with आছे. Since this is a regularly recurring pattern I will deal with it here rather than in section 5. Thus, we can have (with approximate translations)

3.3.1 बाबार राग होता. Father became angry.
3.3.1a) बाबा राग करता. Father is angry.
3.3.1b) बाबार राग आता. Father has a volatile temper.

with quite distinct meanings which are not easily captured by simple translation. Sentence 3.3.1a) is about present and tangible anger, which is either expressed (for instance by shouting) or suppressed and seething away under the surface. 3.3.1b) makes a statement about the father's character, not about his present behaviour. It means, essentially, that he has a potential for anger, a volatile temperament, even if he is quite peaceful at the moment This is a particularly interesting use of आता, which is usually associated very much with the here and now, cf the difference between He lives in Kolkata, but He is in Kolkata., whereas in sentence 3.3.1 b) the use of आता removes the subject anger from the immediate context. Sentence 3.3.1 is semantically somewhere in between the two preceding sentences. It means that father has become angry in this specific context but may not have expressed his anger yet. If the tense in sentence 3.3.1 is changed to the simple present बाबार राग होता. Father gets angry, its meaning comes a lot closer to the meaning in 3.3.1 b), but the basic difference remains in that the sentence with आता deals with a characteristic, the one with होता with a behavioural trait.

These semantic parameters are not automatically applicable to all conjunct verbs of this type. For instance, the two nouns शुरु beginning and शेष end have a dynamic semantic component which corresponds with होता. They are therefore unlikely to combine with stative verbs like आता or खाला.

3.3.2 आरु शुरुর शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष शेष

And in her heart the grief for him started. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 100)

3.3.3 तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज तेजस्तेज

Their game hasn't finished yet. (EEB, p 299)
Other conjunct verbs and their transitive (sentences a)) and/ or stative counterparts (sentences b)) arc:

3.3.4 রোমাসার কি হচ্ছে কাহে? Are you having difficulty walking?
(Klaiman, p 32)

3.3.4 a) সে রোমাসা অনেক কাহে। He has gone to a lot of trouble for you.

3.3.4 b) এই কাহে কাহে। He is in difficulty. This is not comparable to the structure with হওয়া.

3.3.5 আমার দেশ হয়েছে। I have done wrong. (Klaiman, p 33)
lit: My fault has happened.

The transitive counterpart দেশ করা is given in the dictionary but is, in my experience, very rarely used, probably because it would cause a semantic clash between admitting a wrongdoing (implicit in দেশ) on the one hand and a deliberate act on the other.

3.3.5 b) আমার দেশ আছে। can mean either I have my faults. or I am to blame.

depending on the context of the sentence. In the first instance, as in the examples with রাগ above, we are dealing with a character trait which is removed from the actual context, whereas আমার দেশ আছে। I am to blame makes an existential statement about a particular situation.

3.3.6 ভয় হয়েছে। He is afraid. (Klaiman, p 19)
a better translation may be He is getting scared.

3.3.6 a) আমি তাকে ভয় করি। I am afraid of him.

3.3.6 b) ভয় আছে। He is afraid.

This is an interesting example because even though ভয় করা is used transitively with an object, it does not, semantically, take on an active perspective. The sentence is perfectly normal, but there is a frequently occurring alternative ভয় করেছে। with the same meaning.

Syntactically, this structure is difficult to classify - although there is an active/ transitive verb there is no subject and hence it is questionable Whether or not ভয় fear can be considered an object. Sentences like these are, however, regularly used (see 3.3.7) and have to be considered a feature of Bengali.

The difference between sentences 3.3.6 and 3.3.6 a) is that in 3.3.6, particularly in the present continuous tense, there is a factor of fear building up. Sentence 3.3.6 a) simply makes a statement about the existence of a mental attitude. ভয় আছে does not, in itself, sound grammatically wrong, but it is difficult to think of a context where it would be used. ভয় করা with its unexpected semantic characteristics, takes over the slot that ভয় আছে would normally have filled (cf sentence 3.3.1 b)) and, to a certain extent, makes it redundant. The same relationship that holds between ভয় হওয়া and ভয় করা exists with অসুস্থ illness, ie

3.3.7 ভয় হয়েছে। He has fallen ill.
verbs of being and having

3.3.7 a) तार असून करते है। He is ill. (Smith, p 118)

3.3.8 (sentence 3.1.12, p 23)

With wish as in sentence

He is ill

Smith, p 118

3.3.8 a) तार इच्छा करते है। I don't want to eat. (Klaiman, p 5)

I don't want to eat. (Klaiman, p 5)

With or wish as in sentence

3.3.8 (sentence 3.1.12, p 23)

She wanted to show it to her aunt. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 104)

I want to go swimming; it is synonymous with इच्छा करते है।

Milne also has

3.3.8 b) तार इच्छा है। You wish to become a barrister.

(p 213)

This is somewhat removed from the immediate context and refers to a dormant ambition rather than to imminent arrangements.

3.3.9 a) तार भूल करते है। He made a mistake. (implies: inadvertently)

3.3.9 b) तार भूल करते है। He made a mistake. (through carelessness)

There are mistakes in this book.

3.3.10 अमार बিশ्नास है। I have come to believe.

I believe him.

3.3.10 b) अमार बिश्नास है। He has (underlying) faith.

3.3.11 यहाँ प्रमाण है। This has been proved.

3.3.11 a) यहाँ प्रमाण है। He can prove everything.

3.3.11 b) यहाँ प्रमाण है। They have no proof.

3.3.12 तार लाभ है। He made a profit. (implies: profit came his way)

3.3.12 a) तार लाभ है। He will be able to (actively) make a big profit.

3.3.12 b) तार लाभ है। What is the advantage in this?

This is used in a non-material sense.

3.3.13 सर ठीक है। Everything has come right.

(implies: a previous problem has sorted itself out)

3.3.13 a) अमार सेटी ठीक करते है। I will fix it/mend it.

from these few examples alone, the complex semantic relationships of these structures is apparent. It is not possible to deal with all of them here, but structurally the nouns and adjectives in question can be divided into these two groups:

1) those that can combine with होता, करा and आहे, as for instance:

with adjectives

3.3.7 a) तार असून करते है। He is ill. (Smith, p 118)

3.3.8 (sentence 3.1.12, p 23)

With or wish as in sentence

He is ill

Smith, p 118

3.3.8 a) तार इच्छा करते है। I don't want to eat. (Klaiman, p 5)

I don't want to eat. (Klaiman, p 5)

With or wish as in sentence

3.3.8 (sentence 3.1.12, p 23)

She wanted to show it to her aunt. (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 104)

I want to go swimming; it is synonymous with इच्छा करते है।

Milne also has

3.3.8 b) तार इच्छा है। You wish to become a barrister.

(p 213)

This is somewhat removed from the immediate context and refers to a dormant ambition rather than to imminent arrangements.

From these few examples alone, the complex semantic relationships of these structures is apparent. It is not possible to deal with all of them here, but structurally the nouns and adjectives in question can be divided into these two groups:

1) those that can combine with होता, करा and आहे, as for instance:

3.3.9 तार भूल करते है। He made a mistake. (implies: inadvertently)

3.3.9 a) तार भूल करते है। He made a mistake. (through carelessness)

3.3.9 b) तार भूल करते है। There are mistakes in this book.

3.3.10 अमार बिश्नास है। I have come to believe.

3.3.10 a) अमार बिश्नास करते है। I believe him.

3.3.10 b) अमार बिश्नास है। He has (underlying) faith.

3.3.11 यहाँ प्रमाण है। This has been proved.

3.3.11 a) यहाँ प्रमाण है। He can prove everything.

3.3.11 b) यहाँ प्रमाण है। They have no proof.

3.3.12 तार लाभ है। He made a profit. (implies: profit came his way)

3.3.12 a) तार लाभ है। He will be able to (actively) make a big profit.

3.3.12 b) तार लाभ है। What is the advantage in this?

This is used in a non-material sense.

3.3.13 सर ठीक है। Everything has come right.

(implies: a previous problem has sorted itself out)

3.3.13 a) अमार सेटी ठीक करते है। I will fix it/mend it.
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verbs of being and having

3.3.13 b) সব ঠিক আছে। Everything is fine. (stative use)

3.3.14 দোকানটা বন্ধ হয়েছে। The shop has closed down.
3.3.14 a) সড়কটা বন্ধ কর। Close the door! (active use)
3.3.14 b) সড়কটা বন্ধ আছে। The door is shut. (permanently?)

2) those that can take হওয়া and করা, but not আছে, eg

3.3.15 তার বই প্রকাশ হয়েছে। His book has been published.
3.3.15 a) সে কিছু প্রকাশ করে নি। He didn't reveal anything. (active use)

3.3.16 কোনটা পছন্দ হয়েছে? Which one did you like?
3.3.16 a) আমি দুই টি পছন্দ করেছি। I chose both of them.

There are, of course, many more examples like these which deserve a closer analysis and could make for an interesting research subject, but this is not the place to deal with them.

3.4 with মন heart, mind

This structure is closely linked to those described in the previous section, but since মন is in the locative its compound with হওয়া cannot be considered a conjunct verb. মন, like many of the conjunct verbs discussed, can combine with হওয়া, করা or আছ- and has these basic meanings:

3.4.1 আমার মনে হয় ... I think, lit: it is / occurs in my mind
3.4.2 তুমি কি মনে কর? What do you think?

The difference between the two structures is that মনে করা involves a more active and deliberate thought process than মনে হওয়া. মনে হওয়া is unlikely to be used in questions such as 3.4.1 a) * তোমার কি মনে হয়? It is also not used in the future tense, but is used in all other tenses, eg

past habitual 3.4.3 এখন প্রথম মনে হতো ... At the beginning he thought... (Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 107)
present continuous 3.4.4 তুরে রয়েছে মনে হচ্ছে। I think he has a fever. (Smith, p 104)
3.4.5 মনে হচ্ছে ও দূরে কোথাও হারিয়ে যেয়েছে। She is thinking that she has got lost somewhere far away.

(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 102)

conditional participle 3.4.6 অধিশৃঙ্খলা মনে হলেও মিথ্যা নয়।
Even if it seems unbelievable, it's not a lie. (Smith, p 116)

infinitive 3.4.7 সে - ওয়াইসও হাস্যকর মনে হতে পারে। Even that attempt can be considered ridiculous. (Smith, p 116)

মনে করা in the future tense, eg

3.4.8 সে কি মনে করবে? What will he think?

is perfectly acceptable. In negative sentences it is used with the meaning mind, object, eg

3.4.9 আমি কিছু মনে করব না। I won't mind at all.
3.4 expressing *must*, *obligation*

This structure was discussed, under the infinitive aspect, in the chapter on non-finite verb forms. In this section I want to concentrate on the role of হওয়া, particularly in comparison with the use of আছে- following an infinitive, expressing permission.

Sentences expressing obligation with the use of হওয়া are structured like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject in the object</th>
<th>হওয়া</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>স্ত্রীলিঙ্গ</td>
<td>infinitive of verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>হমাকে</td>
<td>in any tense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

eg আমাকে যেতে হবে। । I will have to go.

The structure can be used in any tense, but the future tense, often with present tense reference, is particularly common, eg

3.5.1. আমার কিছু করতে হবে না। । You don't have to do anything.

There are no imperative forms and non-finite uses are restricted to the conditional, eg

3.5.2 আপনার যদি যেতে হয় । and

3.5.3 আপনার যেতে হল । If you have to go...

The structure is not easy to explain. Milne attempts to draw a parallel with the Latin 'me ire necesse est' lit: *my going is needed*, ie *I need to go*, but then dismisses this by saying: 'I must admit that this theory seems to me somewhat farfetched and perhaps the best explanation is simply to say that the construction is an inexplicable idiom' (p 298). I do not see any real connection between the Bengali structure and Milne's Latin example - the presence of 'necesse' in Latin carries the meaning, whereas in Bengali the semantic value of obligation is carried by হওয়া alone. A much more comparable structure
exists, however, in English, namely in sentences like You are not to mention this to anyone, which has
the same semantic component of must as the Bengali তোমাকে (or তেমার) এই কথাটাকে কাটিয়ে বলতে হবে না।
We can only assume that verbs of being (আছ- as well as হয়) in connection with infinitives develop a
particular modal force. This is not entirely surprising when we find how versatile infinitives are in their
modal capacities, in English as well as in Bengali. In English we have sentences expressing

- purpose: I went to France to study architecture.
- sequence: He came back to find that his wife had left him.
- compulsion: She made him finish his homework. and, of course,
  He had to tell you about this.

In Bengali, apart from the structures with হয় (compulsion) and আছ- (permission), we can have

- purpose: আমি বাড়িতে বেঁচে আসেছি। I have come to see the baby.
- permission: আমাকে যেতে দাও। Let me go / allow me to go.

This is moving away from semantic properties of হয়, but it shows that the modal potential in these
sentences comes from the combined force of the two verbs taken together, not from either one of
them.

3.6 lexicalised derivations of হয়

This section is nothing more than a list of lexical items which are derived from হয় but have gained
an independent lexical status even though most of them retain some of their original verbal character.
Ferguson calls these 'marginal uses of হয়. I think that the more neutral term 'lexical' is more
appropriate.

- মেই হয় (maybe, perhaps)

  3.6.1 মেই হয় শিখার দেশ হইতে পতিত হইয়া থাকিবে।
  I think it may have fallen from the peak. (Milne, p 167)

- মেই হয় (may, perhaps)

  3.6.2 মেই হয়তঃ তোমার সঙ্গে যাবে। She may go with you. (EEB, p 249)

- প্যাসিবল possibly

  3.6.3 প্যাসিবল নাও হতে পারে। Maybe, maybe not.

- এই- না হয় (either- or)

  used as a conjunction, but still with a verbal character. The two parts of the
  sentence have to be syntactically matched, ie it is not possible to say
  * হয় আমি আজকে চিঠি লিখব না হয় তাকে টেলিফোন করতে পারব।
  ?Either I will write a letter today or I can phone him tomorrow.
  The English translation, if not expressly wrong, does not sound very good
  either.

  3.6.4 হয় আমি আজকে চিঠি লিখব না হয় তাকে টেলিফোন করব।
Either I will write a letter today or phone him tomorrow.

This is interchangeable with, and not as frequent as, বা or না

When it was hot we slept in the courtyard or on the veranda.

(Smith, p 113)

This is used as a postposition and has all but lost its verbal connection.

Since your departure he is withering away more and more each day.

(Milne, p 265)

Neither - nor

If I go there I won't get either studying done or going around.

(Ferguson, p 102)

A better translation may be:

If I go there I will get neither studying nor visiting done.

I think that a future tense verb form would be more appropriate in this sentence and I do not consider this use to be either very idiomatic or very common.

If this is so, then

This is used predominantly in conditional clauses and retains its verbal character fully.

If you have some special wish, say it. (Smith, p 167)

As তা হলে, this has its full verbal character and its function as a conjunction is probably not felt by Bengalis.

I will stay at home today. Otherwise we will not be able to go tomorrow.

(EEB, p 114)

via

as a postposition has lost its verbal characteristics.

We're going to Kolkata via Dhaka. (Ferguson, p 101)

ago

This, like পূর্বে, is also used adverbially, but with some connection to its verbal roots remaining, ie it can be understood as intervening time passing rather than referring to a point of time in the past tense. পূর্বে is used in the same way as আগে ago.
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4. uses of থাকা

The intransitive verb থাকা has the lexical meanings stay, live, remain, continue to be but also includes the meanings of being and having in its suppletive uses (4.2.) Negation and all tense uses are regular, but the simple past, present perfect and past perfect tenses of থাকা are severely restricted in their use. The past tense form of থাকে tends to be used instead.

4.1 absolute uses

These are the ordinary, lexical uses of থাকা, which need no further comment. Examples are:

4.1.1 আপনি কোথায় থাকেন?
Where do you live?

4.1.2 তুমি আর একটু থাকতে পার?  
Can you stay a bit longer?

4.1.3 ডাকাতির সাহের কি কাজকে থাকবেন?
Will the doctor be here tomorrow?

4.1.4 তাদের খাওয়ার পরে আর কিছু থাকবে না।
Nothing will be left (remain) after they have eaten.

4.2 suppletive uses for থাকে

থাকে supplies the tenses which are missing in the paradigm of থাকে, ie the future and habitual past tense. Since both থাকে and থাকা are stative/continuous verbs continuous verb forms are not often used and all past tense forms except the habitual past tend to be covered by the forms of থাকে (ছিলাম, ছিলে, ছিল, ছিলেন). থাকা also supplies the missing non-finite verb forms. The relevant structures in existential/possessive uses are

- future tense 4.2.1 আমার লোকান থাকবে। I will have a shop.
- past habitual 4.2.2 আমার লোকান থাকত। I used to have a shop.
- conditional
  - with যদি 4.2.3 a) আমার লোকান যদি থাকত... If I had a shop...
  - with participle 4.2.3 b) আমার লোকান থাকলে... If I have/ had a shop...
- verbal noun 4.2.4 আমার লোকান থাকা গোষ্ঠ... Until I have a shop...
- infinitive 4.2.5 তার লোকান থাকতে পারে। He may have a shop.
- perfective participle no examples with possessive meaning, but
- locative 4.2.6 আমি আর ঘরের দিন বাড়িতে থেকে জাকা থায়।

I will stay at home for a few days and then go to Dhaka.

Ferguson says on the meaning of থাকা in its suppletive uses: 'In the future tense, it is not completely clear that থাকা has other than its basic lexical meaning, but in the subjunctive suppletion থাকা seems to have no trace of its lexical meaning' (Ferguson, p 103). He gives the following examples:

4.2.7 ঘর থাকে তাকে বড় মানুষ বলে। A person who has wealth is called a rich man.

Ferguson considers this a subjunctive use where থাকে retains 'no trace of its lexical meaning', but in the following sentence its lexical meaning is present:
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4.2.8 If he is there, I will tell him.

I do not entirely agree with him on the future tense use of खाका. Sentence 4.2.1 can be either a suppletion of आज़- which results in the translation I have given I will have a shop, or it can be the non-suppletive future tense of खाका, in which case the sentence would mean My (existing) shop will stay, remain. The hearer's interpretation of the sentence आज़ दोकान खाके। depends on whether or not the speaker already owns a shop and on the hearer's knowledge of this.

Ferguson's two examples are misleading because the difference between them has nothing to do with types of suppletion. If 4.2.7 (a relative clause) is a subjunctive suppletion, then surely sentence 4.2.8 (a conditional clause!) must be the same. And in both sentences खाका retains some, though not all, of its lexical meaning. Sentence 4.2.7 is an existential/possessive use of खाका, घर देन खांके means literally whose wealth exists, which overlaps at least in part with the original meaning of खाका. Equally, in sentence 4.2.8 (a locative use) the translation of the sentence is determined by the context, ie the speaker is concerned with the other person's actual presence, not the fact that he lives there (and might be out!), so this, just as sentence 4.2.7, is a clear case of suppletion for आज़-.

4.3 following an infinitive

खाका can be used in all tenses following the infinitive of another verb to express a continuous or iterative aspect, eg

4.3.1 ने शून्यबे ना, कोही कलते थाके।

He will not listen, he will keep on talking. (Brother James, p 70)

4.3.2 पाकाका आर फितूकृत पाइते थाके।

The bird continued singing for a while longer. (Brother James, p 71)

4.3.3 कोई सकले बुझी हुटे थाके।

Tomorrow morning it will keep raining. (Brother James, p 71)

4.3.4 a) चा ठाका हुटे थाके।

The tea is getting cold.

4.3.5 a) जने ताय देव झक हुटे थाके।

His body is gradually growing stiff. (both Smith, p 147)

One of the risks in looking for examples to verify particular structures lies in losing touch with real language use. Combinations of हुटे with a form of खाका (sentences 4.3.3 to 5) are not representative of this structure, grateful though I am for the examples. Sentence 4.3.4 a) is grammatically correct but places, syntactically, an unnecessary burden on a mere cup of tea, or on a dead body, for that matter (sentence 4.3.5 a)! A much more ordinary way of expressing the same concepts is to say

4.3.4 b) चा ठाका हुटे थाके। and

4.3.5 b) ताय देव झक हुटे थाके।

This use of खाका in the future tense (sentences 4.3.1 and 4.3.3) is sometimes seen as a future continuous tense (discussed in tenses chapter p 7f), but what is more relevant here is its separateness from आज़- (see under 1.5). आज़- can also be used with a preceding infinitive but with a very different
meaning. It is interesting to see that the morphological and consequently syntactical limitations of আছে do not result in semantic restrictions, while a syntactically independent verb like থাকা stays within its semantic parameters.

4.4 following a perfective participle
Syntactically speaking, থাকা is used in these structures as the second component of an aspective compound verb. আছে can be used in a very similar way (see sentences 1.4.11 to 1.4.16) but is more restricted, not only to simple present and simple past tense, but also in the range of verbs it can combine with.

Examples with থাকা and its aspective nuances:

continued active states

4.4.1 এখনও অফিসিয়াল অস্বভাব জাতিরা এই ঢাল ব্যবহার করে থাকে।

The uncivilized tribes of Africa still use these shields.

continued existence of a state:

4.4.2 আমি চিরকাল তোমার পথ চেয়ে রহস থাকব।

I will be waiting for you forever. (both Smith, p 156)

Smith makes the distinction between active (4.4.1) and stative (4.4.2) verbs in their combinations with থাকা but I think that the semantic properties of থাকা can effectively turn active structures into stative ones, as in sentence 4.4.1, which comes under Smith’s category of ‘habitual actions’. This category seems to me better represented by sentences like the following which can also have an iterative aspect:

habitual, repeated action

4.4.3 যখন চুপ করিয়া থাকি তখন তাহার কথা মনে হয়।

Whenever I remain quiet his words come to my mind.

better translated as: Whenever I remain quiet I think of him.

4.4.4 আমি প্রায় এই সময়ে আহ্বান করিয়া থাকি।

I usually eat at this time. (both Milne, p 194)

This structure with থাকা is fully productive, ie it can be used with the perfective participle of any verb, active or stative, and represents an alternative to continuous tenses, eg

4.4.5 আমি ভাত খাও থাকলাম। is equivalent to

4.4.6 আমি ভাত খাইলাম। I was eating rice.

Some suggestions have been made to consider the future tense use of this structure as a future perfect tense for Bengali (discussed in the tenses chapter, p 71), but its use throughout all Bengali tenses would make this singling out of the future tense a rather arbitrary decision.

4.5 lexicalised uses

The perfective participle থাকে has acquired a separate function as a postposition, meaning from. It has moved both semantically and syntactically away from its verbal equivalent, though the verbal form is also used (eg sentence 4.2.6). The use of থাকে as a postposition is discussed fully in the chapter on post-positions (p 12f). Ferguson gives থাকে as being able to follow a nominative, locative or genitive noun. A noun in the locative is the normal form preceding থাকে as a perfective participle, a preceding nominative is expected with verbally derived postpositions, but the genitive structure, used by Tagore,
is grammatically difficult to justify.

5. COMPARISONS
This section aims to bring together the different structures and look at the way they overlap or contrast with one another. It also deals with negation in the simple present and other tenses. At the end of the section there is a list of mainly negative and past tense example sentences, some of them quite regular, others rather unusual. They need further analysis.

5.1 negation, tenses, overlapping and contrasting uses
We start with these broad assumptions which are partly based on Sableski's research. The reason for taking conditional sentences into consideration is that they require a verb form and can help to establish the otherwise not always obvious relationship between the verbs in question. The use of a procopula is not taken into account here. All verbs are given in 3rd person ordinary form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>present tense affirmative</th>
<th>present tense negative</th>
<th>past tense affirmative</th>
<th>past tense negative</th>
<th>conditional sentence affirmative and [negative]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>আছে</td>
<td>আছে</td>
<td>নেই</td>
<td>হয়</td>
<td>হয়</td>
<td>থাকে</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>আমার বই আছে।</td>
<td>আমার বই নেই।</td>
<td>আমার বই ছিল।</td>
<td>আমার বই ছিল না।</td>
<td>থাকে আমার বই যদি [না] থাকে</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>এরা ভিত্তিবান।</td>
<td>এরা ভিত্তিবান নয়।</td>
<td>এরা ভিত্তিবান ছিল।</td>
<td>এরা ভিত্তিবান ছিল না।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>হয়</td>
<td>হয় না</td>
<td>হয় না</td>
<td>হয় না</td>
<td>হয় না</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>এরা ভিত্তিবান।</td>
<td>এরা ভিত্তিবান নয়।</td>
<td>এরা ভিত্তিবান ছিল।</td>
<td>এরা ভিত্তিবান ছিল না।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>থাকে</td>
<td>থাকে না</td>
<td>থাকত।</td>
<td>থাকত।</td>
<td>থাকে নি</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সে এখানে থাকে।</td>
<td>সে এখানে থাকে না।</td>
<td>সে এখানে থাকত।</td>
<td>সে এখানে থাকে নি।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>হয়</td>
<td>হয়।</td>
<td>হয়।</td>
<td>হয়।</td>
<td>হয়।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভাল ফলল হয়।</td>
<td>ভাল ফলল নয়।</td>
<td>ভাল ফলল হয়।</td>
<td>ভাল ফলল নয়।</td>
<td>ভাল ফলল হয়।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>থাকে</td>
<td>থাকে।</td>
<td>থাকত।</td>
<td>থাকত।</td>
<td>থাকে।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সে এখানে থাকে।</td>
<td>সে এখানে থাকে না।</td>
<td>সে এখানে থাকত।</td>
<td>সে এখানে থাকে নি।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A simple table like this shows the connections between these verbs. The following observations can be made: আছ- and zero verb have the same past tense forms, আছ- and থাক- of course, have the same conditional forms, and zero verb and হয়ওয়া also share their conditional forms. We can conclude from this:

- A contrast exists between uses with আছ- and uses with হয়ওয়া. The uses of থাক- are by virtue of their suppletive function, fairly firmly attached to আছ-; the zero verb 'swings both ways', with past tense forms taken from আছ-; conditional forms from হয়ওয়া.
- nominal (with আছ-) and adjectival (with zero verb) structures
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We have implicitly established that modal and other abstract nouns are used with present tense or omitted आছे (sentences in 1.6) and are consequently negated with नहीं, with a few exceptions (see under 1.3.). Adjectival complements, on the other hand, are used in zero verb constructions and are negated with forms of न-.

Typical examples for these two structures are:

**Nominal**

- धारणा आयार दरकार। *I need the key.*
- धारणा is a noun, आयार can be omitted and negation is नहीं। *I don't need the key.*

**Adjectival**

- तौमार निष्कृति उचित। *You ought to say something.*
- निष्कृति is an adjective in a zero verb sentence, which means that no verb form can be supplied without a change in meaning. Negation is नहीं। *You shouldn't say anything.*

- आছ- and होता

In sentences which can be used with either आছ- or होता (section 3.3) होता has a dynamic, आछ- a stative aspectual nuance. This can occur with nouns as well as with adjectives.

**Nominal**

- तार राष्ट्र आছ। *He is capable of anger.*
- तार राष्ट्र होता। *He became angry.*

**Adjectival**

- से ज्यादा होता। *He is well.*
- से ज्यादा है। *He is not well.*
- से होता हार न है। *He hasn't got better.*

- Another facet of the difference in dynamics between होता and आछ- can be seen in this sentence:

  ना हो फसल, ना आछे एक मीठा जल। *No crops grow and there is not a drop of water.*

  (Ferguson, p 102)

होता has an affinity with natural processes and phenomena, such as crops, rain, floods, which is why we have a contrast between आछ- (existential/ locative) and होता (natural phenomenon) in this sentence.

- आछ- and थाका

In sentences which can have either आछ- and थाका the structures with आछ- result in a more immediate meaning, particularly in sentences with a locative component. Milne has the following contrasting pair of sentences, but taken out of context, their translations sound a bit arbitrary:

  with आछ- वालिबार मुख नाह। *I am ashamed to speak.*
  with थाका वालिबार मुख थाके न। *I cannot find an opportunity to speak.*
Here are some simpler examples:

- with არა:
  
  affirmative  ს კალკატაში არა.  \[\text{He is in Kolkata.}\]
  
  negative  ს კალკატაში არ არია.  \[\text{He is not in Kolkata.}\]
  
  past tense  ს კალკატაში ჰქონდა (არ).  \[\text{He was (not) in Kolkata.}\]

- with ვიცხადები:
  
  affirmative  ს კალკატაში ვიცხადი.  \[\text{He lives in Kolkata.}\]
  
  negative  ს კალკატაში ვიცხად არ არია.  \[\text{He does not live in Kolkata.}\]
  
  past tense  ს კალკატაში ვიცხად ჰქონდა (არ).  \[\text{He lived (didn't live) in Kolkata.}\]

- a note on past tense forms: the verb ვიცხადი has perfectly regular past tense forms ვიცხად (simple past, ვიცხად (present perfect), ვიცხად (past perfect), but these forms are rarely used. This is caused by the strong position of თან (ჰყოფა, ჰყოფ, ჰყოფ) for past tense existential uses. The only form of ვიცხად  which can withstand this appropriation is the past habitual form.

- ჰყოფ  and zero verb

  uses of ჰყოფ  and of the zero verb can be in contrast to one another. In these cases the zero verb has purely existential semantic properties whereas the uses with ჰყოფ  have a sense of becoming, turning out.

  - with zero verb
    
    affirmative  თან ჰყოფ ლუხალა სუნდა.  \[\text{His handwriting is beautiful.}\]
    
    negative  თან ჰყოფ ლუხალა სუნდა არ არია.  \[\text{His handwriting is not very nice.}\]
    
    past tense  თან ჰყოფ ლუხალა სუნდა ჰყოფ.  \[\text{His handwriting was beautiful.}\]
    
    (this sentence implies that he is either dead or no longer capable of writing)

  - with ჰყოფ
    
    affirmative  თან ჰყოფ ლუხალა სუნდა ჰყოფ.  \[\text{His handwriting comes out beautiful.}\]
    
    negative  თან ჰყოფ ლუხალა სუნდა ჰყოფ არ არია.  \[\text{His handwriting doesn't turn out very nice.}\]
    
    past tense  თან ჰყოფ ლუხალა სუნდა ჰყოფ.  \[\text{His handwriting turned out beautifully.}\]
    
    or
    
    თან ჰყოფ ლუხალა სუნდა ჰყოფ.  \[\text{His handwriting used to turned out beautifully.}\]

- Here again, the pervasive influence of ჰყოფ  is felt. თან ჰყოფ  ჰყოფა ჰყოფა ჰყოფ.  is grammatically correct, but has a slightly affected ring to it. The becoming properties of ჰყოფ, which are strongly felt in the present tense, become less perceptible in contexts removed from the present. In other words, the process through which someone arrives at
beautiful handwriting is no longer very relevant so 
and 
become almost 
interchangeable in this sentence. In other examples, however, the difference between 
them remains crucial eg.

- past tense of zero verb
  
  She was his wife.

- past tense of 
  
  She became his wife.

The aspective difference between the zero verb and 
can result in unexpected verb forms:

আমার যাওয়া উচিত ছিল না। 

I shouldn't have gone.

This is the expected past tense negative form, but we also find:

এমন একটি জন্য কাজ করা কিছুতেই আমার উচিত হয়নি।

I should never have done anything so horrible.

(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 94)

Although an aspective difference must be at the bottom of this, it would take a lot of 
semantic imagination to define this difference precisely.

- and 

regularly supplies the missing forms of 
but there are a number of cases where forms of 
are used instead, particularly in the future tense and in conditional sentences, eg.

in future tense

তোমার সময় হবে?

Will you have time?

অগুন্ধ হবে না তো?

This won't be inconvenient, will it?

কোনোর কথা হবে না।

There won't be a problem.

with conditionals

আরও দন্তার হলে বলে যাও।

Tell me if you need more.

সুমধুর হলে আমাকে টেলিফোন করিও।

Phone me if you get chance.

হঁচ্ছ হলে থেকে পার।

You can go if you want.

These sentences are all with abstract nouns, but there are other abstract nouns which are used with 
forms of 

তোমার সন্ধে থাকবে ... 

If you have doubts...

tার আপত্তি থাকবে ...

If he has objections...

cোনোর উপার থাকবে ...

If there is a way...

and, of course, with all concrete nouns, remains firmly in place:

আমার ঠাকুর থাকবে ... 

If I have the money...

তোমার গাড়ি / বাগান থাকবে।

You will have a car/ garden ... etc

There is, as in previous examples, a developmental element in the sentences with 

eg a wish growing, a need arising, a problem emerging, an opportunity forming, but it seems to me that in 
the majority of these sentences the use of 

is simply easy and convenient (if in doubt use 

!) and it would be a mistake to go looking for deep and meaningful semantic undercurrents.

5.2 further negative and past tense examples

1. with 
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existential/ possessive with nouns

আমার বলবার শক্তি নেই।  I am too weak to speak. (Milne, p 179)
আমার পরিবারের কাপড় নাই।  I have no clothes to put on. (Milne, p 179)

(genitive) verbal nouns of purpose (future directed), cf sentences 1.4.8 - 10)

এর উপরে আমার সন্দেহ নেই।  I have no doubts about him. (Klaiman, p 30)

with উপায়

একথা গোড়ার না করে উপায় নেই।  One cannot but agree with it. (Bykova, p 101)
এখন শুধু পড়া ছাড়া উপায় নেই।  There is no recourse now save to lie down.
(Smith, p 78)

past tense (affirmative and negative)

মিথ্যা বন্ধ উপায় ও ছিল না।  There was no way to lie.
(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 93)
তাহার আসিবার ইচ্ছা ছিল।  He was inclined to come. (Milne, p 179)

possessive

তুমি ছাড়া আমার আপন বলতে কেউ নেই।  
I have no one but you to call my own. (Ferguson, p 87)

locative

তিনি তা কিছুটেই নেই।  He is indifferent. (He is in nothing) Milne (p 219)

2. with the zero verb

fixed phrase

বড় একটা নয়।  hardly (Milne, p 216)

with adjectives

সে আমার চেয়ে পার্টি নয়।  He is not cleverer than I am. (Milne, p 218)
এটা সম নয়।  This is not bad (Das, p 9)
আমি সুখী নাই।  I am not well. (Milne, p 216)

possessive

নইটি আমার নয়।  The book is not mine.
এই তোমার কাজ নয়।  This is not for you to do. (Milne, p 186)

past tense

সর্বশেষে বেতন ছিল চারশ টাকা।  At the end her salary was 400 Taka.
(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 96)

existential (??)

আমি কুঁড়ি কেহ নয়।  Am I nobody? (Milne, p 211)

with উচিত (present neg and past tense)

তা করা কি উচিত নয়?  Shouldn't that be done? (Milne, p 218)
থাকা না তা হয়ে তবিন আমাদের নিয়ে থাকা উচিত নয়।  
We must not cease our efforts until it is accomplished. (Milne, p 215)
আমার বেঞ্চা উচিত ছিল।  I should have understood. (Smith, p 125)
verbs of being and having

I should have turned you over to the police. (Smith, p 125)

with future directed verbal noun in gen

Give him poisha or rupees, he is not the kind of man to forget.

lit: he is not of the forgetting (Milne, p 178)

He is not to be beguiled by those words (Milne, p 179)

should be He is not one to forget this.

He is not of the forgetting

I am not a man to run mad so easily. (Milne, p 179)

Joyoti is not a girl to be subdued.

(Bangla Journal, Vol 4, p 114)

with verbal noun + নয় (is not to be done)

This is not supposed to happen and it won't happen.

(from a personal letter)

implying purpose

Human beings don't just exist for love.

(Bangla Journal Vol 4, p 89)

This is syntactically similar to postpositional uses, cf এটা তোমার জন্যে,

unusual (expected নেই)

I don't wish to go there without an invitation. (Milne, p 176)

I can't adequately express how greatly he annoyed me. (Milne, p 200)

even more unusual

You have eaten, have you not?

You are ready, are you not? (both Milne, p 211)

According to the translations, these are questions asking for confirmation of a stated fact. We would expect

You haven't changed at all.

Brother James (p 23) has the ball, hasn't he?

Perhaps Milne's sentences are a sort of twisted variation of this, but how can it work with a second person subject?

3. negatives of হওয়া

You haven't changed at all.
verbs of being and having

The becoming, emerging component of होना is apparent here.

There is no song worth singing, no gift worth giving.

If Suhrat Babu hadn't helped me, I should have remained illiterate.

In subjunctive

It wouldn't be easy to explain.

4. with conditionals (affirmative and negative, होना and zero verb)

with होना:

It won't do if I don't go home.

It won't do for me not to go.

But today he can't go without eating.

One may as well call him a pundit

It is a simple thing and may be said without beating about the bush.

Milne's translation is very imaginative. Literally the sentence means

It's simple, just to say it is enough.

with हो ना:

Won't it be wise to call a doctor?

But won't you do well to look out for something else?

Shouldn't it be आर किस्म के देखकर हो ना?

I suspect that Milne's sentence may be a typing error.

7. SUMMARY

I said at the beginning of this chapter that Ferguson's article was excellent and then proceeded to criticize it all along the way, so maybe a correction is needed here. On the positive side there is the
clarity of his writing: what he does say, he says very well. His definition for the use of the zero verb in contrast to omission of आहँ (section 2) is an exemplary model for concise, lucid and accurate grammatical thinking. He has a clear concept of his objectives and his findings confirm his initial hypotheses but at the same time he does not shirk apparent contradictions as on the omission of आहँ—where he modifies his original assumptions.

The problems with his approach can be seen in two distinct but interlinked areas:

- He seems to have an unshakeable belief in the logic behind grammatical structures. His definitions start from the top down, eg uses of आहँ are divided into existential, copulative and auxiliary categories and all possible uses of आहँ are assigned to one or other of these categories. This, not surprisingly, leads to some unconvincing results. Examples are given in section 1.

  It is an unfortunate fact - and this goes beyond a comment on Ferguson's work - that many linguists are above all intent on making language structures fit into given categories. This is very understandable - what greater pleasure than finding a grammatical rule that works! But, it could be argued, what do we gain by distributing language structures into neat and well-defined compartments and thereby losing the language? What do we gain by clinging to our ideas of the way things should be and losing sight of the way they are?

  I started with Ferguson's 'unshakeable belief', but in a lot of ways this kind of linguistic procedure actually shows a lack of belief, a lack of belief in the underlying logic, not of grammatical definition, but of living language. As linguists our objective must be, above all, to observe how language is used and to attempt to draw some conclusions, even sometimes discover some rules, but our potential for discovery and learning is cut sadly and unnecessarily short if we shut our eyes to structures that 'do not fit'. These structures especially - we come across them all the time - show, not that there is something wrong with the language, but that we, as yet, 'see through a glass, darkly'. We are tempted to treat language as a research object, to be categorised, defined and compartmentalised, but we can gain and learn so much more if we treat it with the respect that any living organism deserves.

- Ferguson is very sparing with example sentences, ie it is not unusual for him to content himself with one or two examples to demonstrate language use. His discussion on the use of the pro-copula in Bengali is essentially based on the sentence जेठाटी है / है / हला झाँ. There is no attempt on his part to probe any further by doing, for instance, simple substitution tests to gain a bigger picture. The underlying, and ever recurring, problem with this is the plight of foreign linguists whose research is based on a given and limited body of language, but who are not themselves in the position to take their inquiries further because they have little or no intuition about the language and hence do not know which questions to ask. This does not prevent them from getting results and from frequently making accurate and valuable observations, but they exist, as it were, in a vacuum.
The only way out of this situation is to bring the research and the language together. This is so obvious - who would attempt a medical diagnosis without a thorough knowledge of how the human body works? Becoming intimately acquainted with a language takes time and dedication, but how can we otherwise make any real discoveries? This again comes back to respect for languages and their idiosyncrasies - especially for a language like Bengali whose grammar has been subjected to numerous diagnoses by undoubtedly dedicated, but essentially 'outsider' linguists. Their work has provided us with a basis but - this may sound harsh - has also created an enormous gap between a postulated research object 'Bengali' and the living language which is spoken by every child in the streets of Kolkata or the villages of Bangladesh. We need to close this gap!

But back to our structures. The main findings (and areas for future research) in this chapter can be listed as follows:

- the importance of the zero verb (not 'the verb is omitted!') as the main copula in Bengali
- the still uncertain use and function of the procopula
- the peculiar standing of abstract nouns in their uses with either হওয়া or আছে-
- the potential of nouns and adjectives to form conjunct verbs with হওয়া, করা and/or আছে- and their semantic implications
- the syntactic and semantic overlap of verbs of being in certain areas and also their contrasting uses
- the unexpected power of the incomplete verb আছে- to usurp the past tense uses of complete verbs like থাকা as well as হওয়া - a true David and Goliath situation
- the as yet unexplored suppletion of আছে- in dependent, eg relative clauses, eg ঘাঁর ঘন থাকে vs ঘাঁর ঘন আছে
CHAPTER 6
WORD ORDER AND SENTENCE STRUCTURE -
PASSIVE AND IMPERSONAL STRUCTURES

PRELIMINARIES

This chapter was meant to give an overview of Bengali sentence structures, active and passive, coordinating and subordinating sentences, complex sentence types such as conditional and relative sentences. A chapter like that would have brought this thesis to a fitting close but it would have been either too long or too cursory. The complexity of, for instance, the Bengali relative-correlative system is not something that can be dealt with in one or two paragraphs. As a result of this, the chapter is something of a compromise. The first half is on some characteristic features of word order and sentence structure in Bengali, the second half concentrates on passives and impersonal structures.

The research situation on sentence structure is such that there are transformational analyses of individual syntactic features (Humayun Azad on pronominalization, Abul Manzur Morshed on relativization, Tanmoy Bhattacharya on Bengali determiners) but, from a more general point of view, there are a number of (mainly non-Bengali) authors who begin their discussions of specific grammatical topics with brief introductions of 'a few basic grammatical principles' (Klaiman, p 2). These introductions vary considerably in depth and in perspective and would make for an interesting study in themselves. As an example, I have given Bykova's observations in section 6.1.

There is a deplorable but persistent tradition of describing the structures of one language in terminology which is suitable for another. Generations of German school children were taught English -ing forms in terms of gerunds (reading is one of my favourite pastimes) and were informed of the lack of gerundives in English as if the German translation of a Latin phrase like liber legendus - ein zu lesendes Buch a book to be read were not also a rather artificial grammatical construct.

All of this changed with the advent of linguistics as an academic discipline, with Saussure's synchronic structuralist approach and the concept of linguistic relativity (Sapir/Whorf) emerging in America, based on first analyses of Indian American languages. These new departures in linguistic thinking brought with them the recognition that grammatical categories are not a given framework which can be superimposed on all languages, but that there is in fact a great deal of structural variety between languages, which may call for a redefinition and adjustment of grammatical categories. In practice this means that in descriptive linguistics we move away from the well-tried grammatical concepts of Latin and instead use terminology which is more suitable for a language like English.

In describing Bengali language structures, again, we have to adjust our frame of reference. In a teaching context a one-to-one transposition from, say, English to Bengali can hardly be avoided, but on a more analytical level we begin to recognize fundamental differences in many areas, which need more appropriate definitions. The most important of these areas are, in my view, the postpositional system,
the fluidity of word classes, the parameters of passive and impersonal structures and the concept of transitivity. Bengali, of course, shares many of these features with other South Asian languages, and a terminology to describe these features is gradually building up, notably in collections like Manindra Verma's *Complex Predicates in South Asian Languages*. A definition of Bengali grammatical categories can and should not be based on translation from English, whereas comparative studies with other South Asian languages will undoubtedly lead to a clearer picture. This chapter can only make some tentative suggestions.

1. Language Typology

The linguistic discipline of language typology is based on the belief that languages share particular, systematic features called language universals, and that a study of these features can establish typical mechanisms and allow a classification of languages accordingly. One of the most visible features languages display is word order. It is important from the outset to distinguish between word order and sentence structure: word order and word order variations happen at the speech act (the situational, pragmatic) level of language; sentence structure is concerned with the syntactic relationship between the parts of a sentence. Henri Weil, in his book *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes* (Paris 1844), was the first European linguist to pursue seriously this line of enquiry. He gives this Latin example to show the fundamental difference between word order and sentence structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Idem Romulus Romam condidit.} \\
\text{Hanc urbem condidit Romulus.} \\
\text{Condidit Romulus Romam.}
\end{align*}
\]

In all three sentences the underlying syntactic structure remains the same: Romulus is the subject (S), Romam (or urbem) the object (O) and condidit the verb (V), but the word order varies according to the contextual situation.

In spite of this apparent variability in word order, each language has an inherent underlying word order which is typically used in sentences that express no particular emphasis. Thus, the Latin unmarked sentence

\[
\text{Romulus (S) Romam (O) condidit (V)}
\]

would in English be

\[
\text{Romulus (S) founded (V) Rome (O)}
\]

and in Bengali

\[
\text{রম্যুলাস (S) রোমে (O) ভিক্ষুণ্য করল (V)}
\]

Research on language typology, in particular Joseph Greenberg's work, has shown that word order patterns such as SVO (English, Dutch, Chinese, Russian, Italian, Spanish, Greek etc) or SOV (Bengali, Latin, Japanese, Farsi, Hindi, Sanskrit etc) go hand-in-hand with other language features, such as the existence of pre- or postpositions, the placing of determiners before or after nouns, the presence or absence of pro-drop and of dative subjects. These are called implicational language universals.

Another classifying distinction between languages, which undoubtedly links in with the word order system, is the amount of grammatical inflection. There is, at least in natural languages, no such thing as zero inflection, so this is a quantitative feature and there are often historic changes involved. Old English was a highly inflected language with noun and adjective declension, gender and a complex...
conjugalional system, features that are still found, for instance, in German. Modern English is a predominantly analytic language, which means that it is made up mainly of free lexical units and there is little remaining inflection. Bengali is a moderately inflected language with verbal conjugation according to person and tense and case marking for nouns and pronouns.

The extent of inflection in a language has an immediate influence on the flexibility of word order. In order to produce unambiguous sentences, English has to follow a relatively rigid word order. Bengali has more freedom - so much, in fact, that Smith states baldly: 'Word order in Bengali is free' (p 162).

A very simple example of the difference between English and Bengali word order is the sentence: *The boy loves the girl* - which can only be given in this word order. In Bengali we can say

*বালের লাল মেয়েকে ভেলোসুই*##

with the subject at the beginning of the sentence; or the subject - object order can be reversed as in

*ভেলোসুই মেয়েকে বালের লাল*##

with the same meaning, but different emphasis.

2. Word Order
Linguistically, words are the lexical or morphological units which are put together in sentences to convey meaning. In all languages, words can be grouped together into word classes with different characteristics. Some word classes are closed as for instance determiners or prepositions in English; others are open, which means that new words can be formed and become part of the lexicon, eg verbs like *to surf, to access, to mosh* and the latest *to google* in English. Languages have rules which determine the way words are put together. In English, as mentioned above, articles precede nouns, in Bengali they follow nouns. English has prepositions, Bengali has postpositions.

Word order describes the way words are put together to make meaningful statements, but words within a sentence also fulfil particular syntactic functions. Any structure which can be considered a sentence - this is disregarding one-word exclamations or ellipses - has to have at least two components, a subject and a predicate. The predicate almost invariably contains a verbal element as well as whatever objects or complements are required by the particular verb; the subject usually contains a nominal form. This is true for English and Bengali as for most languages, but again Bengali has more flexibility than English. The almost infinite number of ways in which the subject and predicate slots can be filled is, in a nutshell, what the study of syntax is all about.

The difference in basic word order between English and Bengali can be seen in the following graph, taken from Longman's grammar (p 3):
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word order and sentence structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>verb</th>
<th>object</th>
<th>manner</th>
<th>place</th>
<th>time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>bought</td>
<td>a hat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yesterday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The children</td>
<td>ran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We</td>
<td>ate</td>
<td>our meal</td>
<td>in silence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The car</td>
<td>stopped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>suddenly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The young girl</td>
<td>with long black hair</td>
<td>walked</td>
<td>confidently</td>
<td>across the room.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bengali</th>
<th>predicate</th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>manner</th>
<th>place</th>
<th>object</th>
<th>verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>আমি</td>
<td>গতবার</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>উপবাসি</td>
<td>কিনেছি।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>বাবারা</td>
<td>মোড় দিয়ে</td>
<td>বাসায়</td>
<td>পিছেছে।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>আমারা</td>
<td>চুপ করে</td>
<td>ভাল</td>
<td>খেললাম।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>পাড়িটা</td>
<td>হঠাৎ করে</td>
<td>খেলা</td>
<td>পেল।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*মেয়েটি</td>
<td></td>
<td>সম্প্রস্ফুটভাবে</td>
<td>ঘরে</td>
<td></td>
<td>পার হয়েছে।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The subject the young girl with long black hair can be given in Bengali only with a relative clause and even in that construction it sounds clumsy. Part of the problem is that all the additional information (young, with long black hair) would have to be positioned before the subject মেয়ে girl or যুবকী young girl, but another difficulty arises from the underlying sentence মেয়েটির লম্বা কালো হার আছে। The girl has long black hair. In English this can be contracted to with long black hair and in Bengali it can be given as a relative clause: যার লম্বা কালো হার আছে সে মেয়েটি ... but no suitable adjective can be formed from আঁ-। A different attribute such as in the long black dress could be expressed in Bengali, though still not very elegantly, with a verbal adjective লম্বা কালো পুরুষ যুবকী the young girl wearing a long black dress.

The only other significant difference is in the sentence The children ran home, where the Bengali sentence literally means The children went home running, ie running becomes an adverb describing manner. The Bengali verb মোড় দেওয়া run cannot, by itself, take a directional complement.

3. Regressive Syntax
3.1 verbs and what goes before them

As we have seen, in unmarked Bengali sentences the verb comes at the end and any objects or complements are put before the verb. This results in what Smith calls 'regressive syntax' or Marian
Maddern the 'backwards' character of sentences. Smith gives these graphic examples to show the difference between Bengali and English syntactic mechanisms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>খরচ</th>
<th>the cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>সারা বছরের খরচ</td>
<td>the cost of an entire year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>আলোক-সারাসারি খরচ</td>
<td>the cost of an entire year's provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>মৃৎজন মানুষের খরচ</td>
<td>the cost of an entire year's provision for three people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a noun phrase expansion which does not contain a verb, but it is the verb in sentence final position which causes this type of structuring. Here is a complete sentence which shows the same features (also from Smith)

বর্ধমান নামের উৎপত্তি সহজে ব্যাখ্যা করা যায় না।

_The origin of the name Burdhwan[sic] cannot be explained easily._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>উৎপত্তি</th>
<th>the origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>নামের উৎপত্তি</td>
<td>the origin of the name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>বর্ধমান নামের উৎপত্তি</td>
<td>the origin of the name Burdhwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>যায় না</td>
<td>cannot be (lit: doesn't go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ব্যাখ্যা করা যায় না</td>
<td>cannot be explained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সহজে ব্যাখ্যা করা যায় না</td>
<td>cannot be explained easily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sentence organisation shows clearly the division between the two basic sentence components: the subject and predicate, both ' regressively ' expanded.

Objects precede their verbs and in unmarked contexts indirect objects precede direct objects, eg

সে তোমাকে (indirect object) চিঠি (direct object) লিখবে।

_He will write you a letter._

3.2 morphology

This seems an appropriate point for a morphological digression. Bengali makes no distinction between direct and indirect objects, though their semantic properties remain. Inanimate objects are usually unmarked for case, eg

আমি ছবিটি দেখেছি।

_I have seen the picture._

but there is a growing tendency to add the object case ending, to concrete as well as to abstract nouns.

Here are some examples from Probhesh Das, _He nari, akash hou_ (p 58ff):

বিনী ফুল রূপেছে হিন্দু বিবাহকে।

_He misunderstands the concept of Hindu marriage._

সাম্ভবতঃ সে জীবনকে,সেসারকে সমান সাহিত্যে ভাস্কর করে নয় জীবনের পথে এগিয়ে চলছেন।

_She proceeds on the path of life by sharing equal responsibility for life and the family with her husband._

(This is from a rather biased speech on women's rights!)

এই সমস্যাকে আরও জুড়েছে।

_They have exacerbated this problem._
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The following example is from Bangla Journal (henceforth BJ), Vol 5, No 1, p 78:

Nipa thought Nadim's objections were just an excuse.

We also find that object endings are sometimes added to oblique plural nouns or pronouns in order to distinguish them from genitive forms, as in

এস আমাদেরকে কিছু বলে নি।     *He didn't tell us anything.*

Morphologically, this indicates an increase in inflection and shows a development in the opposite direction from English, which has moved away from an inflected to an analytic structure.

3.3 government

The 'regressive' ordering of syntactic elements in a sentence is one of the crucial features which distinguishes SOV from SVO languages and is related to, but also distinctive from, word order. The relationship between a verb and its (in Bengali preceding) object is one of government, i.e. the verb determines whether or not an object is required and an object does not exist without a governing verb. This same hierarchical situation exists wherever one syntactic element is dependent on another. Verb-object dependency is easy to see, though, in English for instance, objects are not obligatory after verbs like *write, teach, tell, show,* and there are a number of verbs which can be either transitive or intransitive (*I rang the bell vs. the phone rang* etc) Milne uses the same terminology to describe the relationship between a verb and an adverb, even though adverbs are optional sentence elements. In Bengali, then, governed elements precede governing elements. The difference between English and Bengali can be seen in the following table. Governed (or dependent) elements are underlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>governed element</th>
<th>Bengali (before governing element)</th>
<th>English (after governing element)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subordinate clauses</td>
<td>সে যে পাখন আমি বিচ্ছাস করি না।</td>
<td><em>I don't believe that he is crazy.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>আমি যা বলি তা ভুলি শুন না।</td>
<td><em>You don't listen to what I say.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>এই কাজ়টা লেখ হলে ভুলি শুনি হবে।</td>
<td><em>You will be happy when this work is finished.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td>আমি ওই মেয়েকে পছন্দ করি না।</td>
<td><em>I don't like that woman.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-finites</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>I can't imagine...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>infinitive verbal noun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>আমি ভাবতে পারি না।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>সে বুঝতে লাগল।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>তার ইতান করা ডাল লাগে।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbs</td>
<td>হঠাৎ নিস্তাগ্ত নেওয়া।</td>
<td>to decide suddenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbial phrases</td>
<td>time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>আমি পরে সে কথা বলব।</td>
<td><em>We will talk about this later.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>আমি কোথাও যাব না।</td>
<td><em>I'm not going anywhere.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ও বাস করে যায়।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. Implicational Universals

As mentioned above, language universals such as word order - SOV in the case of Bengali - are accompanied by other, implicational patterns. There has been a vivid but rather futile discussion, notably Greenberg (1960s) and Lehmann (1970s), about the chicken-and-egg factor concerning these structures, but for the present purposes it is enough to recognise that these phenomena tend to occur together.

4.1 pro-drop

Pro-drop means that a language can omit personal pronouns in the subject position. Both Italian and Spanish (both SVO languages) are pro-drop languages. In Spanish pro-drop is so common that verbal paradigms in textbooks are usually given without pronouns altogether. It is logical to assume that pro-drop occurs in languages with unambiguous conjugational systems where tense and person information is given in the verb forms. Bengali also has pro-drop, but it is not as automatic as in Spanish. It is particularly noticeable in answering yes-or-no questions where Bengali uses only the verb form, eg

- Have you been to Kolkata? Yes, I have.
- Will you have some tea? Yes, please.
- Can you speak Hindi? No, I can't.
- Will you give me ten Taka? Yes.

In narrative texts we find many examples where a subject, once given, is dropped and subsequent sentences are 'subjectless', eg:

- Babu became very worried. He (omitted) was thinking about Cadu.
- Suddenly he (omitted) remembered the incident from the year before.

(Bimol Kar, Uttorer hawa, p 101)

The rules for where pro-drop occurs and where it doesn't are very much context-based in Bengali. Where the reference is clear from the context, eg

- I don't know why. (BJ 3, p 46)

subjects can be dropped, but this is not an automatic process. As can be expected, pro-drop occurs much more frequently in first and second person than in third person statements.

4.2 postpositions

In accordance with the recognized pattern for SOV languages, adpositional elements in Bengali follow a nominal phrase, which is a complicated way of saying that Bengali has postpositions, not prepositions. There are only very few exceptions to this. Milne has the sentence

- I cannot see without preceding a locative noun phrase: I cannot see without spectacles. (Milne, p 271)
A comparable example in English is the postpositional use of *notwithstanding* (rules notwithstanding).

Interestingly, the semantic equivalent in German *zum Trotz* is also postpositional, as in *allen Regeln zum Trotz* _despite all the rules._

### 4.3 Position of Determiners

One of the implicational universals of SOV languages is that determiners are placed after nouns. Bengali conforms to this rule on the whole, but the distribution and application of definite, indefinite articles and demonstrative adjectives is quite different in Bengali from the way it is in English. In certain cases the article can be omitted, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Bengali</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definite/Indefinite Articles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing def (animate)</td>
<td>রোজা (রোজা) আসছে।</td>
<td>the girl is coming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing def (inanimate)</td>
<td>রোজা (রোজা) আসছে।</td>
<td>the car is coming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing indef (animate)</td>
<td>একজন, একজন রোজা আসছে।</td>
<td>a girl is coming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing indef (inanimate)</td>
<td>একজন রোজা আসছে।</td>
<td>a car is coming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural def (animate)</td>
<td>রোজা আসছে।</td>
<td>the girls are coming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural indef (inanimate)</td>
<td>রোজা আসছে।</td>
<td>there are cars coming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that the singular indefinite article can be formed with the word for _one_ plus the 'definite' particle রোজা for inanimates, জন, জি for humans. The same pattern applies for attributive numerals, as in একটা রাস্তা _one road, তিনটি মহিলা three women_ and the equivalent interogatives কতটা খেলার _how many games, কতজন ছাত্র how many students?_ This in effect shifts the article to a prenominal position, but as an attachment to a numeral or question word it is still postpositional. Demonstrative adjectives _this, that_ consist of the demonstrative particle which precedes the noun, and the definite determiner which follows it, but _singular determiners can be omitted, e.g._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Bengali</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrative Adjectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing (here)</td>
<td>এই রোজা(রোজা), এই কলম(রোজা)</td>
<td>this girl, pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing (there)</td>
<td>এই রোজা(রোজা), এই কলম(রোজা)</td>
<td>that girl, pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rem from context</td>
<td>সে রোজা, সে কলম</td>
<td>that girl, pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural (here)</td>
<td>এই রোজারা, এই কলমগুলো</td>
<td>these girls, pens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural (there)</td>
<td>এই রোজারা, এই কলমগুলো</td>
<td>those girls, pens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rem from context</td>
<td>সে রোজারা, সে কলমগুলো</td>
<td>those girls, pens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have given the translations for rows 3 and 6 as _that and those_ only because there are no equivalent adjectives in English. Combinations with neither-here-nor-there _সন্ন_ in the singular do not usually add the determiners রোজা or রোজা, but they can be used for a more definite sense.

### 4.4 Dative Subjects
So-called dative (or: experiencer) subjects, which in Bengali are usually in the genitive, occur in many South Asian languages and are linked with a particular group of verbs. This will be discussed in more detail in section 8 on impersonal structures, but here are some examples for the type of structure under consideration. In all these sentences the semantic subject is in the genitive, the verb form is in 3rd person and the verb generally, but not always, expresses something that is experienced, not done, by the (semantic) subject. English translations are best given as active sentences.

4.4.1 আমার আজকে খুব ভাল লাগছে। I am feeling very well today.
4.4.2 তার অসুখ হয়েছে। He has fallen ill.
4.4.3 পাপটু তোমারে কেমন লেগেছে? How did you like the story?
4.4.4 বাবার কলকে আমার অস্বস্ত। Father won’t be able to come tomorrow.
4.4.5 আমার মূখ্য ভাই আছে। I have two brothers.
4.4.6 আপনার আর কি দরকার? What else do you need?
4.4.7 তার ভয় হয়েছে। He is afraid.
4.4.8 তোমার কি খাওয়া ইচ্ছা করে? What would you like to eat?
4.4.9 তুমি এখানে থাকার কারণ কি? Why is he staying here?

These few example sentences show what a variety of meanings are structured in this way.

5. Changes in Word Order (emphasis)
Smith says that word order in Bengali is free. This is true in as far as simple sentences like I have told you the truth can be arranged in all possible variations. The unmarked order is

5.1 আমি (subj)বলেছ। (indir obj)সত্যি (or সত্য) কথা (dir obj)বলেছি (verb)।

This word order can be changed with the purpose of emphasising any of the four sentence components. Smith says that stressed components go at the end of the sentence, eg the sentence

বলেছ। (indir obj)সত্যি কথা (dir obj)বলেছি (verb) আমি (subj)।

implies that other people may have lied to father. The stressed sentence part can also, however, stand at the beginning:

বলেছি (indir obj)আমি (subj)সত্যি কথা (dir obj)বলেছি (verb)।

implies that I may have lied to other people. Stress is above all a feature of intonation in spoken language and an isolated, written sentence cannot convey its possible overtones. Suffice it to say that both the initial and the final sentence position are used for emphasis. All combinations are grammatically acceptable but, for instance

বলেছি বলাকে সত্যি কথা আমি।

with the verb at the beginning and the subject at the end, beautiful though it may sound, is likely only in poetry.

The statement that word order in Bengali is free should, however, not be taken to imply that word order is arbitrary. If and when word order is changed from the normal SOV sequence, there is usually good reason for it. The positioning of adverbial phrases is relatively variable. In the sentence
5.2 In the afternoon Nishan and her friends would come to the canteen from a different college. (BJ 3, p 73)

we have one time- and two place-adverbials placed at the beginning and at the end purely in order to achieve a pleasant flow in the sentence - there is no particular emphasis intended here. Placing the adverbials all together in between the subject and the verb would simply make the sentence too heavy. Statistically, in an arbitrary body of contemporary non-fiction text no less than 80% of sentences have the verb in final position - this is an estimate from about 150 pages of text from three consecutive issues of the Bangla Journal. I was surprised by this, particularly in view of fairly free adverbial movement - this may be more relevant to fictional texts - but it shows the overall regularity of Bengali word order.

Emphasis has been mentioned as a reason for word order change. Other reasons are, for instance, the complexity of particular parts of the sentence. I will restrict myself to three examples.

In the following sentence we have a long postpositional phrase preceding a one-syllable subject and thus, in a way, fulfilling an attributive function:

5.3 A knock could be heard from the other side of the door leading to the kitchen. (BJ 5, p 79)

Long complements can follow verbs, eg

5.4 And in this he was different from the intellectual elite, close to ordinary people, one of them. (BJ 3, p 45)

This can be interpreted as an emphatic use, but in a narrative context such as this, and with the semantically bland verb argument at the end of the sentence simply gives it the appropriate weight. The same is true for

5.5 This also became possible through Chofa’s interest. (BJ 3 p 47)

In sentence 5.6 we have a juxtaposition of conjunct verbs - the precise syntactic relationship between abstract nouns like chat, discussion, argument and the verbs they combine with awaits further research. The positioning of argument at the end of the sentence is, in this case, an emphatic device.

5.6 As many talks and discussions as I have had with him, I think I have had more arguments. (BJ 3, p 48)

6. Sentence Structure

This section is nothing but a brief glimpse at some of the issues that relate to sentence structure in Bengali. I chose Bykova’s account of Bengali sentence structure for her succinct statement on what she
sees as typical for Bengali. Section 6.2 summarises some of my own thoughts. These are, more than anything else perhaps, preliminaries for future research possibilities.

6.1 E. M. Bykova

Bengali sentences can be two-peak, three-peak or four-peak, depending on what type of verb is involved. The first split is between nominal and verbal sentences. Bykova’s nominal sentences are what is more commonly called copulative sentences and can only have two peaks. The table (note the graphic effect!) shows her basic sentence types (my examples). English translations of these simple sentences are (6.1.) 1. Rabindranath is a poet. 2. The girl is beautiful. 3. The boy is crying. 4. I will drop him off. 5. He has opened the door. 6. I will give you the key. 7. He will explain this matter to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nominal (2 peak)</th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>noun complement</td>
<td>6.1.1 কবি।</td>
<td>ব্যক্তি।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj complement</td>
<td>6.1.2 সুন্দর।</td>
<td>ব্যক্তি।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verbal</th>
<th>subject</th>
<th>indirect object</th>
<th>direct object</th>
<th>verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 peak, intransitives</td>
<td>6.1.3 চেলাটি</td>
<td>কাঁদে।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 peak, causative of intransitives</td>
<td>6.1.4 আমি তাকে নামায়।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 peak, transitives</td>
<td>6.1.5 উনি দরজাটা খুলেছে।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 peak, transitives</td>
<td>6.1.6 আমি তোমাকে চাহিদাঁ। লেব।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 peak, causative of transitives</td>
<td>6.1.7 সে আমাকে কথাটা বুঝবে।</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This type of classification does not take into account adverbial or other optional parts of the sentence. In fact, it is little more than a demonstration of verb valency. That is presumably her reason for bringing in the matter of causative verbs. She indicates that some causatives of transitive verbs can revert back to three-peak structures by dropping the direct object and moving the indirect object into the direct object slot, eg

6.1.8 মা ছেলেকে ভাত খাওয়ায়।  The mother gives the boy rice to eat. (four-peak)
6.1.9 মা ছেলেকে খাওয়ায়।  The mother feeds the boy. (three-peak)

Bykova herself admits that the difference between 6.1.9 and a non-causative sentence like 6.1.5 is purely semantic and has little to do with sentence structure as such. She does, however, stress the importance of two-peak nominal sentences as she includes in them verbal noun ‘constructions […] with modal meanings (সম্ভব possible, গরিবনাথ necessity, উচিত proper, অর্থাৎ necessary) and the verb চলুন’ (p 147). She sees these as essentially copulative, ie subject - complement structures. This is one
possible interpretation of them, but the syntactic shape of these 'modals' is rather vague. Would she include in this group sentences like

_He has no right to say this._

with an infinitive rather than a verbal noun? I suspect that these structures are more complex than Bykova sees them. I have discussed them in more detail in chapter 1 (p 40ff).

Bykova sums up in one paragraph her perception of what is typical in Bengali as a language. It would be absurd to expect anyone to give their impressions of a language in a few sentences, but when a statement like that is made spontaneously it is all the more telling and I want to quote it in full:

'The peculiarities of the Bengali patterns manifest themselves in the sphere of functioning. The diversity of their functions is by far greater than the functions of corresponding sentences observed in other languages. This can be explained by the infinite possibility of combining a noun-subject with a verb of being - existence (practically any noun); the poly-functionality of the genitive case, specifically its ability to function as subject (possessor, doer, subject being in a certain state); a situational likeness between the instrumental-locative case and the genitive of the subject; the lack of the verb to have, the peculiarity of passive constructions; and last, but not least, the specific combinability of Bengali words as lexical-semantic units.' (p 144)

Bykova's thought processes are not always easy to follow - her unrelenting density of language sometimes makes one want to gasp for breath! I am not quite sure what she means by the 'situational likeness between the instrumental-locative case and the genitive of the subject', but her comment on the diversity of function is undoubtedly one of the crucial characteristics of Bengali.

6.2 Diversity of function

There are many different linguistic phenomena which could be singled out as being distinctive and characteristic, but I agree with Bykova that diversity of function (on all language levels) is a central feature of Bengali. In the following paragraphs I give a brief outline and some examples to show what 'diversity of function' may mean. There are two main aspects of it:

- fluidity of word classes
  This is a lexicographer's subject! Bengali words do not stay within their designated word classes but tend to stray. Here are some examples. There are a number of nouns and adjectives where the dividing line is not at all clear. We have the noun সত্য সত্য 'truth' and the adjectives সত্য 'true' but the usual combination to refer to the truth is সত্য কথা, ie truth word, not সত্য কথা 'true word'. There are of course in most languages words that belong to more than one word class, but Bengali takes this kind of fluidity to a new level. Even with words which one uses naturally and confidently there can be surprises. A word like নষ্ট destroyed, ruined, wasted, for instance, is an adjective but is rarely used attributively. Morphologically it is formed like স্পষ্ট clear, pure, which is also an adjective and like সমস্ত hardship, trouble, which is a noun. The difference between উচিত proper
(adjective) and need (noun) only becomes apparent in negation. helper is a noun, but its negative helpless, defenceless is an adjective. There are many more examples like this.

- poly-functionality (an ugly word!)

- postpositions

As we saw in chapter 3, the function of postposition in Bengali is taken on mainly by nominal and verbal forms. Some of these forms, for instance from, change sufficiently from their original meaning to acquire a new postpositional status, but the great majority of particularly nominal postpositions remain locative noun forms and are used as such.

- genitives

Bykova points to the poly-functionality (why not 'multi-purpose' or 'versatility?') of the genitive in Bengali. Although she does not give any examples herself, it is likely that she means structures like the following. Genitive nouns and pronouns take the subject role in impersonal structures where they can refer to

a possessor  
I have two brothers.  

an experiencer  
He is feeling cold.  

a recipient  
I have got a new job.  

a doer  
I have written a letter.  

If we take a step back from sentence functions to semantic structuring within phrases we find that noun phrases with a genitive modifier can express the following relationships:

object - possessor    
father's shoes  

object - material    
leather bag  

object - place    
street shops  

object - purpose    
doll for playing  

phenomenon - cause    
damage from rain  

There are likely to be more of these types of structures, but these few examples are sufficient to give us an impression of what poly-functionality means in Bengali.

- conjunctions

This is moving very briefly into the realm of complex sentences. Conjunctions provide the mortar which is needed to link sentences together in a logical sequence. Bengali, like most languages, has conjunctions but some of the most common ones are 'on loan' from other word classes. Here are just three examples:

because  
I am worried because I haven't heard from you.

The word for because is simply a noun with no syntactically connecting function.  

either - or  
Either read the book or give it back to him.

- are 3rd person present tense forms of be, become, happen. Literally, the sentence means it happens you will read... it doesn't happen you will give...
Again, there is to English ears a lack of syntactic linking which is not felt in Bengali.

```
if - then
If he had told me before I wouldn't have made this mistake.
```

This is so and is therefore a repetition of the conditional conjunction যদি if.

These are examples for individual conjunctions or the words which stand in for them. A more significant factor in the linking of sentences in Bengali is the use, wherever possible, of non-finite verb forms, eg

- **simultaneous events** can be expressed by using the present participle:

```

tāhela, which is translateable with then in this context is a conditional participle meaning if
```

*This is so* and is therefore a repetition of the conditional conjunction যদি if.

- **consecutive events** employ the perfective participle:

```
He came when I was writing a letter.
```

- **the conditional participle** followed by যদি if can express although

```
Although we missed the train we were not late.
```

- **cause** can be expressed through verbal nouns in the locative

```
Rita was very happy because her mother was giving up her job. (Das, p 84)
```

Poly-functionality is thus a typical feature of Bengali syntax ranging from one-to-one word linking to complex sentence structuring. Its effects in terms of 'character' of the language is twofold and, to some extent, contradictory. On the one hand it results in syntactic compactness, conciseness, absence of redundancy but adds, on the other hand, a quality of semantic oscillation. This is apparent in structures like the perfective participle, but goes a lot further than individual structures. A simple phrase like আমি দিয়ে লিখেছি: I, having gone, for instance, has a semantic potential (temporal, circumstantial, causal etc) which is not easily matched in other languages.

7. Passives

The existence of passive structures is assumed and referred to by a number of authors, but there is no clear understanding of what passive means in Bengali or even whether it exists. Klaiman refers to the passive as 'one of the most extensively discussed, yet poorly defined topics in linguistics'. *(Volitionality, p 63)* These theoretical discussions centre around structures which have a passive sense but do not have the syntactic feature of object raising. Structures like this exist in many languages, including Bengali. In order to include them, Comrie introduced the term 'impersonal passive'. This term has undergone some changes and Trask, for instance, considers impersonal passives as 'most typically derived from intransitive verbs, though not exclusively so' (p 136). Before we get caught up in definitional terminology, let us look at some of the Bengali structures.
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7.1 derived from active sentences

In English only sentences containing a transitive verb with an object can be passivised. An English passive sentence is derived from an active one by dropping the subject (or adding it in a prepositional phrase with *by*), raising the object to the subject position, and changing the active verb form to the appropriate form of the verb *be* plus a past participle, eg

*He sold the car* \(\rightarrow\) *The car was sold (by him).*

The great majority of English passive sentences have an equivalent active sentence which is considered to be the original or unmarked source sentence. A sentence like *Rome was not built in a day* is an example for a passive without an underlying active sentence simply because there is no candidate for a subject in an active sentence.

The same process of derivation is also possible in Bengali. The verb changes to a verbal noun and a finite form of *be*.

*সে পাড়িটা বিক্রি করেছে।* \(\rightarrow\) *পাড়িটা বিক্রি করা হয়েছে।*

The agent (subject in the active sentence) can be added by using the postposition *ঘরা* *by, through*, eg *আমরা ঘরা* *by him* but in practice this is not very common. The derivational process from active to passive can be seen more clearly in an example with an animate object:

*আমি কেঁটেকে ধরল।* \(\rightarrow\) *কেঁটেকে ধরা হল।*

*They caught the thief.* \(\rightarrow\) *The thief was caught.*

We can see from this that the English object raising (see above) does not happen in Bengali. The object remains object and instead the verb in its nominal form becomes the subject. These type of derivational passive formations are quite possible in Bengali, and McLeod takes them as formulaic. But there is rather more to Bengali passives than just this.

7.2 with intransitive verbs

In Bengali intransitive verbs can be passivised, eg

7.2.1.a) active *আমি কালকে যাব। I will go tomorrow,* can be rendered as

7.2.1.b) passive *আমার কালকে যাওয়া হবে। lit: My going will be (occur) tomorrow.*

The syntactic process from a) to b) is significantly different here, in that the subject is changed to a possessive and the verbal noun forms the sentence subject. This alone shows that the syntactic and semantic properties of ‘passives’ are not the same in Bengali as in English. The traditional grammatical definition of passives as derived structures where the subject is not the agent but the recipient of an action is not valid in sentences with a verbal noun subject. A somewhat different and less syntax-related definition is given for German passives in the Duden Grammatik. German shares with Bengali the ability to form passives from intransitive verbs, though the syntactic realisation of these passives is quite different from Bengali. Active and passive sentences (in the Duden definition) have opposing perspectives in that active sentences look from an agent’s point of view, passive sentences look at the event itself without any agent being involved. In this sense sentence 7.2.1.b) is acceptable as a passive sentence, but a grammatical category cannot be defined on the basis of perspective. There are a host of
other structures in Bengali which have the same perspective (away from the agent) but cannot be considered passive because they fail to fulfil certain syntactic criteria (see 7.7)

7.3 Sanskrit past participles
There is a group of 'passive adjectives' (McLeod), which can combine with forms of হওয়া to form passive sentences. These are Sanskrit in origin and are derived from verbs or nouns. They are limited in number, i.e. the structure is no longer productive. The forms of হওয়া are not restricted to third person use but agree with the sentence subjects. This throws some doubt on their status as passives. A decision on this is based on whether passives are defined by syntactic or by semantic criteria. But let us look at the examples first.

- দৃষ্ট as in 7.3.1 আমি দৃষ্ট হলাম। I was seen.
- কথিত as in 7.3.2 এটা কথিত হয়। This is said. (McLeod, p 62)

Anderson (p 24) gives:

7.3.3 তা না হল। That has been destroyed.
7.3.4 আমি উন্নতি হয়েছি। [sic] I have become exalted. [sic]

The sentence is unusual in that the adjective উন্নতি developed would be more common. The translation is somewhat eccentric. The sentence simply means: I have improved.

7.3.5 তিনি এই পদে নিযুক্ত হবেন। He will be appointed to this post.

Other such adjectives are (from Milne and McLeod):

- লিখিত written
- সৃষ্ট served
- দেওয়া given
- দীর্ঘ destroyed
- তৈরি created
- রক্ষিত protected
- অধিষ্ঠিত anointed
- করা done
- উক্ত spoken
- পালিত fallen
- মঞ্চ intoxicated
- কীত sung

In the given examples all the verb forms are from হওয়া and are in agreement with the subject. I suspect that forms of আছে are also possible in sentences with a stative (resultative) aspect, e.g.

7.3.6 লিখিত লিখিত আছে। The letter is written.
7.3.7 পত্র লিখিত আছে। The leaves are lying fallen.

Semantically, these sentences are equivalent to structures with regular verbal adjectives or past passive participles like 7.3.8 কথাটা কথিত হয়েছ। The promise has been made.

7.3.9 শুধু কথা আছে। The tea is poured.

The passive character of these structures is undeniable. If we want to accept them as passives, we have to keep in mind that these are personal structures with subject-verb agreement. Although this may pose a potential problem, it could prove useful in the attempt to separate passives from impersonal structures.

7.4 passives with পড়া
Anderson gives these examples for passives with *'fall', expressing 'sudden or violent action in the passive' (p 24)

7.4.1  He died suddenly.
7.4.2  They were suddenly surrounded.
7.4.3  The thief was caught.

Smith also mentions this structure 'resembling a passive' (p 143) with the following examples:

7.4.4  Three people were run over by a train and died.
7.4.5  Even getting run over by a car is nothing unusual.

All of these sentences sound possible, but I do not consider them to be very common. There is no question that they are passive in character. The number of verbs which combine with *'fall' in this way, however, is quite restricted and so I would not classify this as a general passive, but record these uses as a lexical entry under the verbs concerned.

7.5  - passives

From आमि দেখা যায়। I was seen, it is only a short step to

7.5.1a)  আমি দেখা যাই। I can be seen.

Both Chatterji and Anderson spend a fair amount of verbal energy on discussing this structure in comparison with the more modern

7.5.1b)  আমাকে দেখা যায়। I can be seen.

The first structure (7.5.1a)) is syntactically interesting because it can be seen as a case of object raising. There is no direct active equivalent from which this sentence could be derived because the semantic component of possibility cannot be expressed with the verb *'go' in active sentences, but in the widest sense a sentence like

7.5.1c)  কেউ আমাকে দেখে। Someone sees me.

can be postulated and the raising operation from আমাকে (object) to আমি (subject) with the verb in first person agreement can be shown (7.5.1a)). It is not immediately clear to me what the syntactic relationship between the verbal noun/verbal adjective and the finite verb is and why this should be considered a passive at all, given comparable sentences like

7.5.2  আমি মারা যাই। I die.

which I do not consider a passive. My knowledge of diachronic language changes is, however, not sufficient to take on Chatterji! If we accept this operation of object raising we have a case of a passive which fits with the narrow syntactic definition of English passives. This is probably the reason that Chatterji and Anderson pay so much attention to it but, as far as I know, this structure is no longer used in modern Bengali.

Sentence 7.5.1b) is of more immediate interest as this type of sentence is very common in modern Bengali and is, in fact, widely accepted as a genuine passive structure.
Anderson refers to this [verbal noun + 3rd person of থাকা] first as an impersonal structure, then as an impersonal passive. This is logically quite accurate but in our quest for a differentiation between passives and impersonal structures we have to mind our terminology. I cannot resist quoting Anderson’s explanation of the Bengali structure as a priceless example of linguistic not-quite-parallel thinking: 'Impersonal verbs are a very common feature of the language, and one which it is difficult to explain to Englishmen from whose tongue this device is practically absent. The construction resembles the Latin vocatur ad arma; magna voce vocandum est; itur; pugnatum est; nobis invidetur. An even better parallel is the phrase Бельковски persuasion non poterat, which could be literally translated into Bengali thus: Бельковски куйщи топарас есле нан (p28f). Englishmen 'from whose tongue this device is practically absent', the Bengali and the Latin, will not be much enlightened by this!

Here are Anderson’s examples (all p 29f) which do clarify the situation:

7.5.3   এই রাজ্য নিয়ে চলা যাব।   By this road let it be gone.
7.5.4   শুনা যায় যে তিনি আসবেন।   It is heard that he will come.
7.5.5   দেখা যায় যে সে আর উঠে পারে না।   It was seen that he is no longer able to rise.
7.5.6   দেখতে পাওয়া যায় যে সে আর আসবে না।   It can be seen that she will not come again.
7.5.7   কিছু কিছু জানতে পাওয়া যায়।   To some extent it can be known.
7.5.8   এরাক বলা যায় না।   It is not thus said.
7.5.9   জিজ্ঞাসা করা যাবে।   It shall be questioned.
7.5.10  আজ থাকবে যাবে না।   Today it shall not be eaten.

A better translation for this last sentence would be: It won't be edible today.

Anderson gives the following sentences to show that this structure can also be used 'with transitive verbs'. In fact, all of the above except for 7.5.3 contain transitive verbs, although in 7.5.8 and 7.5.10 the direct objects are omitted and in 7.5.4 to 7.5.6 the subordinate clauses with যায় function as direct objects. What makes the transitivity more noticeable in the following sentences is the presence of an animated and pronominalised (except in 7.5.14) direct object:

7.5.11  সে একো শান্ত যে তরকে সমালাতে পাইনা যায় না।
   He is so fickle that it is not possible to control him.
7.5.12  স বড় বেরালা তরকে চিন্তা দেখানা যায় না।
   He is very foolish, there is no teaching him anything.
7.5.13  মেয়েটির বাথা কদাচ হয়েছে, বিশ্বাহ না মিলে তরকে আর ঘরে রাখা যায় না।
   The girl is twelve years old; if she is not given in marriage there is no keeping her in the house any longer.
7.5.14  এটি বিলম্ব করলে ট্রেন আর ধরা যাবে না।
   If you delay so much the train any longer will not be caught.
   (better: it won't be possible to catch the train.)

Most, but not all, of Anderson’s translations contain the possibility component which to me seems to be the characteristic feature of the থাকা passive, although Anderson makes no express mention of it.
Perhaps this is a fairly recent feature - Anderson's article was written in 1913, before Chatterji - while the structure itself is, in fact, considerably older than passive structures with হওয়া (Klaiman, p 72).

7.6 the derivation issue

Although the passive is, as Klaiman shows, a much discussed topic as far as object raising or subject deletion is concerned, there seems to be a tacit and unchallenged agreement that all passive sentences are derived from active sentences. I do not think that this is true in Bengali.

As an example for passive derivation in Bengali Seely gives:

7.6.1 a) active আমি তা বলি। I say that.

7.6.1 b) passive তা বলা হয়। That is said. (p 129)

If we add the supposedly suppressed agent আমি I in sentence b)

7.6.1 b2) আমার দ্বারা বলা হয়। That is said by me.

we end up with a somewhat dubious sentence. The sentence is not ungrammatical, but there is no obvious reason to use it when the active আমি তা বলি। I say that, is so much simpler. The situation becomes clearer with the next example:

7.6.2 a) active সে গুরু নে বসে। He sits there.

7.6.2.b) passive গুরু নে বসা যায়। lit: It can be sat there. [sic]

Klaiman gives this example to show a process of 'omission of the core argument', in this case the subject সে he in sentence b). She says: 'The basic verb is nominalized and followed by a finite form of the verb গুরু go. However, in b) this verb does not have the conventional lexical sense [namely go], rather, it serves as a grammatical marker, signaling omission of the basic S [the subject সে]. The result is a structure in which S is suppressed, or a subjectless clause' (Klaiman, Grammatical Voice, p 6).

The Bengali structure of a verbal noun + a 3rd person form of বসা go is one of the two structures which I think justify the use of the term passive in Bengali - the other one being the parallel structure with বসা he, as shown in Seely's example (sentence 7.6.1). Sentence 7.6.2.b) is not, as Klaiman would have it, a product of suppressing a subject and it is not subjectless. In the two sentence pairs given by Seely and Klaiman the ‘passive’ versions are, in fact, syntactically quite unrelated to the active a) sentences or as unrelated as, for instance, the two English sentences He sits there, and It is possible to sit there are to one another. In Klaiman's sentence b) the verbal noun is the subject and the 3rd person form of বসা, while it does not retain its original meaning go, is rather more than just a grammatical marker. It has a semantic component of possibility, but, more importantly, it is a full verb and forms the sentence predicate. If we drop the optional adverb একটি in sentence b) we have what Bykova would call a two peak sentence of subject and predicate meaning literally the sitting goes. The semantic dimension of possibility can be seen as a simple extension of the meaning go. A similar, though syntactically more restricted, structure exists, for instance, in German where es geht nicht lit: it goes not means simply it is not possible.
My statement that the verb in such sentences is a full verb can be seen as controversial. Terms such as 'dummy verbs', 'auxiliaries', 'mere grammatical markers' tend to be used in a rather indiscriminate way and are not clearly defined. To simplify the matter, it may be reasonable to assume that a finite verb form in a sentence with no other verb forms is a full verb and constitutes the sentence predicate. This does not solve the semantic issues concerning the verb in sentence 7.6.2 b) but it clears up the syntactic confusion.

In her discussion on - and - passives Klaiman states: 'The two passives differ as regards the fate of the underlying subject. In - passives the subject is obligatorily deleted' (Volitionality, p 73). There may be historic issues at play here which I am not qualified to comment on, but from a synchronic point of view it seems absurd even to postulate an underlying subject. A simple sentence like

is used in contexts where the 'agent' is irrelevant. It does not necessarily imply that no one can understand the poem, but that is precisely the point: the sentence focus is turned away from a potential interpreter of poetry to the poem itself. These - passives are, in my opinion, impersonal structures par excellence, and they do not need an obligatorily deleted underlying subject to define them.

Semantically - this is a step onto thin ice - the Bengali structure [verbal noun + 3rd person of the verb] resembles sentences of the type *something happened, something occurred*, which are not passive structures in English. This may be sufficient reason for some linguists to say that passives do not exist in Bengali. Verbs like *happen* and *occur* can be considered impersonal in English as they do not occur with animate subjects and are event-focused in meaning. Bengali does not have this type of impersonal verb. The situation may become clearer when we look at some sentence types with the main verb and their literal translations - all of these sentences contain the same element of something happening or occurring.

Are any or all of these passive sentences? A decision on this depends entirely on definition and demonstrates very clearly how relative and to some extent arbitrary grammatical categorisation is. In the chapter on non-finite verb forms there was some discussion on the nominal and/or verbal character of verbal nouns (p 22). My impression here is that there is a qualitative difference between, for instance, the following two sentences. The non-idiomatic, literal translation is given to show this difference:

```
7.6.4 আমি খুশি হয়েছি। lit: I have become happy.
7.6.5 ভাত নষ্ঠ হয়েছে। lit: The rice has become spoilt.
7.6.6 আমার অসুখ হয়েছে। lit: My illness has happened.
7.6.7 আমাদের কলহ হয়েছে। lit: Our quarrel has occurred.
7.6.8 তার সদা দেখা হয়েছে। lit: The seeing with him has occurred.

Are any or all of these passive sentences? A decision on this depends entirely on definition and demonstrates very clearly how relative and to some extent arbitrary grammatical categorisation is. In the chapter on non-finite verb forms there was some discussion on the nominal and/or verbal character of verbal nouns (p 22). My impression here is that there is a qualitative difference between, for instance, the following two sentences. The non-idiomatic, literal translation is given to show this difference:

```
7.6.4 আমি খুশি হয়েছি। My illness has occurred
7.6.5 আমার কাজ করা হয়েছে। My working has occurred.
```
In as far as the verbal noun retains its verbal character, there is a difference between the emergence of a state of illness and the occurrence of a process of work. We need to establish whether this difference is sufficient to justify a separation of these sentences into different grammatical categories.

7.7 the passive as a grammatical category
Passive structures contrast not only with active structures but they also have to be distinguished from other structures whose semantic focus is an event rather than an agent. The terminological difference between 'impersonal structures' and 'passives' is significant. The term 'impersonal structure' can, in principle, be defined in a purely semantic sense and be applied to any sentence which does not have an agent subject. This would mean that impersonal structures are not restricted to any particular syntactic pattern. For any given structure to be considered a passive, however, the structure has to fit into a recurring, systematic syntactic pattern. The [verbal noun + 3rd person form of হওয়া or ঘাওয়া] structures constitute such a pattern and, more importantly, the great majority of Bengali verbs can participate in them. Exceptions that spring to mind are the incomplete আছে- be, have and হওয়া itself, though হওয়া can be used in combinations with ঘাওয়া, eg

আবার দুখি হওয়া যাবে। It will be possible to be happy again.

Smith lists these uses not under 'passives' but under 'Compounds with the verbal noun', though he does use the term 'passive' there. Seely confidently calls the হওয়া structure 'the passive, pure and simple' (p 129) Bykova acknowledges that the structures with হওয়া and ঘাওয়া 'largely possess meanings common, for example, to the Russian passive' and then says 'but they are not passive' (p 146). She gives no further explanation but we can see from this that opinions on what constitutes a passive in Bengali are divided.

7.8 personalised passives and ভাব-বাচ
Passive sentences, as mentioned above, focus on an event rather than an agent. This is certainly true for the structures with হওয়া. But what about structures with ঘাওয়া? They do not so much focus on an event, but on a potential event, ie they contain a modal element. I do not see this as a problem. Their modal character does not impinge on their wide syntactic applicability and it does not affect their focus. Rather, it adds to the Bengali passive system an exhilarating semantic/aspective dimension of endless possibilities.

There is, however, one important syntactic difference between passives with হওয়া and passives with ঘাওয়া, which was briefly mentioned in section 7.6.

In many cases these two structures can be used in exactly the same way, eg

with হওয়া

এখানে মাছ ধরা হয়। Fish is caught here.
সব পরে বলা হবে। Everything will be talked about later.
কাজ শেষ করা হত। The work would have been finished.

with ঘাওয়া

এখানে মাছ ধরা যায়। Fish can be caught here.
সব পরে বলা যাবে। Everything can be talked about later.

-222-
The work could have been finished

**In intransitive structures with হওয়া genitive (possessive) modifiers can be added to the subject (the verbal noun), as in তার হওয়া হবে।**

*lit: his going will be: He will go.*

*আমার নাম হয়েছে।* lit: **my getting down has been:** I got down.

This way of personalising passive structures is not possible with খাওয়া, eg

*আমার খাওয়া চাবে। This gives the structures with খাওয়া an added impersonal component (see 7.6), but I do not see this as a reason not to accept the খাওয়া structures as passives in Bengali and as essentially parallel to the structures with হওয়া.*

Interestingly, Anderson in his discourse on verbal nouns views things from the opposite angle. He has no problems with হওয়া structures, but says about আমার হওয়া হবে না। *My going will not happen:* 'Such quasi-impersonal constructions are very common in Bengali, constructions in which the attention is drawn rather to the sense, the *bhav* ভাব of the verb, than to its subject. In fact in indigenous grammars, besides the Active and Passive Voices, there is shown a *bhava-vacya* ভাবব্যায় a Sense-Voice, in which the action of the verb is itself practically the subject.' (Anderson, *The Bengali Verb*, p 18)

In this as in many discussions of Bengali verbal categories (eg Bykova, Smith, Milne, Seely), the terminology is rather vague. Are Anderson's reasons for not considering this 'quasi-impersonal construction' as a passive based on the presence of the personal *আমার? And, if so, what is a 'real' passive in Bengali?

But before we move on to that, let us have a closer look at what Anderson is saying. The idea of a middle voice category between actives and passives is, of course, quite common - in many European languages this category is assigned to reflexive verbs like divertirsì to enjoy oneself and prepararsi to get ready in Italian, se réveiller to wake up and se reposer to rest in French etc. But these cases are really quite different from the Bengali example Anderson gives. The verb, or more accurately the verbal noun, is not just 'practically' the subject. It is the subject and this is the strongest reason why this structure is not a 'quasi-impersonal construction' or should belong to a 'sense-voice' category, but is a passive 'pure and simple', as Seely puts it (p 129). The focus of the sentence is the verbal action and this focus remains even with an added genitive modifier.

For the record I add Bidhubhusan Dasgupta's view of the passive, outlined in his book *Learn Bengali Yourself.* He divides structures into passives (কর্মবাচ) and 'intransitive' passives (ভাব-বাচ) - the Bengali word ভাব-বাচ is given in the Samsad as 'impersonal voice'. In his passive sentences 'the object is prominent and the subject takes *কর্মক* or *ধারা by'* (p 133), eg

যাদু কর্মক বহু পড়া হয়।

* book is read by Jodu.

In intransitive passive sentences 'the verb is always intransitive and accords neither with the subject nor with the object' (ibid), eg

আমাদৃত্ব কর্ম কার না।

*I am unable to move.*

There are two mistakes here. Firstly, intransitive verbs do not generally have objects, so there is no question of accord and secondly the use of *ধারা* is not restricted to intransitive verbs. What is more
significant than his definitional ideas though is that his example sentences are just that: artificial example sentences from a grammar book! They are highly unnatural and show a worrying detachment from real language.

7.9 Bengali passives
If we want to accept the term passive as applicable to particular Bengali structures - and there is no reason not to - its properties need to be clearly set out.

Bengali passives are similar to English passives in that

- they look at a situation not from an agent but from an event point of view
- they have a regular, productive and well-defined syntactic structure

Bengali passives differ from English passives in that

- they need not be derived from active sentences, ie many Bengali passive sentences do not have direct active equivalents.
- they do not have to have a (suppressed) agent hidden in their deep structure. This is true specifically for passives with যাওয়া which refer to potential rather than real events and are as such agentless.
- in sentences where a derivation can be seen to exist, objects remain objects and are not raised to subject status, eg

   আমি তাকে দাওয়া দিয়েছি। I have invited him.
   \[\Rightarrow\] তাকে দাওয়া দেওয়া হয়েছে। He has been invited.

This is an example with an indirect object. The same applies to direct objects:

    আমাকে বোঝাতে। He has saved me.
    \[\Rightarrow\] আমাকে বোঝানো হয়েছে। I have been saved.

- they can be formed from intransitive as well as transitive verbs.
- in structures with 3rd person forms of যাওয়া go they refer to possible rather than actual events.

On the basis of this we have two structures for passives in Bengali:

1. sentences with transitive verbs - these can be interpreted as being derived from active sentences. In these sentences the subject of the active sentence is almost invariably suppressed. Their syntactic shape is [object + verbal noun + 3rd person form of হওয়া].
2. sentences with intransitive verbs: the logical subject of the sentence can be added in structures with হওয়া as a genitive modifier of the verbal noun. Structures with যাওয়া cannot take such a modifier. The basic syntactic pattern for these passives is [verbal noun + 3rd person form of হওয়া or যাওয়া].

In both types of sentences the verbal noun forms the grammatical subject. This seems to me to be a crucial factor in the decision on what should or should not be defined as a passive. The reason for this was mentioned earlier: structures with verbal nouns as subjects describe a process rather than a state. Sentences without this feature, such as the structures with Sanskrit participles (7.3.1 - 9) and
sentences of the *happening, occurring* type (7.6.4 - 8) have a passive meaning, but they have neither the aspective dynamics nor the syntactical potential of the হওয়া / যাওয়া structures. A graded scale for primary (with verbal noun + হওয়া / যাওয়া) and secondary (7.3.1ff and 7.6.4ff) passives could be used, but this is just a matter of definitional terminology and is, to a large extent, arbitrary.

8. Impersonal Structures

As we saw earlier (cf Anderson), there is not always a very clear dividing line between passives and impersonal structures. What they have in common is that they do not have an active agent as the subject of a sentence. We have now tentatively defined passives as having a regular syntactic shape, which is a verbal noun as subject (with or without a possessive complement) in connection with a 3rd person form of either হওয়া or যাওয়া.

'Impersonal structures' is a term which, according to Trask's definition, seems to include passives. He says that 'the verb stands in an invariable 3rd person form and the NP which might be regarded as the subject on semantic grounds stands in an oblique case' (p 135). Smith's explanation for Bengali impersonal structures states that 'the verb is always in the third person and the logical subject, when expressed, takes the genitive' (p 114). This does not expressly exclude passives, but it can be assumed that impersonal structures are not syntactically restricted to verbal noun subjects (as passives are) and that the finite verbs involved are not, or not only, হওয়া and যাওয়া.

Semantically, impersonal structures, according to Smith, express emotions (fear, anger, love), mental activities (thinking, wanting), bodily sensations (hunger, illness, fatigue) and possession. This semantic restriction, if it is correct, would mean that passives could not be included in impersonal structures since they are semantically quite unrestricted.

Let us look at some examples starting, as usual, with Smith's classification. Some of these structures have been discussed in previous chapters. All of Smith's example sentences are given on pages 114ff of his book and are marked (S).

8.1 with আছঃ- be, be present

Smith's example sentences can be divided into two separate uses of আছঃ, as shown in examples 8.1.1 and 8.1.2:

8.1.1 বাংলাদেশের লোক আছে। There are people in the bungalow. (S)

This is আছঃ in its locative sense (discussed in chapter 5, section 1.2 and 1.3). It should not be listed as an impersonal structure. There is subject-verb agreement as can easily be established if we substitute a first person pronoun for লোক in sentence 8.1.1, eg

8.1.1a) বাংলাদেশের আমি আছি। I am in the bungalow.

The following use of আছঃ is quite different:

8.1.2 আমার দুটি শব্দ আছে। I have two wishes. (S)

This is the possessive or existential function of আছঃ and is always expressed as an impersonal structure.
word order and sentence structure

8.2 with হওয়া be, become

8.2.1 আমার বেশ পছন্দ হয়েছে। I liked the boy very much. (S)
8.2.2 যুব রাগ হয়েছিল আমার। I became very angry (S)

These are structures with conjunct verbs. They are combinations of abstract nouns or adjectives with what Klaiman calls dummy verbs (হওয়া, করা, আছে). Smith has separated out the uses with হওয়া here to show their impersonal features. A closer investigation of these structures is likely to show that Smith’s semantic caveat on emotions, mental activities and bodily functions is too narrow, eg

8.2.3 বিরের বাড়ি যাওয়ার ব্যবস্থা হয়েছে।

It has been arranged to go to the wedding.

As can be seen from the three sentences (8.2.1 - 3) this structure varies in complexity. In 8.2.1 we have a direct object, in 8.2.3 a genitive verbal noun, governed by the respective conjunct verbs. Sentence 8.2.2 represents almost (যুব very is an optional adverbial) the basic form of this structure, which is [noun (with optional genitive modifier or experiencer subject) + 3rd person form of হওয়া be, become]. This takes us back to the sentences of the happening/ occurring type discussed in section 7.6, eg

7.6.6 আমার অনুষ্ঠান হয়েছে। lit: My illness has happened.
7.6.7 আমাদের কবর্ণা হয়েছে। lit: Our quarrel has occurred.

These sentences are more appropriately placed here than under passive sentences.

Sentence 8.2.1 is an example for the type of structure which makes linguists question the concept of transitivity in Bengali and other South Asian languages. পছন্দ হওয়া enjoy is an overtly intransitive verb which can take, as in this sentence, a direct object. Research into the transitivity status of such verbs in Tamil (notably by K.Paramasivam, Effectivity and Causativity in Tamil, Trivandrum: Dravidian Linguistics Association, University of Chicago, 1977) suggests that dividing the verbal system into 'effective' vs 'affective' verbs may provide a more accurate classification than the traditional transitive/intransitive split. The same is likely to be true for Bengali. This links up with the concept of 'experiencer subjects' also, and seems to me to be an area of enormous potential for future research. Mimi Klaiman in her study on volitionality has taken some initial steps in this direction.

8.3 with লাগা touch, be attached to

8.3.1 আমার বেশ মজা লাগছে। I’m having great fun. (S)
8.3.2 গরম লাগে? Are you hot? (S)
8.3.3 আমার শুষ্ক তোকে ভাল লাগে। I like only you (S).
8.3.4 এটিকু বুঝতে অনেক সময় লেগেছে।

It has taken a great deal of time to understand this little bit. (S)

The verb লাগা lit: touch, be in contact with is, alongside আছে, the most common Bengali verb used in impersonal structures and has a variety of meanings. These structures are so prevalent that লাগা is often thought of as an impersonal verb, but active sentences are perfectly normal, eg

8.3.5 আমার সঙ্গে লাগ কেন? Why do you pick a quarrel with me?

(Milne, p 420)
8.3.6 'The car got stuck in the mud.'

8.3.7 'The word is quite appropriate here.' (Milne, p 419)

8.3.8 'I am engrossed in my work.'

With preceding infinitives লাগা আছি. means begin, eg

8.3.9 'We shall start talking.'

Smith's examples (8.3.1 - 8.3.4) show the semantic properties of feelings (8.3.1), bodily sensations (8.3.2), like and dislike (in connection with adjectives like ভাল and খারাপ) (8.3.3) and the concept of taking time or money (8.3.4)

In addition to these লাগা can express

- **taste**
  - 8.3.10 The medicine tastes bitter.

- **need**
  - 8.3.11 What else do you need?

- **impact**
  - 8.3.12 I like him very much. (Milne, 421)

Literally, this (8.3.12) sentence means: He (acc) has struck in my mind, and is thus different from sentence 8.3.3. In both these sentences, again, we have a direct object.

8.4 with চলা move, go

8.4.1 'We won't be able to manage without Mr Mittir.' (S)

This is an impersonal structure with চলা which is used predominantly in negative sentences in the future tense meaning it will not do. চলা can also be used with the same meaning. These structures have been discussed in connection with preceding conditional participles in chapter 1, p 30).

8.5 with করা do and পাওয়া get, receive

8.5.1 'Aren't you afraid?' (S)

8.5.2 'I am terribly hungry.' (S)

These are idiomatic impersonal uses of two very common verbs and I must admit that I was inordinately pleased to find them in Smith's book. I have been aware of these structures for a long time, but was uneasy using them myself, opting for equivalents with লাগা or for active sentences instead; but finding a written 'rule' for them will boost my confidence!

There is no difference in meaning between sentence 8.5.1 and the 'active' তুই ভয় করিস না, but I suspect that the impersonal uses for both করা and পাওয়া are more idiomatic than their active equivalents. The range of nouns/adjectives which can be used in these structures is severely restricted.

Words like ভয় fear, ইচ্ছা wish, ঘুম sleep, অসুখ illness, ভাল good, cold, হাসি smile etc are acceptable. Smith lists the meanings as emotions (fear, desire), illness and sensations such as fatigue, hunger, thirst and sorrow. These impersonal uses of করা and পাওয়া seem to be defined on purely semantic grounds and are therefore not easy to pick up for syntax-oriented foreigners.
8.6 other impersonal structures

We have three more impersonal structures to go, whose internal syntactical patterns differ from those mentioned above.

- আসা-ছাওয়া

The combination of the two verbs আসা come and ছাওয়া go is used to express indifference. In my experience, this structure is more often cited in grammar books than used in speech, but when it is used, there is some variation in the actual verb forms involved. Smith gives the following versions (p 119):

with perfective participle + 3rd person simple present

তাতে তোর কিছু এসে থায় না। That has nothing to do with you.

both forms in 3rd person simple past

তাতে কারোর কিছু এলো ঘোলো না। That didn't matter to anyone.

both forms in 3rd person simple present

লোকার্টির যাগে আমার কিছু যায় আসে না। The man's age doesn't concern me.

I am not very familiar with the structuring in Smith's first example [perfective participle + 3rd person simple present], but the example shows that these structures are perhaps not as common as grammar books would want us to think. The English sentence *That has nothing to do with you* is much more likely to be given in Bengali simply as

তাতে তোমার কিছু নেই। lit: there is nothing in this for you.

As far as classification is concerned, I would consider this an idiomatic, impersonal use of the two verbs involved, but not determinative for Bengali impersonal structures.

- inf + 3rd person of হওয়া and আই-.

These structures are used to express (with হওয়া) obligation or (with আই-) permission. The structures with হওয়া add a twist to the concept of dative (in Bengali genitive) subjects in that here we have subjects in the object case. Examples and a more detailed discussion of these structures can be found in chapter 5, page 170 (আই-) and 187 (হওয়া). The existence of the 'accusative subject' and to some extent the infinitive are stumbling blocks in our quest for a uniform syntactic shape of impersonal structures, but this is unavoidable. The [infinitive + হওয়া ] structure can be used with all Bengali verbs and is very common.

- no subject

Only Chatterji mentions this structure. It expresses 'a general prohibitive or exhortative force' (p 919). I have an emotional attachment to this structure as my first awareness of it was of (village) mothers talking to their toddlers and I concluded, wrongly, that it was a kind of baby talk. Sentences have a 3rd person present tense verb but no subject. Semantically, they are closest to structures with impersonal pronouns like *Man tut das nicht* (German) or *On ne le fait pas* (French). Syntactically, the structure could be interpreted as a pro-drop use with a zero impersonal pronoun,
but that would be stretching its applicability. It is generally used in the simple present negative. Translations are probably best given as English imperatives:

- Don't eat that!
- Don't put your hand in the fire!
- Don't hit your brother!

Chatterji gives these examples

- One shouldn't eat fish on Sundays.
- One shouldn't bathe when there is fever.

Another very common example for this use is with the verb বলা, say, speak, eg

- One calls one's older brother dada.
- How do you say in Bengali?

Neither imperatives nor Chatterji's should translations adequately convey the tenor of these structures. They do have the implication of something that isn't done, ie one doesn't hit one's brother etc, but at the same time they are more direct, more like the French and German examples and less moralistic than structures with ought, should would be.

This leaves us with the not surprising result that impersonal structures are not uniform in syntactic pattern. We have established that Bengali does not have impersonal verbs as such (as the English seem, happen, occur) but that a limited number of verbs বলা, do and পাড়া, get, receive have impersonal uses which often have a modal force. These uses, particularly with the verbs বলা, do and পাড়া, get, receive cannot be explained by syntactic criteria alone. The semantic aura around impersonal structures, the concept of 'experiencer' vs 'doer' subjects and linguistic notions of transitivity in Bengali are all areas where we need to recognize that syntax and semantics do not offer alternative ways of looking at language but are interlinked at the basis, ie the definitional level.

SUMMARY

The first part of this chapter is in itself a kind of summary, so I will restrict my comments to the questions on passives and impersonal structures. At the beginning of the discussion on impersonal structures (p225) there was a question about the extent of overlap between passives and impersonal structures. This can now be cleared up. We have seen that Smith's semantic restriction of impersonal structures to emotions, mental activities and bodily sensations is too narrow. Sentences with আছি, for instance, have an almost infinite semantic range and cannot be considered anything other than impersonal structures.

In a very general and non-syntactic way we can say that impersonal structures are about experienced states, passives are about processes. Without going into the hierarchy of these two terms, I see no reason to draw a strict dividing line between them. The question of perspective towards or away from an agent, which seemed so important at the beginning of this discussion, has now become almost meaningless. Semantically, Bengali impersonal structures can be used to express highly personal experiences such as আমার শীত করছে. I am feeling cold or আমার ডুব হচ্ছে. I am afraid. The effect of
this has nothing to do with perspective (regarding agents) but emphasises the state of non-volitional (to pay Klaiman her due!) affectedness or experience. Passive structures are a more neutral syntactical device to express a process of *happening* or *occurring*, with or without a personal 'experiencer' involved. On the basis of this, I think we can now move to the following definitions:

- The term 'impersonal structures' can be applied to a sub-group of Bengali verbal structures whose characteristic feature is the absence of a nominative active subject. Impersonal structures can have a variety of syntactic shapes. Most, but not all, of them have a genitive subject and a 3rd person verb form.
- In connection with particular verbs such as হওয়া be, become and লাভা be attached to feelings, bodily sensations and experiences are expressed in impersonal structures. The genitive subject in these structures is, semantically, an experiencer subject.
- In structures with আছ- exist, be present stative expressions of existence or possession have an unlimited semantic range.
- Passives are impersonal structures of a special type. They are syntactically defined (as above) and semantically unrestricted. The semantic focus in passive sentences is on the event or process described. A personal (genitive) subject may be present.

The two main considerations emerging from this chapter are:

- the link between syntactic and semantic criteria, which is ever-present in our language structures and needs to become much more central to our research methods
- the importance of defining grammatical categories and their parameters precisely for the individual language without assuming an a priori understanding or a universal applicability of a term like 'passive'

This point links in with the question of linguistics as a science. In discussing particularly semantic criteria our (meta)language becomes automatically more tentative and careful. This is entirely appropriate when we set out to describe aspects of meaning. There should be nothing vague, however, about defining syntactic categories and we should (scientifically!) assume that traditional concepts need to be re-examined, re-applied and perhaps re-defined.
CONCLUSIONS

Summaries and suggestions for further research are given at the end of each chapter, so I would like to use this space for some more general remarks.

All interlingual activity, be it language learning or teaching, translation or preparation for a new grammar, is an enterprise with a twofold underlying aim, namely an increase in communication and a breaking down of barriers. In this enterprise, the overcoming of language barriers is only a first step. My own awareness of this started with a surprise. When I set out to write my colloquial Bengali dictionary I encountered surprised reactions to something that I considered important and perfectly normal: making colloquial language accessible to people who wanted to learn it. The surprise came from two directions. Those who were, in effect, teaching me Bengali suddenly said 'Oh, but you can't write that in a book!' Those who were going to publish my book thought it a very original idea to spend linguistic skill and determination on ordinary language.

Their reactions, in turn, surprised me. In Europe we have had colloquial dictionaries for decades and we have discarded hierarchical ideas about what constitutes a worthy research object to such an extent that, nowadays, investigating people's shopping habits is called research. There is still a wide gap between what Bengalis perceive as learned, literary and 'beautiful' Bengali on the one hand and ordinary, spoken language on the other. This deep-rooted value judgment on language is one of the obstacles that need to be overcome. I must confess now with shame to a certain irritation at the ubiquitous references to Tagore whenever I mentioned my plans for writing a book on Bengali. This irritation was, of course, partly a cover-up for my ignorance of literary Bengali; and this is where we come back to the need for breaking down barriers.

Here are some of the areas where I see these barriers still very much in place:

• literary and colloquial language

What is the real Bengali? This question, as it relates to grammatical analysis, invariably pushes against the barrier between literary and colloquial language. In linguistic research there is always discussion and disagreement on whether we should concentrate our efforts on literary language as the better or colloquial language as the more real alternative for our research purposes. This discussion is based on the premise of an either-or situation, on the assumption that if a) is right then b) must be wrong and vice versa. Having to choose between right and wrong, or between better and worse, is sometimes unavoidable, but this is not such a situation. Indeed, to choose between different manifestations of the same language for our research would be like defining a human being in terms of only one of the roles that most of us have, such as husband, father, teacher, colleague etc. If we want to arrive at an accurate description of Bengali language structure, we must look at it in all its different shapes. That is why a pooling of expertise and cooperation among Bengali linguists of different backgrounds is essential - no single one of us can do this work on their own.
• syntax and semantics

Just as there is a (sometimes arbitrary) split between types of language, so there are well-defined divisions within the discipline of linguistics, divisions which have to be kept separate at all times. It is, of course, important to be aware of the difference between, for instance, syntactic and semantic criteria. But in writing the preceding chapters I have become aware again and again of semantic factors encroaching on syntactic categories. This was noticeable in the attempt to define Bengali passives and, more particularly, in Klaiman's introduction of volitionality into the interpretation of dative subjects and impersonal structures. Klaiman's book has a number of shortcomings and mistakes, but her leap from syntactic to semantic criteria was at the time a courageous and, as far as I know, unique initiative in breaking through inter-linguistic barriers. Not only does her interpretation explain a grammatical structure which is clearly outside purely syntactic criteria, but it opens up new possibilities for the consideration of language structures from more than just one angle.

• hypothesis and description

Spectacular new insights can be achieved by proving particular linguistic hypotheses. Nothing is more satisfying to a syntactician than establishing a grammatical rule and finding that it works. The reason that this type of high-flying success is not yet at our fingertips in Bengali grammar research is that the plodding, often mechanical and time consuming ground-work needs to be done first. I've had plenty of times where I began to doubt my sanity after a morning spent looking for example sentences with particular postpositions or time adverbials. But this is data collecting, and the most exciting theory is worthless without data to test it against. A disparaging attitude to data collecting shows a counterproductive narrow-mindedness in our perception of what constitutes 'real' research. Rashida Begum's work on postpositions can be used as an example for this. Her research results in terms of GB theory, based on a series of tests, are rather predictable, but her comprehensive list of example sentences with postpositions is of immense value for further research in this area.

• Bengali and 'foreign' linguists

In his article Archaeology of Bangla Grammar Debaprasad Bandyopadhyay writes with a touch of bitterness: 'All the foreign colony-seekers wrote Bangla Grammar for their own need to interact and colonise the natives of Bengal. In the title page of Halhed's Bangla grammar, he distinctly affirmed that he wrote this grammar for the sake of Englishmen'.

I must admit that I, as a somewhat non-political linguist, was fascinated by Halhed's grammar and the challenge these 'colony-seekers' faced in writing a grammar of a language they barely knew. Yes, they wrote for their own purposes (and made a lot of mistakes), but it seems unlikely that these early European missionaries wrote their textbooks with the intention of defining the future of Bengali grammar.
Bandyopadhyay makes an important point in showing the development of Bengali grammar research from etymological and philological studies to modern linguistic analysis. But his article, written in 1996, peters out rather disappointingly into a discussion of Suniti Kumar Chatterji's *আৎ প্রকাশ বাঙলা ব্যাকরণ* from 1939.

It is time, I think, that we, Bengali and foreign linguists alike and together, move on from Halhed, Carey, Wenger, even from Chatterji. All of them have made more or less significant contributions to our present language awareness, and there seems little point in grieving over old political or linguistic injustices. Instead, we should try to amend these injustices by finding a way in which we can work together towards a better understanding of Bengali.

- theory and practice
  This has been dealt with in the introduction to this thesis and needs no further elaboration in itself but the following points are all, to a greater or lesser extent, linked to it.

- ideas and their application
  Scientific and academic research is still often seen as fulfilling its own purpose. It has about it an air of 'purity', which likes to keep a distance from such mundane activities as teaching. I believe very strongly that all academic research should have an aim and a purpose which go beyond the intellectual stimulation of a select few. In language matters in particular, a close cooperation between research and the ground-floor, namely the language teaching, is essential and can be used to mutual advantage. It is easy to see that efficient language teaching benefits from a thorough knowledge of grammar, but researchers, too, can profit from contact with those who are experts at explaining linguistic features in clear and accessible language.

- research and learning materials
  This leads on from the previous point to the split between a) grammatical research work which can, at times, be far removed from real language, and b) grammar and course books which are sometimes faulty and sketchy. This type of teaching material is being produced all the time, often for specific learning situations and usually written by dedicated teachers who know a lot about what their students need but little about grammatical issues.

  I recently met Mrs Hosne Ara Begum, the author of a new book for learning Bengali *Esho Bangla Porhi*, published by the Bengali Workers' Association in London. This is a well-organised, glossy, illustrated book with beautifully clear Bengali script and interesting stories and dialogue. Clearly Mrs Begum has put a lot of effort into the production of the book and she has a right to be proud of it. The phonetic transcript she uses is unrelated to anything I have ever seen before. Her grammatical explanations are inept and sometimes wrong. The book is like a lovingly prepared, elaborate meal with the main ingredient hopelessly spoilt. This is just one example of many, but for me such an encounter has a heart-breaking poignancy. It makes me more and more convinced
that the availability of a modern, definitive Bengali grammar has become a matter of some urgency.

- linguistic and literary research

In the present situation of work on Bengali we have serious literary research on the one hand and serious linguistic research on the other. There is hardly any link between the two. I was in the fortunate position of doing my essentially linguistic work not in a Linguistics but in a South Asia Department because my aim from the beginning was not to write a linguistic thesis but to work on Bengali grammar. It is always easy to see other people's learning gaps. Linguists will readily agree that 'literature people' with their heads in poetic clouds need more down-to-earth scientific linguistic reality. My always rather shaky belief in the exactness of linguistics as a science has, over the last four years, given way to the recognition that language cannot be captured, categorised and compressed into linguistic compartments and that our research should take into account the possibility of surprises.

As for the 'literature people', I have been greatly impressed and humbled by the careful and diligent dedication, the meticulous attention to linguistic detail, the sure instinct for nuances in form and meaning in their work. They may not know all the technical terminology but, particularly in translation work, they are involved in the nitty-gritty of language as much as any linguist is and they are a good deal less ostentatious about it. This comes under the heading of what is called, I believe, interdisciplinary cross-fertilization. In more ordinary terms it is simply the chance to learn from one another.

'Breaking down barriers' is, in the first instance, an image of destruction, but then we must ask ourselves what created these barriers in the first place and why they continue to exist. Physical barriers exist for two reasons: to keep things apart and to protect from intrusion. This translates, with a bit of a leap, into a) territorialism or possessiveness and b) fear and competitiveness. These are traits which are in direct opposition to our aims in language learning, teaching and research in general, and perhaps particularly in connection with a language like Bengali.

Those of us who have come into contact with Bengali as adults are very aware of the barriers that were broken in the process: the barriers broken by others to allow us access, not only to the language itself but to the cross-cultural experiences and friendships that came with it, but also the barriers we ourselves break by taking an active part in this mind-expanding linguistic adventure. All of our lives have been greatly enriched by our involvement with Bengali. The best way in which we can show our gratitude for this gift of language is to make it accessible to others.
APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

CONJUNCT VERBS WITH INFINITIVES AND/OR VERBAL NOUNS
combinations with infinitives

request
I asked you to come.

beginning
When will they (implied) start counting the money.

comfort
There is comfort in driving a car over such a road. (Seely)

trouble, difficulty
Are you having difficulty walking? (Klaiman, p 32)

harm
I don't have the power to cancel the strike.

power, influence
I am not ashamed to tell you. (Seely)

sadness, regret
It makes me sad to see him like this.

delay
How much longer will it take to reach Calcutta? (Smith)

fault, harm
Basundhara was not slow to comprehend (Seely).

prohibition
What's the harm in running away with one's husband? (Seely)

forbade you to speak. (Milne)

remainder
Nowhere at all did there remain a person to send. (Seely)

confidence
She didn't have confidence enough to let the two girls out of the house. (Seely)

mistake
He failed to grasp the hint of genius. (Seely)

embarrassment
I am not ashamed to tell you. (Seely)
He started work last week.

If I speak of my childhood, it will perhaps help to understand one side of my personality. (Satyajit Ray)

**combinations with verbal noun**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>উদ্দেশ্য</th>
<th>purpose</th>
<th>তোমার এখানে আসার উদ্দেশ্য কি?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>উপায়</td>
<td>way, means</td>
<td>আমাদের আরও টাকা দেওয়ার উপায় নেই।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>কারণ</td>
<td>reason, cause</td>
<td>তার এখানে বাঁধার কারণ কি?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>নিয়ম</td>
<td>custom</td>
<td>আমাদের জমাদিন পালন করার নিয়ম।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ব্যবস্থা</td>
<td>arrangement</td>
<td>বিয়ের বাড়ি যাওয়ার ব্যবস্থা হয়েছে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ব্যাপার</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>টাকা না দেওয়ার ব্যাপারটা যেন তুমি না জানতে পার।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ভাব</td>
<td>pretence</td>
<td>সবাই এইরকম না-জানার ভাব করে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>রাজ্য</td>
<td>way, road</td>
<td>আর কিছু করার রাজ্য নেই।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সম্ভাবনা</td>
<td>possibility</td>
<td>তার ফেল করার সম্ভাবনা আছে।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**combinations with either infinitives or verbal nouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>অধিকার</th>
<th>right, privilege</th>
<th>এই কথা বলতে তার অধিকার নেই।</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>অনুমতি</td>
<td>permission</td>
<td>বাবা কি তোমাকে যেতে অনুমতি দিয়েছেন?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smith, p 126

Smith, p 85
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Smith, p 126
appendices

habit, custom

He has got used to driving.

I am no longer accustomed to drinking spirits. (Smith, p 126)

wish, desire

I would very much like to see you.

I want to die. (Smith, p 118)

Wouldn't you like to eat a banana?

I don't wish to go there without an invitation. (Milne, p 176)

People try to learn from their mistakes. (Das, p 86)

She tried to laugh. (Smith p 126)

Thieves would fear to tread the path he walked. (Tagore)

Abdul is not afraid of going into the forest.

He is not afraid of going on a plane.

He doesn't even have the strength to lift his head.

I am not strong enough to walk very far.

I am too weak to speak. (Milne, p 179)

Do you have time to watch the film now?

It is not yet time to eat.
Play while you play, read while you read. (Milne, p 179)

He didn't have the nerve to get angry. (Seely)

I have not the courage to go near him (Milne, p 194)

I don't find the courage to sing loudly even in the bathroom. (Smith, p 126)

It will be convenient to talk tomorrow.

It would be convenient (for you) to come tomorrow.

There was no difficulty winning him over. (Seely)

May I get the opportunity to return here. (Seely)

He has got the chance to go to Calcutta.
### CHAPTER 2 APPENDIX 1  FREQUENT COMPOUND VERBS
#### Intransitive Second Component Verbs (Compound Makers)

**Go** used after many verbs to complete or modify their meaning (BA)

- used as intensive, inceptive, continuative, completive (Vale)
- with verbs of motion
- with verbs expressing a change of state
- with transitive verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with verbs of motion (intransitive)</th>
<th>with verbs expressing a change of state (intransitive)</th>
<th>with transitive verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>चला</strong> go away, leave</td>
<td><strong>हैर</strong> become, be finished</td>
<td><strong>करे</strong> do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>इन्द्र</strong> arrive</td>
<td><strong>उठे</strong> come off, get up</td>
<td><strong>दिखे</strong> take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>चर</strong> move around</td>
<td><strong>वहें</strong> get down, descend</td>
<td><strong>देने</strong> give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>पालिया</strong> flee, run away</td>
<td><strong>अंबू</strong> be turned upside down</td>
<td><strong>बले</strong> tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>बेल्डिया</strong> go visiting</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> fall down, decrease</td>
<td><strong>मिशे</strong> mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>रैल्</strong> walk</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> get broken, decrease</td>
<td><strong>देखे</strong> see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>रेल्फिया</strong> run</td>
<td><strong>कुंडली</strong> dry</td>
<td><strong>शुल्ले</strong> hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>उल्ल</strong> fly away</td>
<td><strong>कुंडला</strong> open</td>
<td><strong>ले</strong> leave behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>जंडेसी</strong> float away</td>
<td><strong>हारिया</strong> get lost</td>
<td><strong>चालिया</strong> continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>रोके</strong> become angry</td>
<td><strong>भेडारे</strong> sink, drown</td>
<td><strong>छेड़</strong> give up, leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>गुंडे</strong> stick, become stuck</td>
<td><strong>बाहर भेडारे</strong> stay, remain and then go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Come** used as continuative, progressive, completive (Vale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with intransitive verbs</th>
<th>with transitive verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>हैर</strong> become</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> leave behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>चला</strong> arrive</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>मिरा</strong> return, come back</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> bring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>घुरे</strong> turn around, come back</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> finish doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>जेम्स</strong> come down</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> eat and come back</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Move, go** used as continuative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with intransitive verbs</th>
<th>with transitive verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>हैर</strong> return</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>घुरे</strong> walk around</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> walk around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>रैल्</strong> carry on walking</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> carry on walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>बेल्डिया</strong> carry on running</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> carry on running</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rise, get up** intensive showing suddenness (Vale)

- used to describe growth or figurative motion upwards (Smith)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with intransitive verbs</th>
<th>with transitive verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>हैर</strong> become</td>
<td><strong>करे</strong> finish doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>जेम्स</strong> burst into tears</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> have one's say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>जेम्स</strong> burst out laughing</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> finish writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>घुरे</strong> swell, blossom</td>
<td><strong>पवित्री</strong> read to the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>मिरा</strong> happen</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> hit suddenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>जेम्स</strong> be finished</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> finish washing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>जेम्स</strong> increase</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> eat up quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>जेम्स</strong> burst out in anger</td>
<td><strong>घुरे</strong> lift up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall, drop**

- as an auxiliary: to perform an action (Samsad)
- used as a complementary verb to indicate the completion of an action (BA)
- pass into a specified state (BA)
- intensives indicating suddenness or hurrying (Vale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>with intransitive verbs</th>
<th>with transitive verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>हैर</strong> happen</td>
<td><strong>उठे</strong> get up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>जेम्स</strong> sit down abruptly</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> start shivering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>जेम्स</strong> break down</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> start shivering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>घुरे</strong> explode</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> lose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>घुरे</strong> fall asleep</td>
<td><strong>घुरे</strong> melt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>शुरु</strong> lie down</td>
<td><strong>वें</strong> get down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decrease rapidly**

- no examples with transitive verbs found
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sit to do, commit suddenly (Samsad)</th>
<th>used as a complementary verb to express suddenness of an action (BA)</th>
<th>intensives showing suddenness (Vale)</th>
<th>used with transitive verbs to describe exaggerated, inappraoipt actions (Smith)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>get up suddenly</td>
<td>do suddenly</td>
<td>become</td>
<td>finish doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrive</td>
<td>say unexpectedly</td>
<td>stand up</td>
<td>say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stand</td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>end, terminate</td>
<td>prosperous, flourish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Either or can be used in the present and past tense. In all other tenses थाका has to be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stay, remain</th>
<th>complete continuatives (Vale)</th>
<th>and (2) आच- be (incomplete verb) continutatives (Vale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stay sitting</td>
<td>remain</td>
<td>keep doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay lying down</td>
<td>remain unused</td>
<td>keep wanting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remain standing</td>
<td>stay alive</td>
<td>keep holding on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remain hidden</td>
<td>stay asleep</td>
<td>keep listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keep awake</td>
<td>remain angry</td>
<td>keep eating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keep running</td>
<td>keep laughing</td>
<td>keep looking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitive Second Component Verbs (with transitive verbs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>give used to complete an action (Samsad)</th>
<th>used after certain verbs to indicate completion (BA) describes actions directed away from speaker (Smith)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>keep, put aside</td>
<td>keep doing, put away, put aside (for s.o.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td>keep wanting, put away, keep putting (for s.o.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy (for s.o.)</td>
<td>keep holding on, put away, keep putting (for s.o.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give away</td>
<td>keep saying, put away, keep putting (for s.o.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give away</td>
<td>keep writing, put away, keep putting (for s.o.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lift</td>
<td>keep eating, put away, keep putting (for s.o.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lift down</td>
<td>keep looking, put away, keep putting (for s.o.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lift down</td>
<td>write (for oneself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throw away</td>
<td>take away, put away, put away (for oneself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throw away</td>
<td>grasp, put away, put away (for oneself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leave, give up</td>
<td>buy (for oneself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explain</td>
<td>manage, put away, put away (for oneself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explain</td>
<td>find out, put away, put away (for oneself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put out to dry</td>
<td>learn, put away, put away (for oneself)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Throw**

- in compound verbs: finish up, do abruptly or unexpectedly (Prog)
- used to complete an incomplete verb (BA)
- in compound verbs: commit suddenly (Samsad)

### Intensives and Completives Conveying Thoroughness (Vale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>রাখা</th>
<th>প্রদর্শিত</th>
<th>করে</th>
<th>প্রদর্শিত</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eat up</td>
<td>give away</td>
<td>make, cause to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blurt out</td>
<td>kill</td>
<td>nurse back to health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finish doing</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>build, create</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see</td>
<td>wipe off</td>
<td>save</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognize</td>
<td>tear up</td>
<td>wake up from sleep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td>but note:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sell</td>
<td>(intr) burst into tears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy</td>
<td>(intr) burst out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chop off</td>
<td>laughing</td>
<td>make grow, increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Completives Showing Gradual Action (Vale)

- lift, raise

**Keep, Put Down**

- (Vale), describes the prolongation or the effect of the verbal action (Smith)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>রাখা</th>
<th>প্রদর্শিত</th>
<th>করে</th>
<th>প্রদর্শিত</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have done beforehand</td>
<td>hide, conceal</td>
<td>lay down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put off, neglect</td>
<td>lay by, set aside</td>
<td>maintain, let grow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detain, hold back</td>
<td>keep in order</td>
<td>involve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>note, put down in writing</td>
<td>confine, detain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keep aside, postpone</td>
<td>keep sth hanging</td>
<td>keep open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dictionaries used:
- Bangla Academy Bengali-English Dictionary, Dhaka 1994 (BA)
- Progressive Bengali-English Dictionary, Calcutta 1991 (Prog)
### CHAPTER 2 APPENDIX 2  
**The Compound Makers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>हाओँ</th>
<th>होँ</th>
<th>चला</th>
<th>उठा</th>
<th>पड़ा</th>
<th>कसँ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syntactic features</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syntactic requirements</td>
<td>with intransitive and transitive verbs</td>
<td>with intransitive and transitive verbs</td>
<td>with intransitive and transitive verbs</td>
<td>with intransitive verbs (possibly with transitive verbs, but no examples found)</td>
<td>with intransitive and transitive verbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantic impact</td>
<td>motion away from subject, finality</td>
<td>motion towards the speaker, resultative</td>
<td>motion from</td>
<td>motion downwards, growth, unexpectedness sudden, abrupt change</td>
<td>sudden, unexpected inappropiate, rash unprededented, exaggerated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantic requirements (with which verbs)</td>
<td>verbs of motion, verbs of change (gradual, eg धूकरे, or momentary, eg झेले)</td>
<td>verbs of motion, verbs of gradual change</td>
<td>verbs of motion, continuative verbs continuous or repeated actions or processes</td>
<td>verbs of growth, improvement, with होँ become verbs of sound (sudden onset)</td>
<td>verbs of volitional acts, 'acts that can be performed in a rash manner ' (Kachru)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspective features</td>
<td>completive, continuative</td>
<td>completive, progressive, continuative</td>
<td>completive, iteratve</td>
<td>completive</td>
<td>completive, intensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical counterparts or opposites</td>
<td>directional opposite of हाओँ, intransitive counterpart of होँ, फेला</td>
<td>directional opposite of होँ</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>directional opposite of पड़ा, intransitive counterpart of कसँ</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenses</td>
<td>all tenses</td>
<td>all tenses</td>
<td>all tenses</td>
<td>not in continuos tenses</td>
<td>not in continuous tenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retains some of its lexical meaning</td>
<td>with transitive verbs, with verbs of motion</td>
<td>with transitive verbs, with verbs of motion</td>
<td>with verbs of motion</td>
<td>partly with verbs of upward motion, not with transitive verbs</td>
<td>partly with verbs like कसँ, होँ, दुःखाने, not with other verbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can be used in negative sentences</td>
<td>yes, in all tenses</td>
<td>yes, in all tenses</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical information in dictionaries</td>
<td>used after many verbs to complete or modify their meaning (BA)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>as an auxiliary: to perform an action, completion of an action (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional nuance</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>can be positive</td>
<td>can be negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### The Compound Makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>syntactic features</th>
<th>तथा stay, remain</th>
<th>आस be, stay</th>
<th>देवा give</th>
<th>तेता take</th>
<th>फेता throw</th>
<th>तेला lift, raise</th>
<th>राखा keep, put</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syntactic</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>transitive</td>
<td>transitive</td>
<td>transitive</td>
<td>transitive</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements</td>
<td>with intransitive or transitive verbs</td>
<td>with intransitive or transitive verbs</td>
<td>with transitive verbs</td>
<td>with transitive verbs</td>
<td>transitive verbs, but also with करा and भावा</td>
<td>with transitive verbs</td>
<td>with transitive verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantic impact</td>
<td>continuous, changes actions into states or continuatives</td>
<td>stative, changes actions into continuatives</td>
<td>other-benefactive</td>
<td>self-benefactive</td>
<td>done easily, intensely, exhaustively done, violent, thoroughly</td>
<td>achievement after some effort, upward motion, gradual action</td>
<td>anticipatory action, accomplished for future use, prolongation of verbal action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantic</td>
<td>with stative or active verbs</td>
<td>with stative verbs, with active verbs</td>
<td>with volitional verbs, often with causative verbs</td>
<td>with volitional verbs that are inherently self-directed</td>
<td>with volitional verbs, changes acts of duration eg लिखा, पढ़ा, करा, करना into momentary actions</td>
<td>often with causative verbs</td>
<td>with active verbs which have some duration in time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements (with which verbs)</td>
<td>with stative or active verbs</td>
<td>with stative verbs, with active verbs</td>
<td>with volitional verbs, often with causative verbs</td>
<td>with volitional verbs that are inherently self-directed</td>
<td>with volitional verbs, changes acts of duration eg लिखा, पढ़ा, करा, करना into momentary actions</td>
<td>often with causative verbs</td>
<td>with active verbs which have some duration in time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspective features</td>
<td>continuative, habitual</td>
<td>continuative</td>
<td>completive</td>
<td>intensive</td>
<td>completive, intensive</td>
<td>completive</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical</td>
<td>intransitive counterpart of आशा, आश, आसा</td>
<td>intransitive counterpart of आशा, आसा</td>
<td>directional opposite of देवा</td>
<td>directional opposite of देवा</td>
<td>transitive counterpart of पढ़ा, directional opposite of देवा</td>
<td>transitive counterpart of आशा, आश, आसा</td>
<td>transitive counterpart of आशा, आसा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenses</td>
<td>all tenses</td>
<td>present and past tense only</td>
<td>all tenses</td>
<td>all tenses</td>
<td>not in continuous tenses</td>
<td>not in continuous tenses</td>
<td>all tenses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Compounds with गो गो
- गो गो, आस, आसा, आसा, आसा,
- विकिर, विकिर, विकिर,

### Compounds with आसा come
- आसा come, आसा, आसा, आसा,
- रिवा, रिवा, रिवा,
- नामा, नामा, नामा,
- राखा, राखा, राखा,

### Compounds with निवरी move
- निवरी, निवरी, निवरी,
- भावा, भावा, भावा,
- करा, करा, करा,
- करना, करना, करना,

### Compounds with आसा rise, get up
- आसा, आसा, आसा, आसा,
- हो, हो, हो,
- रिवा, रिवा, रिवा,
- नामा, नामा, नामा,
- राखा, राखा, राखा,
- करा, करा, करा,
- करना, करना, करना,

### Compounds with आसा fall
- आसा, आसा, आसा, आसा,
- हो, हो, हो,
- रिवा, रिवा, रिवा,
- नामा, नामा, नामा,
- राखा, राखा, राखा,
- करा, करा, करा,
- करना, करना, करना,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>থাকা stay, remain</th>
<th>আছে be, stay</th>
<th>সেবনা give</th>
<th>তেজা take</th>
<th>ফেলা throw</th>
<th>তোলা lift, raise</th>
<th>রাখা keep, put</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>retains some of its lexical meaning</td>
<td>yes, with all verbs</td>
<td>yes, with all verbs</td>
<td>very marginally</td>
<td>very marginally</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can be used in negative sentences</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>occasionally, in idiomatic use</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical information in dictionaries</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>used after certain verbs to indicate completion (BA)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>finish up, commit suddenly, do abruptly or unexpectedly (Prog)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional nuance</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>intimacy (?)</td>
<td>intimacy (?)</td>
<td>can be negative</td>
<td>can be positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compounds with</td>
<td>intransitive verbs</td>
<td>same as থাকা, present and past tense only</td>
<td>করা, বলা, লিখা, খুলা, দেওয়া, রাখা, ছাড়া, কেলা, তোলা, কেনা</td>
<td>বেলা, মুনা, জানা, বুকা, খাওয়া, মানা, নেওয়া, শিখা, করা, চাওয়া, ধরা, কেনা</td>
<td>বাড়া, কলা, জেলা, করা, ডেনা, দেওয়া, ভাড়া, জিড়া, বন্ধু, মারা, খুলা, মুলা</td>
<td>কাঁদা, হাসা incr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transitive verbs: করা, চাওয়া, ধরা, পুনরায় খাওয়া, বলা, লিখা</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with causatives: বুকানো, নামানো, উত্তানো, মুকানো</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations of dictionaries: Samsad (S), Bangla Academy (BA), Progressive (Prog)
### POSTPOSITIONS RASHIDA BEGUM (translations are mine)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>postposition</th>
<th>case of preceding noun</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| অনুপস্থিত | nom | than | অনেক স্থানে পদ্ধতি অনুপস্থিত গল্প কাহারের উপায়ধীন।
In many places the poetry of prose is more appropriate than verse. |
| অজাজাতহত | gen | without knowledge of | অজাজাতহত অজাজাতহতের সময় ফেরিয়ে এলে।
He came out of the house without anyone noticing. |
| অগ্রহণে | gen | because of | অগ্রহণের অগ্রহণে কীভাবে চলছে?
Amin took a holiday because of illness. |
| অনুপাতে | gen | comparative to | শালী তালের অংশতার শালী নাম।
Shall is taller than Shyamoli. |
| অনুক্তি | nom | according to | ব্যক্তিদের নিয়ম অনুক্তির কর্তৃত্ব করা আছে না।
According to grammar rules a nominative comes before an accusative. |
| অনুসরণ | nom | at intervals | একই স্থানে অনুসরণ ব্যবহার করা হয়।
(You) will take the medicine every two hours. |
| অববিদি | nom | up to | অববিদির অববিদি রাখা পাকা।
Up to the post office the road is sealed. |
| অববিদি | nom | up to | সুতো করে বাতাস অববিদি জেগে কবিতা লেখেন।
Suупা stays up so late at night writing poetry. |
| অভ্যাসের | gen | inside | দলের অভ্যাসের ভালো হয়েছে।
The group is crumbling from inside. |
| আগে | nom, gen | before | উন্নয়নের মিনিতে দশকের আগে ছাড়া।
The train will leave ten minutes early today. |
| আশ পাশে | gen | near by | বাড়ির বিকাশ উন্নয়ন কোথাও বোধ হয়েছে।
The bomb fell somewhere right next to the house. |
| আরোহণে | gen | in favour of | আরোহণের আরোহণে কথা বলা হয়েছে।
(He) was told to save money for him. |
| আশ পাশে | gen | near | বাড়ির আশায় কেনা বিকাশ নেই।
There are no shops close to the house. |
| আড়ালে | gen | behind | গ্রামের প্রবেশের আড়ালে নীতি কথা থাকা।
In stories and proverbs something is said about customs. |
| উদ্দেশ্যে | gen | to | কমানির উদ্দেশ্যে বলা হয়েছে।
Kamal has been told. |
| উদ্দেশ্যে | gen | towards | আশায় যাত্রার উদ্দেশ্যে
our travel towards the village |
| উপরে | gen | about | তার কবিতার উপরে কিছু সমালোচনা বেরিয়েছে।
Some discussions of his poetry have been published. |
| | gen | on | There is a book on the table.
| | gen | about | আরাম উপরে তিনি ছিলেন।
He is distressed about me. |
| | gen | in front of | মুখের উপর কথা সুনিয়ে দিন।
He said this in front of me. |
| | nom | for | ইদ উপলক্ষে উদয় হচ্ছে।
There are Eid celebrations going on. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>उदाहरण</th>
<th>गणना (gen)</th>
<th>स्थान (nom)</th>
<th>स्थान (nom)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>एक्षण</td>
<td>ऊपर (above)</td>
<td>आमिना का सब कथा है सबसे ऊपर।</td>
<td>Everything Amina has said is beyond doubt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>एक्षण</td>
<td>नज़ीब (near)</td>
<td>आमिना एक्षण में किसी चारों ना।</td>
<td>Don't demand anything from me here!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>एक्षण</td>
<td>नज़ीब (near)</td>
<td>दरजाज़ एक्षण में शन है।</td>
<td>There is a noise over there by the door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कथा</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (about)</td>
<td>तोमार कथा भावित है।</td>
<td>I was worried about you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (in the grip of)</td>
<td>पादुका सल्लुला नौका कवल के पड़े।</td>
<td>All the boats on the Padma have been gripped by the storm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (by)</td>
<td>बांलादेश के लोगों पादुका सल्लुला सरकार क्षणिग्न अनुमोदित।</td>
<td>School books in Bangladesh are sanctioned by the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (by means of)</td>
<td>तोमार कवल के आमिना का चार रहता है।</td>
<td>Amina got a job through you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (near)</td>
<td>दरजाज़ कवल पेरे बन गया।</td>
<td>There was a rustling sound near the door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (near)</td>
<td>लोकपाठ के बाद चर्चा के कवल बाध्यवान।</td>
<td>The man is about forty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (near)</td>
<td>बांडिय सज़ाएँ एस पांडियों ने बन देखा।</td>
<td>When we got near the house the car broke down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (to)</td>
<td>शक्तिशाली सज़ाएँ चारित्र निर्देशित।</td>
<td>The readers used to write letters to Saratochandra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (for)</td>
<td>अनेकां कवल बुद्धि बुद्धि।</td>
<td>Many people find the Buddhust semigods hard to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (with)</td>
<td>आमिना बुज़बुज़ कवल से मिलाते हैं।</td>
<td>Ahamad stays with his big sister in Sylhet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (constantly near)</td>
<td>चारां कवल सब समय आमिना कवल की कवल है।</td>
<td>My little brother is always with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (near)</td>
<td>बांडिय कवल के कोनों से कवल।</td>
<td>There are no shops near the house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (because of)</td>
<td>तोमार कवल कवल के हाल रहता।</td>
<td>My going was delayed because of you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (at the time of)</td>
<td>दिनदहाड़ कवल अकेले कवल।</td>
<td>Many people move away in times of danger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (at the time of)</td>
<td>विधानसभा के अयोग्य निर्देशक चर्चाकारी के बाद देशवास निकाला।</td>
<td>When legal council meetings are in progress entry to this area is forbidden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (as a result)</td>
<td>तारे कवल के निर्देशक को बन लेना।</td>
<td>Because of this I made no profit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (by)</td>
<td>बांडिय बांडिय कवल खुल बिंदु कवल।</td>
<td>The girls are selling flowers in (his) honour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (below)</td>
<td>बांडिय कवल के कवल कवल।</td>
<td>Radha has an ink-stain under her eye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (in the middle of)</td>
<td>बूढ़े कवल के बिंदु कवल।</td>
<td>There is a drop in the middle of the circle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (about)</td>
<td>पृथ्वीकों कवल कवल बांडिय कवल।</td>
<td>Complications have arisen about the accident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (according to)</td>
<td>आमिना अनुवाद के कवल कवल।</td>
<td>According to our request he is going with us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कवल</td>
<td>क्षणिग्न (for the sake of)</td>
<td>कवल के कवल कवल कवल।</td>
<td>I have neglected you for the sake of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>খাতে</td>
<td>nom toward</td>
<td>The incident could take a turn in any direction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>কেন্দ্র</td>
<td>gen in case of</td>
<td>The case of Banalata Sen this statement is applicable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>গায়ে</td>
<td>gen with</td>
<td>Karim's land is next to the beel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>গায়ে</td>
<td>gen on</td>
<td>Nowadays there are slogans even on the walls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>পোড়াঘায়</td>
<td>gen near</td>
<td>There is a noise beside (my) ear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ঘিরে</td>
<td>nom around</td>
<td>The girl has a wide interwoven border round her waist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>চাহিতে</td>
<td>nom than</td>
<td>The Padma is the most important river in the country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>চে</td>
<td>nom than</td>
<td>Aisha is the oldest of the siblings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>চেয়ে</td>
<td>nom, gen than</td>
<td>Selim's statement sounded truer than anyone else's.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ছাড়া</td>
<td>nom, acc without except</td>
<td>He doesn't go anywhere without me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ছাড়িয়ে</td>
<td>nom across</td>
<td>Across the pasture is a field of ripe paddy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>জাতীয়</td>
<td>nom like</td>
<td>a story like a fairy-tale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>জায়পাইয়া</td>
<td>gen instead of</td>
<td>He brought me lychees instead of mangoes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>জনা,জনা</td>
<td>gen for</td>
<td>for you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>জেলের</td>
<td>gen with the help of</td>
<td>Amin will pass his exams with the help of his good memory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>অপার</td>
<td>gen near</td>
<td>It has been stolen from under my nose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>তলায়</td>
<td>gen underneath</td>
<td>There is a girl standing under the tree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>তুলনায়</td>
<td>gen comparative to</td>
<td>Compared to girls boys are more advanced at football.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>থেকে</td>
<td>nom gen from</td>
<td>It is not very far from Dhaka to Calcutta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>থেকে</td>
<td>nom gen from</td>
<td>The smell of jasmin is more intense than that of roses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>দখলে</td>
<td>gen in the grip of</td>
<td>Your pen is now in Shyamol's grip.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>দখল</td>
<td>gen because of</td>
<td>Because of the incident the train will arrive late.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ball was rolling towards the goal. Come around evening time!

The boy ate rice mixed with milk.
The bird flew through the window.
Water is running off (her) hair.
Not everything can be proved by argument.

Further along this road is the prime minister's residence.
I called (him) by name.
There has been incessant rain for one week.
Selim is beside the fence.
There is no post-office near the house.
Without me his work won't get done.
His song won't be heard without me.

I played the sitar until seven in the evening.
Somebody told on you.
Nazrul's poetry is very valuable in order to understand Nazrul.
Abahani will play instead of Mohamedan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>before</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>এক রাত্রি প্রায় ৬টার দিকে বাছাড়া।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>side by side</td>
<td>তোমার ছবির পাশাপাশি আমাদের ছবি ছাপা হয়েছে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>beside</td>
<td>বাড়ির ঠিক পাশে একটা কক্ষ ছিল।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratidhi</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>towards</td>
<td>তোমার প্রতি তোমার খারাপ অভিনব সহায়তা।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>সেটিতে কিছুটা কী কিছু জেনেছি।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paribesh</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>across</td>
<td>তোমার অভিষেকের সাথে সাথে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>as a result</td>
<td>উক্তিটি প্রায় ৬টার দিকে ছুড়ে দেওয়া হলো।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>in between</td>
<td>কোনো কোনো স্থানে একান্ত বর্তমান।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baner</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>instead of</td>
<td>আপনাদের বাদল পেয়ারা দেনো।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baner</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>An application has been made to the registrar।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>along</td>
<td>তোমার বাবার সাথে আবেদন করা হয়েছে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>because of</td>
<td>আমার পাকা বাদল মিথ্যা।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>The mango is sweet because it is ripe।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by the help of</td>
<td>মূলতঃ বলে কিছুটা বলা যায় না।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As a brother-in-law, there is nothing I can say।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>মানুষ মূঢ় বলে আগুন আবিষ্কার করেন।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Man invented fire through intelligence।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>because of</td>
<td>তোমার নাম লেখা হয়েছে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>under the influence of</td>
<td>তোমার নাম লেখা হয়েছে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>out of reach</td>
<td>বল নাগালের বাইরে চলে গেছে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>The ball has rolled beyond reach।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>লোকটি সরানাচার বাইরে দীর্ঘিয়েঃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the person standing outside the door।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>দুই দিন বাদে আমার সাথে দেখা কর।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>without</td>
<td>Come and see me in two days time।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>করলে বাদে যে কোনও বল খাওয়া দেয়ে পারে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any fruit can be eaten except oranges।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>at intervals</td>
<td>দুই দিন বাদে দেখা করেন।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Come and see me every two days।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>কাজন বাবার পীচ হারায় টাকা পেয়া হয়েছে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Five thousand Taka has been given as revenue।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>against</td>
<td>মোহামেদানের বিপক্ষে অবাহনের মত অভিনব দল খেলছে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A team as strong as Abahani played against Mohamedan।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>against</td>
<td>অবাহনের বিপক্ষে মোহামেদান খেলবে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mohamedan will play against Abahani।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All over the world the oppressed are at war with the oppressors.

Everyone is worried about you.

There is a sailingboat in the middle of the sea.

To demonstrate humanity is the best attribute of a human.

Everyone is at college except for Bela.

Everyone except Kolpona will receive a prize.

You can't write poetry without imagination.

You have been told about you.

Moytreyi Debi wrote with courage about herself.

The ball went straight inside the room.

Malika decorated the house according to her own liking.

There is no girl at the college for teaching Suroma.

In the middle of the picture there is a trace of the path.

In the middle of Phalgun our Krishnashrub started blossoming.

Equal-sized portals were erected at intervals along the road.

As soon as we got to Dhaka it started raining.

As soon as we got to Dhaka it started raining.

People keep their spines straight through hard work.

The boat was going against the current.

The boat was going against the current.

Somebody is at the root of this incidence.
| সংবাদ | gen | inside | বাঙালির মধ্যে একটা গোল মাখ।
There is a round mark inside the box.  
মূজনের মধ্যে কুমভাব।
There is a great friendship between them. |
| মধ্যাহ্নে | gen | in the middle of | ঘরের মধ্যাহ্নে একটা রেশিল।
There is a table in the middle of the room. |
| যাত্রা, যাত্রা | nom | during | সুই মাস যাকে সে অস্থূল।
He has been ill for two months. |
| যে কথা | nom | by | দেশের বাহিরে দৈনিক বাঙালি জাহাজের গাঠনো হয়।
Daily Bengali newspapers are sent out of the country by post. |
| রুপ | nom | as | আগেরকার দিনে পাথর হাঁটার রুপে ঘায়েছে থাক।
A long time ago stones were used as weapons. |
| শুভ | nom | with | টান শুষ্ক ফুলটি ছিড়ে এনেছে।
They tore off the branch together with the flower. |
| সত্ত্বেও | nom | in spite of | মানা করা সত্ত্বেও আমিন ছায়াহিবি দেখে।
Even though he was forbidden, Amin went to the cinema. |
| সামগ্রী | nom | with | বামাল সময়ে চারটি ঘরা পড়িল।
Four people were arrested with the stolen goods. |
| সমাপ্তি | nom | about | জেনে যাওয়া সমাপ্তি আমাদের কৌতুকে অবিচ্ছিন্ন বায়েছে।
We are getting more curious about James Joyce every day. |
| সমুদ্রে | gen | about | রবীন্দ্রনাথ সমুদ্রে তার একটা কবিতা আছে।
There is a poem by him about Tagore. |
| সুরুর | nom | as | আমিন নির্ভীক সুরুর অনুসারে কথা উল্লেখ করেছে।
Amin refers to the illness as an explanation. |
| সেহামের | nom | with | জন্মের মীরের সেহামের শিশুদের মিলাতে এগিয়ে গেলে।
Sahid advanced towards Minar with a crowd. |
| সঙ্গে | gen | with | সেলিমের পাষাণের সঙ্গে আমিনের পাষাণ মেলে না।
Selim's and Amina's preferences are not the same. |
| সঙ্গে সঙ্গে | gen | constantly with | আমার ছোট ভাই সব সময় আমার সঙ্গে সঙ্গে থাকে।
My little brother stays with me all the time.
বাশি বাজারের সঙ্গে সঙ্গে ট্রেন ছাড়ল।
As soon as the whistle went the train set off. |
| সাথে | gen | with | কোমার সাথে যাও।
I will go with you. |
| সামাজিক সামাজিক | gen | face to face | আমাদের সামাজিক সামাজিক তিনি বড়িয়ে আছেন।
He is standing in front of us. |
| সামনে | gen | in front of | মেয়েরা ধর্জার সামনে বসে পুকুরে মেজাজস্থ।
The girls sat in front of the door and played with dolls. |
| সাহায্যে | gen | with the help of | ফেনিকার সাহায্যে ফেনিকার পাত্রের মত উজ্জল দিদী পার হয়।
The fishermen cross a river as rough as the Padma by boat. |
| সুমধ্যে | gen | in front of | ফাঁদির সুমধ্যে একটা পুকুর।
There is a pond in front of the house. |
| সৌজন্যে | gen | in courtesy of [sic] | ফোরবার্কের সৌজন্যে পোশাক হাজার টাকা পাঠিয়েছেন।
Five thousand Taka was sent for the writer. |
| হাত থেকে | gen | from | একশোজোনির হাত থেকে মানুষ মুক্তি চায়।
People want to be free of monotony. |
| হাতে | gen | by | সুরক্ষার হাতে লাঁদিত disgraced by wickedness |
| হিসাবে | nom | as | বিদ্রোহী তথ্য হিসেবে জায়গার ইসলামের কাছাকাছি কেউ কি
কেতে পেরেছে? Has anybody been able to come close to Nazrul Islam as a rebel poet? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>हত</th>
<th>nom</th>
<th>than</th>
<th>राधा हते ललिता অনেক বড়।</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>हত</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>तिनি আমার হতে কলকাতা।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हत</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>via</td>
<td>He spoke for me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am going to Calcutta via Dhaka.
## LIST OF POSTPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W.L. Smith</th>
<th>W.S. Milne</th>
<th>S.K. Chatterji</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beyond</td>
<td>beyond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in lieu of</td>
<td>in accordance with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the side of, for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the sake of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at intervals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after, every</td>
<td>at intervals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to, until</td>
<td>from, since</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in order to, with the object of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before, ago</td>
<td>before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by, alongside</td>
<td>aloft, high, above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in order to, with the intention of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in search of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on, over, upon, at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over, above, against</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over, by way of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the intention of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aloft, high, above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by, through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around, near from (a person)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near, by the side of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near, by, beside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on account of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of regard for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the presence of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house, in the house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on all four sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on all sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on all sides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without, besides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>besides, except</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for, for the sake of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the sake of, for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the sake of, because of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.L. Smith</td>
<td>W.S. Milne</td>
<td>S.K. Chatterji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for, for the sake of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below, at the bottom of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from, out of, since</td>
<td>having stopped at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from, since</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>having stopped at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>locative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for, on account of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the direction of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from, through, with, by, by means of</td>
<td>having given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through, by, via</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for, during (a period of time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>during</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>near, toby the side of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below, at the bottom of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with, in the company of, about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for, on the side of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after, later</td>
<td>above, upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>since, after</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instead of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>up to, as far as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after, behind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by the side of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the direction of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the direction of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at, towards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by, near,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alongside of, beside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>behind, after</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after, behind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards, in the direction of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>against</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>against</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.L. Smith</td>
<td>W.S. Milne</td>
<td>S.K. Chatterji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the presence of</td>
<td>because of</td>
<td>without, apart from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instead of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct, to the address of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on account of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from without</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without, besides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposed to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against, opposed to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the matter of, concerning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without, besides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without, besides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>according to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the midst of, within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from amidst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the midst of, within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by means of, through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of, by means of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having come in touch with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connected with, concerning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with, in the company of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>along with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as, simultaneously with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.L. Smith</td>
<td>W.S. Milne</td>
<td>S.K. Chatterji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in spite of, despite</strong></td>
<td><strong>in spite of</strong></td>
<td><strong>with</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>near</strong></td>
<td><strong>like</strong></td>
<td><strong>with</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in relation to, about, regarding</strong></td>
<td><strong>in the matter of, concerning</strong></td>
<td><strong>in front of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>about</strong></td>
<td><strong>with</strong></td>
<td><strong>in front of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>with</strong></td>
<td><strong>with</strong></td>
<td><strong>in the presence of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>with, in the company of</strong></td>
<td><strong>with</strong></td>
<td><strong>inclusion, also</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>in front of</strong></td>
<td><strong>in the place of, by way of</strong></td>
<td><strong>in that case</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>from, since</strong></td>
<td><strong>from, since</strong></td>
<td><strong>ablative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>via, by way of</strong></td>
<td><strong>through, by, via</strong></td>
<td><strong>in that case</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>as, in the capacity of</strong></td>
<td><strong>because of</strong></td>
<td><strong>in that case</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Chapter 3, Appendix 3 Postpositions Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>postposition</th>
<th>derivation</th>
<th>status / word class (dictionary)</th>
<th>case of preceding noun</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>special use / example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>আগে</td>
<td>loc আগে n front, forepart</td>
<td>adverbial - connection with noun weak</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>temporal</td>
<td>before, first, early, ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>উদ্দেশ্য</td>
<td>loc উদ্দেশ্য n intention, purpose</td>
<td>remains nominal, not a proper postposition</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>purpose</td>
<td>in order to, with the intention of, for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>উপরে</td>
<td>loc উপরে n top, upper part</td>
<td>adverbial, prep - connection with noun weak</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>above, on top of, upon, over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>কাছে</td>
<td>from কাছ n nearness, proximity; not as postpos</td>
<td>adverbial, not often used as postpos</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>near, close, about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ছাড়া</td>
<td>loc ছাড়া n nearness, proximity</td>
<td>adv, prep - independent of noun</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>near, close, by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>জন্য</td>
<td>loc in form only, জন্য also given as prep</td>
<td>prep</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>advocacy or purpose</td>
<td>for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>থেকে (কাছ</td>
<td>(n +) perf part of থেকে</td>
<td>থেকে has lost verbal character (loc ending is dropped)</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>from (a person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>দিকে (চারঘিন)</td>
<td>loc দিক n direction, side of</td>
<td>not given separately</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>towards, in the direction of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>দিয়ে</td>
<td>perf part of দিয়ে</td>
<td>prep, but connection with verb remains</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>with, by, through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ধরে</td>
<td>perf part of ধরে</td>
<td>prep - connection with verb remains</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>temporal</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>নিচে</td>
<td>loc নিচে, n adj</td>
<td>adv and prep, but nominal connection remains</td>
<td>gen as prep, nom as adv</td>
<td>spatial</td>
<td>below, under, underneath, down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>নিয়ে</td>
<td>perf part of নিয়ে</td>
<td>remains verbal</td>
<td>nom, acc for people</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>with, in the company of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>postposition</th>
<th>derivation</th>
<th>status/ word class (dictionary)</th>
<th>case of preceding noun</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>special use/ example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>মাঝা</td>
<td>loc মাঝা</td>
<td>n, middle, centre</td>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>spatial between, in the middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>মাঝাম</td>
<td>loc মাঝাম</td>
<td>n, medium</td>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>instrumental by means of, through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সাঙ্গ</td>
<td>loc সাঙ্গ</td>
<td>n, company, association</td>
<td>prep</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>manner with, together with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সাঙ্গকে</td>
<td>loc সাঙ্গকে</td>
<td>n, relationship</td>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>nom for inanimates, gen for animates</td>
<td>referential about, in relation to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সাঙ্গে</td>
<td>loc সাঙ্গে</td>
<td>n, relation, connection</td>
<td>prep</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>referential regarding, about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সাথে</td>
<td>loc সাথে</td>
<td>n, company</td>
<td>prep</td>
<td>gen</td>
<td>manner with, together with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>সাথাম</td>
<td>loc সাথাম</td>
<td>n, front, forepart</td>
<td>prep or adv</td>
<td>gen as prep, nom as adv</td>
<td>spatial in front of, before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>হেত, হইতে</td>
<td>inf of হেত</td>
<td>prep, has taken on independent meaning</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>spatial or temporal from, since</td>
<td>হেতে can be used instead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>হেন</td>
<td>perf part of হেন</td>
<td>prep, has taken on independent meaning</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>spatial through, via</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>হিসাবে</td>
<td>loc হিসাবে</td>
<td>n, account, reckoning</td>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>manner as, about</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHAPTER 4, TIME ADVERBIALS

#### Positional Time Adverbials (cf chapter p 22ff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Deictic Relatum (TU)</th>
<th>Anaphoric Relatum (TT)</th>
<th>Further Specification</th>
<th>Boundedness</th>
<th>Tense Restrictions, Not Used In:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>এখন</strong></td>
<td><em>now</em></td>
<td>simul</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>varies in extension</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>past cont past perf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>এখনই</strong></td>
<td><em>just now</em></td>
<td>simul</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>very close to TU</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>pres perf past cont past perf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>তখন</strong></td>
<td><em>then</em></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>simul</td>
<td>varies in extension</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>simple pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>আজকে</strong></td>
<td><em>today</em></td>
<td>simul</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>precise rel to TU</td>
<td>left, right</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>গতকাল / মাস / বছর</strong></td>
<td><em>yesterday, last week, year etc</em></td>
<td>before</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>precise rel to TU</td>
<td>left, right</td>
<td>simple pres future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>আগামীকাল / মাস / বছর</strong></td>
<td><em>tomorrow, next month, year etc</em></td>
<td>after</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>precise rel to TU</td>
<td>left, right</td>
<td>simple past past cont past perf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>কালকে</strong></td>
<td><em>tomorrow, yesterday</em></td>
<td>before after</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>precise rel to TU</td>
<td>left, right</td>
<td>simple pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ভোর, সকালে, রাত্রে etc</strong></td>
<td><em>at dawn, in the morning, at night etc</em></td>
<td>before after</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>precise rel to TU or TT</td>
<td>left, right</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>দিনে</strong></td>
<td><em>in the day time</em></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>unspecified with simple present</td>
<td>left, right</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>সে সময়ে</strong></td>
<td><em>at that time</em></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>simul</td>
<td>varies in extension</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>simple pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>তার আগে</strong></td>
<td><em>before that</em></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>before</td>
<td>varies in extension</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>simple pres pres cont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>তারপরে</strong></td>
<td><em>after that</em></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>after</td>
<td>varies in extension</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>simple pres pres cont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>সে কোনও সময়ে</strong></td>
<td><em>any time</em></td>
<td>after after</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>pres cont pres perf simple past past cont past perf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>সেই স্থানেতে</strong></td>
<td><em>at that moment</em></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>simul</td>
<td>narrow time range</td>
<td>left, right</td>
<td>simple pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>একটি পরের</strong></td>
<td><em>a bit later</em></td>
<td>after after</td>
<td>fairly close to TU or TT</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>simple pres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>অনেক আগে</strong></td>
<td><em>a long time ago, long before</em></td>
<td>before before</td>
<td>great distance from TU or TT</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>simple pres pres cont(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>এই সময়ের</strong></td>
<td><em>just now</em></td>
<td>before</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>very close to TU</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>simple pres future past cont past perf past perf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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other time adverbials

For the following time adverbials (frequentative (frequ), durative (dur), and those 'indicating the position of a situation in a series of possible situations' (pos sit) (Klein, p 149)), the above criteria of deixis and boundedness are of less relevance and, in order to make a meaningful statement about their semantic properties, other criteria have to be applied, eg their use with either stative or active verbs, intervals of occurrence (frequentative), length of duration (durative) and possible reiterative connotations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adverbial</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>functional type of adv</th>
<th>aspective features</th>
<th>semantic properties</th>
<th>boundedness, if any</th>
<th>tense restrictions, not used in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
<td>frequ</td>
<td>with stative or active verbs</td>
<td>constant re-occurrence (frequ) unlimited time range (dur)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>pres perf simple past past cont past perf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>frequ</td>
<td>with stative or active verbs</td>
<td>occasional reoccurrence</td>
<td></td>
<td>simple past past cont past perf (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>frequ</td>
<td>with stative or active verbs</td>
<td>no extension in time</td>
<td>left, right</td>
<td>continuous tenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyday, daily</td>
<td>frequ</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>regular reoccurrence within fixed time frame</td>
<td>left, right</td>
<td>future tense present perf all past tenses, except past habit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>again and again</td>
<td>frequ</td>
<td>with active verbs</td>
<td>repeated reoccurrence within open time frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once, twice etc</td>
<td>frequ</td>
<td>with punctual vbs</td>
<td>positional quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still</td>
<td>dur</td>
<td>imperfective aspect</td>
<td>deictic, can precede and include TU</td>
<td></td>
<td>pres perf simple past past cont past perf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not yet</td>
<td>dur (?)</td>
<td>imperfective aspect</td>
<td>expectation not met?</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>continuous tenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the meantime</td>
<td>dur</td>
<td>perfective aspect</td>
<td>deictic or anaphoric</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>simple pres pres cont future tense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>until now</td>
<td>dur</td>
<td>perfective aspect</td>
<td>deictic, up to TU</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>simple pres pres cont past cont past perf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for so long</td>
<td>dur</td>
<td>imperfective aspect</td>
<td>deictic or anaphoric</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>simple pres future tense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all day, all night</td>
<td>dur</td>
<td>not with telic vbs</td>
<td>deictic with all but simple pres</td>
<td>left, right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>again</td>
<td>pos sit</td>
<td>with active or stative vbs</td>
<td>non-deictic, reiterative</td>
<td>left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>pos sit</td>
<td>not with stative vbs</td>
<td>earlier than expected</td>
<td>left</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>দেরিতে</td>
<td><em>late</em></td>
<td>pos sit</td>
<td><strong>not with stative verbs</strong></td>
<td>later than expected</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>অক্ষরে</td>
<td><em>at first</em></td>
<td>pos sit</td>
<td><em>with active or stative verbs</em></td>
<td>first in a series of events</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>pres tenses unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>শুরুতে</td>
<td><em>at the beginning</em></td>
<td>pos sit</td>
<td><em>with active or stative verbs</em></td>
<td><em>beginning of a fixed time span</em></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>pres tenses unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>শেষে</td>
<td><em>finally</em></td>
<td>pos sit</td>
<td><em>with active or stative verbs</em></td>
<td><em>ending of a fixed time span</em></td>
<td>left</td>
<td>pres tenses unlikely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ERRATA

The errata listed here serve only to tidy up the text, i.e., add missing page number references, correct spelling or other mistakes. More substantial changes will be incorporated in a forthcoming overhaul of these chapters to make them suitable for publication.

Chapter 1 (non-finites)

p 38, line 2 should read: is a present participle or an infinitive (quoted on page 36).

p 46, translation missing:

p 56, line 5 should read:

Chapter 2 (compound verbs)

p 71 line 7 of Definitions: change 'Pobito' to 'Pabitra'

p 77, line 2 should read:

p 78, line 4, under 3:

p 86, line 13/14 should read:

p 89, line 15

Chapter 3 (postpositions)

p 95 under 3, last line: add full stop after 'sentences'

p 96, line 22: for 'cofirm' read 'confirm'

p 100, line 11: 'The analysis...' - this should be moved to the beginning of the line and not have a bullet point

p 101, line 8: for কি উপলব্ধিতা তা অপুলিতে read কি উপলব্ধি তাহার অপুলিতে

p 107, eighth line from the end of the section on নিয়ে: for 'When নিয়ে is used as a perfective participle...' read 'When নিয়ে is used as part of a compound verb...'

p 112, line 11: for তুমি বিনানাই চাও তুমি বিনা নাই for আমারা read আমারা

Chapter 5 (verbs of being)

p 189 last entry: for হলে read হল

p 191 second last line should be: (discussed in tenses chapter p 128)

p 200 line 10 should read: examples are given in section 1 (p 164)

Chapter 6 (word order)

p 210, line 1 under 5: for I have told you read I have told father

p 217, 3rd line under 7.3.5: for বিনষ্ট destroyed read বিনষ্ট