Macrothink Institute™

International Journal of Linguistics
ISSN 1948-5425
2024, Vol. 16, No. 3

Complex Predicates in the Verbal System of Kumzari Language

Said Al-Jahdhami

Department of English Language & Literature, Sultan Qaboos University

P.O. Box 42, PC. 123, Muscat, Oman

Tel: 968-241-402-378 E-mail: saidj@squ.edu.om

Received: April 9, 2024 Accepted: May 19, 2024 Published: June 5, 2024

doi:10.5296/ijl.v16i3.21948 URL: https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v16i3.21948

Abstract

Complex predicates, composites made of more than one grammatical element, are attested in an ample number of verbal systems cross-linguistically whereby syntactically independent elements combine together to form semantically joined units. Syntactic elements that belong to an array of forms and lexical categories chain with verbs to make verbal structures whose building and meaning are equally dependent on both parts of the structure. Each element exhibits certain patterns and behaviors, and makes its own semantic contribution to the composite predicate, resulting in a collective meaning that is not necessarily a precise reflection of the overall meanings signified by both elements. Drawing on data from Kumzari language, this paper attempts to give a better understanding of its verbal system, and to situate its complex predicates within the complex predicates spectrum. It argues that complex predicates in Kumzari belong to the 'light verb constructions' [LVCs] realm since both elements exhibit similar features attested in light verb constructions of other languages, including Indo-Iranian languages, such as syntactic and semantic compatibility, morphosyntactic behaviors, and joint predication of argument structures.

Keywords: Kumzari, Oman, Predicates, Verbal system, Light verb constructions

1. Introduction

The term 'complex predicate' is used elastically to refer to a variety of constructions whose internal structure is made of two grammatical elements that appear to be independent of one another, but they both behave as one formed unit that denotes the meaning resulting out of the contribution of both elements (Allerton, 2002; Vincze et al., 2011). One unique type of complex predicate is the so-called Light Verb Constructions (henceforth LVC), namely verbal constructions made of a verb with a bleached or little semantic content (light verb) preceded by

a preverbal element that could belong to different lexical categories. The light verb does not have sufficient semantic force to function as an independent predicate; thus, it joins with another element to make a complex verbal unit with joint predication (Babych et al., 2009; Vincze et al., 2011). LVCs are also defined as verb phrases that result out of the combination of semantically depleted verbs (verbs that have somewhat lost their meaning) with their logical predicates (preverbal elements used in one of their original senses) that bear some situational propositions (Allerton, 2002; Butt, 2010; Ahmed & Butt, 2011). The contribution of both preverbals and the light verbs is indispensable for making a well-constructed LVC. The semantic content of LVCs is mostly indicated by the preverbal elements that tend to predicate names of actions, activities, properties and relations. Yet, the syntactic contribution is made by the light verbs since they license the construction its verbal nature and assign it other features like tense, number, agreement, and aspect marking (Allerton, 2002; Folli et al., 2005). Apart from LVCs, several other names have been used to refer to such constructions such as 'complex verb structures', 'support verb constructions', 'conjunct verbs', 'composite predicates', 'serial verb constructions', 'particle plus verb constructions', 'compound verbs', 'composite verbs', 'vector verb constructions', and 'explicator compound verbs' (Park, 1992;Butt & Geuder, 2001; Allerton, 2002; Butt, 2010; Ahmed & Butt, 2011; Vaidya et al., 2014).

LVCs usually have synonymous or equivalent 'heavy' verb constructions used in the language to denote somewhat the same general meaning like in 'to take a drink' versus 'to drink' and 'make an offer' versus 'to offer.'. Since such constructions tend to signify roughly the same intended meaning, speakers may use them interchangeably with LVCs without loss of the core meaning of the expression (Allerton, 2002; Vincze et al., 2011). Unlike heavy verbs, however, light verbs have subtle shades of meanings that are different from their unequivocal meanings when used as heavy verbs. Such subtlety of meanings is caused by their dependency on other predicative elements that seem to modulate the given predication of the composite verb (Folli et al., 2005; Babych et al., 2009; Vaidya & Palmer, 2016). LVCs are also found to share some syntactic patterns with other verb plus noun combinations that denote their very literal meaning, where nouns function as 'real objects of verbs' like in 'make cake & make bread' versus nouns that function as 'objects of light verbs' like in 'make a mistake & make a decision'. Unlike LVCs that tend to co-exist with synonymous verbal constructions both in usage and meaning (i.e. make a cry versus cry), 'verb plus object noun' constructions (i.e. make a house) do not have synonymous verbal construction that denote somewhat the same meaning and thus could replace them in some contexts depending on speakers' preferences (Babych et al., 2009).

Although LVCs are formed in a conventional way and may share some syntactic patterns with some verb plus noun combination, it is argued that they should not be analyzed as regular constructions due to their specific features that tease them out from other verbal constructions. It is also argued that they should not be translated literally since their meaning is partially uncompositional and sometimes fully idiomatic (Smardzic, 2008; Vincze & Csirik, 2010; Karimi-doostan, 2011). It is noteworthy that most of these verbal constructions are mistranslated by the state-of-the-art machine translation systems since such systems translate

them literally, giving no account to the semantic relations between the two elements and the collectively denoted meaning (Babych et al., 2009). Although such machines have witnessed some improvement in delivering the exact meanings of LVCs, still they are susceptible to mistranslation. It is proposed, accordingly, that the relationship between these verbs and their complements should be defined in terms of lexical functions since they predicate jointly a monoclausal structure (Ahmed & Butt, 2011). Likewise, translation of these constructions should bear in mind the subtle shades of meanings they may bear so that proper translation with the intended meanings is delivered. (Folli et al., 2005; Babych et al., 2009; Vaidya & Palmer, 2016)

The perception behind the term 'light' in LVCs is that these verbs cannot contribute full predication like when used as 'heavy' verbs although they may follow the standard verb complement schema (Smardzic, 2008). The verb take in 'take a walk', for example, does not hold its full semantic power since it does not denote that one physically takes 'a walk', which shows that it serves the function of a verbal licenser for the noun 'walk'. These verbs are not devoid of semantic content either. They fall into a middle zone, for they neither retain their full semantic meaning, nor are they semantically empty. The term 'heavy verbs', in contrast, signifies using a verb that has its full predicational content (Butt, 2010; Vaidya & Palmer, 2016). In its heavy use, the verb 'gave' in 'The vendor gave the buyer a sack.', for instance, denotes an event of giving something to somebody (a transfer of a theme (sack) from an agent (vendor) to a recipient (buyer). In its light use, on the other hand, (e.g., The vendor gave a speech.), the verb 'gave' does not denote a literal giving of something (speech) that is transferred to someone. The denoted event (giving a speech) is rather dependent on the element that accompanies the (light) verb not the (light) verb itself. The semantically depleted nature of light verbs (i.e. partially or fully devoid of its default meaning) that necessitates dependency on preverbal elements has led some researchers to consider them as purely functional elements such as auxiliaries or as a middle category between auxiliaries and main verbs (Allerton, 2002). Unlike auxiliaries and main verbs that fit one clear-cut category either as purely functional or purely lexical, light verbs seem to be debated that they are not fully functional nor fully lexical since they allow the ability to straddle the line between both categories (Stevenson et al., 2004; Butt, 2010).

From a diachronic point of view, it is said that there is historical relationship between light verbs and their main verbs counterpart in which one is derived from the other. Butt and Lahiri (2013) suggest that light verbs have developed from main verbs whose forms lost some of the semantic content as part of historical change; both light verbs and their corresponding main verbs, however, stand in a very tight relationship towards one another. It is suggested that the lexical specification of a handful of verbs cross linguistically serves the use of a main verb or a light verb depending on speakers' intention. Some common examples cross linguistically are the verbs for 'come', 'go', 'take', 'give', 'hit', 'throw', 'give', 'rise', 'fall' and 'do/make'. It is argued that the lexical semantic specifications of such verbs are so general that they can be used in multitude of contexts and to fit many constellations including LVCs (Babych et al., 2009; Butt, 2010; Butt & Lahiri, 2013; Vida & Palmer, 2016).

2. LVCs Cross Linguistically

Numerous studies of various scales have been done on complex predicates in several languages in the world, including LVCs. Modern European languages such as Russian, English, French, Italian, German, and Spanish, (Alba-Salas, 2002; Kearns, 2002; Wittenberg, 2014; Fleischhauer, 2016) are attested to exhibit a small scale of LVC productivity. Examples of LVCs in such language are 'оказывать давление= put pressure' (literally make pressure) in Russian (Salkoff, 1999), 'kuss geben= give a kiss' in German (Wittenberg, 2014) and 'mettre fin = put an end' in French (Babych et al., 2009). High scales of LVC productivity are attested in several languages such as Urdu, Sanskrit, Hindi, Bengali, Japanese, Korean, Persian, Kurdish, Amharic, Czech, Undi, Xamanga, Marathi and Hungarian, among other languages. (Miyamoto, 1999; Choi & Wechsler, 2001; Family, 2006; Butt, 2010; Karimi-doostan, 2011; Butt, 2013; Vaidya & Palmer, 2016). Underneath are selective sample examples of LVCs in several languages.

Japanese (Saito & Hoshi, 2000)

1. Mary-ga John-to kinoo kaiwa-o sita
   Mary-NOM John-with yesterday conversation-ACC did
   'Mary spoke to John yesterday.'

Hindi (Butt, 2010)

2. Medak-ne bicchu-se bahas ki-ii
   Frog.M.SG-ERG scorpion.M.SG-INS quarrel.F.SG do-PRF.F.S
   'The frog quarreled with the scorpion.'

Pasque (Vincze & Csirik, 2010)

3. Pellok garai berriez amets egin du
   Peter.E time new.DET.PL.INS dream make.PF AUX
   'Peter dreamt of new time.'

Sanskrit (Butt, 2010).

4. Ez a megjegyzes mindenkit zavaraba ho-zott
   This DEF remark everyone.ACC trouble.ILL bring-PAS.3SG
   'This remark embarrassed everybody.'

Korean, (Choi & Wechsler, 2001)

5. Chelswu-Ka namwunip-ul ssel-E chiw-ess-ta
   Chelswu-NOM leaves-ACC sweep-E clean-PST-DECL
   'Chelswu has swept up the leaves.'

The use of LVCs is also attested in a number of Indo-Iranian languages that make a wide use of LVC formation in their verbal systems, which has attracted an extensive attention from different interested researchers (Karimi, 1997; Karimi-Doostan, 2001; Megerdoomian, 2001; Karimi-Doostan , 2008; Butt, 2010; Karimi-doostan, 2011; Vaidya et. al, 2014, among many others). LVCs are highly productive in the verbal systems of Urdu, Kurdish, Hindi and Persian, among several other Indo-Iranian languages, making a considerable number of complex predicates formed via the combination of light verbs with other elements that could belong to different lexical categories such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, participles, and prepositional phrases. A set of lexically full verbs with general meanings have the elasticity to combine with a wide range of co-verbal/preverbal elements to make a joint predication that can bear a number of arguments that could go up to four arguments (Stevenson et al., 2004; Karimi-Doostan, 2008). Not all full verbs, however, have the potentials to serve as light verbs that combine with preverbal elements to make LVCs (Megerdoomian, 2001; Karimi-doostan, 2011). The following sentences exemplify the use of LVCs in several Indo-Iranian languages.

Persian (Samvelian, 2001)

6. Omid harf zad
   Omid word strike.PAS.3SG
   'Omid spoke'

Kurdish (Karimi-Doostan, 2008)

7. Columbus amrika kashf Kerd
   Columbus America discovery do.past
   'Columbus discovered America.'

Urdu, (Butt, 2010)

8. Nadya-ne xat lıkh li-ya
   Nadya.F-ERG letter.M.NOM write take-PFV.M.SG
   'Nadya wrote a letter (completely).'

Hindi (Vaidya et al., 2014)

9. Samir-ne ghadii-kii chorii k-ii
   Samir.M.SG-ERG watch.F.SG-GEN theft.F do-PRF.F
   'Samir stole the watch'

Unlike their use in simple verbal constructions, the analysis of verbs in complex predicates whether in Indo-Iranian languages or elsewhere pose some difficulties to researchers for a variety of reasons. First, the semantic specifications of light verbs are of general nature that entitles them the ability to appear in a wide variety of syntactic contexts as they may freely

appear with preverbal elements of different lexical categories (Ahmed & Butt, 2011). Second, they place certain semantic restrictions in their combinational patterns, making each potential light verb combine with only certain elements and reject others (Wittenberg, 2014). Third, their semantic contribution is quite subtle. The contribution of the light verb to the interpretation of the predicate is either minimal, abstract or poorly understood, which depends highly on the idiosyncratic properties of each given language (Butt, 2010; Vaidya et al., 2014). The non-compositionality of their meanings (meaning is not literally constructed from both parts of the verbal unit) makes literal translation of the two parts of the unit misleading and inaccurate (Vincze & Csirik, 2010). Forth, such constructions (e.g. make a mistake) tend to share syntactic patterns with other verb plus noun combination (e.g. make a cake) whereby both verbs and nouns are taken in their literal sense (a mistake is not literally made, but cake is). What is more, LVCs show considerable variation syntactically. While some have certain restrictions, some can be passivized, modified by adjectives, show flexibility with location or can be separated by an intervening particle (Karimi-Doostan, 2011; Vaidya et al., 2014; Wittenberg, 2014). Finally, the nature of the relationship between the two elements of LVCs is of various types including transparent, opaque, pseudo-derived, orthographic, and form (Stevenson et al., 2004; Smolka et al., 2009; Vincze & Csirik, 2010; Vaidya et al., 2014, among others). Yet, these relationships may not hold for verbal structures in some languages whose LVCs exhibit some language specific LVC features and behaviors that tease them out from LVCs in other languages (Karimi-Doostan,1997; Vincze & Csirik, 2010).

Such difficulties exhibited by LVCs have in fact given rise to a spectrum of approaches and methods to address and identify LVCs such as lexical, morphosyntactic, collocational, and semantic (Megerdoomian, 2002; Begum et al., 2011). The most prominent and widely used approach is mainly based on the semantic constraints some light verbs impose on the type of preverbals they combine with, making certain combinations possible and disallowing others (Megerdoomian, 2002; Vaidya et al., 2014). Vaidya & Palmer (2016) found several semantic constraints verbs impose on their combinational patterns; the verb ‘de-give’ combines with nouns that have ‘transfer’ property whereas nouns that combine with the verb ‘kar-do’ tend to name actions with animate agents. Unlike the verbs give and do, the verb ‘ho-be’ appears with only stative nouns or those that denote mental states. Apart from the semantic diagnosis, Vaidya et al., (2014) propose the ability of preverbals to introduce their own arguments as a diagnosis to identify LVCs. If they are able to introduce their own arguments, then they are part of LVCs. This can be verified by using the same light verb(s) with different preverbals to detect the nature and number of arguments each preverbal requires. Yuancheng & Roth (2011) proposed a ‘replacement’ principle to verify LVCs. This principle stipulates that if an LVC combination ‘i.e. take a shower’ can be replaced with a verb ‘shower’, then ‘take a shower’ can be considered an LVC. This proposed principle may work for some languages like Hungarian that has verbal counterparts derived from the same stem of deverbal nouns although they have subtle differences in meanings (Vincze & Csirik, 2010). It does not, however, hold for LVCs in languages whose LVCs are not deverbal in nature. LVCs in English, for instance, can have a nominalized from of a verb (take a walk= walk) and tend to accept such replacement without significant change in meaning. This behavior does not hold for LVCs in several languages that do not necessarily have verbal counterparts and their nouns are rarely

nominalizations of a verb (Vaidya et al., 2014; Vaidya & Palmer, 2016). The ability of case marking was also proposed to identify LVCs (Karimi-Doostan, 1997; Vincze & Csirik, 2010; Yuancheng & Roth, 2011). Nouns in Hungarian, for instance, can bear several cases with some typically used with LVCs. The verb 'hoz-bring', for example, is usually used with a noun in the accusative case. When used with a noun in the sublative or illative case, it makes LVCs as illustrated underneath (Vincze & Csirik, 2010).

10. Vizet hoz [non-LVC]
    Water.ACC bring
    'to bring some water'
11. Zavarba hoz [LVC]
    trouble.ILL bring
    'to embarrass'

Kearns (2002) and Samardžić (2008) discussed several other features based on a distinction they made between true light verbs and vague action verbs. The former co-occur with elements that are categorically ambiguous, namely 'verblike stem nouns' that take indefinite complements (i.e. take a look) whereas the latter co-occur with unambiguous nouns that do not have to be indefinite (i.e. take the bag). Samardžić (2008) makes the assumption that depending on the nature of the complement, the same verb can function as a light verb or a vague action verb. Certain processes applied to the noun complements were proposed to make a distinction between these two types of verbs. Nouns occurring with vague actions verbs can undergo some processes like passivization, Wh-movement, and can be replaced via a pronoun. Verblike stem nouns (deverbal nouns) occurring with true light verbs resist such processes. Yet, some researchers emphasize that LVCs may exhibit language-specific behaviors that are different from those commonly known among LVCs in several languages, which requires taking into consideration the idiosyncratic properties of any given language regarding its LVC constructions (Folloi et al., 2005; Ahmed & Butt, 2011).

3. Kumzari Complex Predicates

As a language family, Indo-Iranian splits into two main sub-families: Iranian languages such as Persian, Kurdish, Baluchi, Pashto, and Tajik, among many others, and the Indo-Aryan languages that include Urdu, Hindi, Bengali, Punjabi, Sindhi, and several other related languages (Lamberg-Karlovsky, 2002). Two main sub-groups form the structure of the Iranian group, namely eastern and western Iranian languages that further divide into northern and southern languages (Sims-Williams, 2003). Kumzari, the language under investigation, belongs to the Southwestern Iranian language sub-group (Anonby, 2003; Ozihel, 2011; AlJahdhami, 2013). Its affiliation with such language family makes it no exception to its sister languages in the extensive use of LVCs in its verbal system. A set of lexical verbs are used to combine with other non-verbal elements to make joint complex predicates (i.e. LVCs). These verbs have the potential to be used as heavy single verbs as well as to partake in making a joint predication attained via their combination with other preverbal elements. Such

behaviors categorizes verbs in the verbal system of Kumzari into two main sets: simple and complex verbs.

Few in number compared to complex ones, simple verbs are made of single roots that are inflected in person and number to mark subject verb agreement. Each simple verb has two distinct roots that do not appear derivative of one other. One is used in the imperfective form to express present, future, progressive, habitual, repetitive events, and another is used in the perfective form to express completed actions. The sentences in (12) and (13) provide pair examples of Kumzari simple verbs that juxtapose the imperfective and perfective forms respectively.

12. ʃan qisat-Ø **to:xwa:n**-in
    3PL.SUB story-INDEF.SG read.IPFV-3PL
    'They read (present) a story.'
    ʃan qisat-Ø **xwa:nd**-in
    3PL.SUB story-INDEF.SG read.PFV-3PL
    'They read (past) a story.'
13. mih ʃɪdɻt-ah **tfo:ʃn**-um
    1SG.SUB tree-INDEF.PL sell.IPFV-1SG
    'I sell trees.'
    mih ʃɪdɻt -ah **fo:ʃand**-um
    1SG.SUB tree-INDEF.PL sell.PFV-1SG '
    'I sold trees.'

Complex verbs, on the other hand, make up the bulk of Kumzari verbs which also include verbs made of loan words from languages such as Arabic, Persian, Laraki, English and other languages (Al Jahdhami, 2013). These verbs have a bi-morphemic structure that comprises a preverbal that remains the same in both imperfective and perfective forms, and a verb that alternates in the imperfective and perfective forms. Examples of Kumzari verbs that join with perverbals to make complex verbal constructions are: tik 'do/make', tu:'become ', ta:ɻ 'bring', du 'give' , txo:r ' eat', ti:mʃ 'watch', ʃwi:n 'listen/hear' and txe:ɻ 'buy'. These verbs have different roots in the perfective form which are gid- 'did/made', bu:ɻ 'became', wa:d- 'brought', da:ɻ- 'gave', xo:d- 'ate', mi:ʃ 'watched', ʃnu:d 'listened/heard', and xe:ɻd 'bought'. Number-wise, the majority of Kumzari preverbals combine with the verb 'tik/gid' whereas a smaller number combine with the other verbs to make other complex verbs. The following are examples of Kumzari complex verbs made of preverbals and verbs given in imperfective and perfective forms respectively.

14. mah saja:ɻat-u: ħaɻa **tik**-im
    1PL.SUB car-DEF.SG look(Noun) do.IPFV-1PL
    ‘We looking do the car.’ [Literal meaning]
    ‘We see the car.’
    mah saja:ɻat-u: ħaɻa **gid**-im
    1PL.SUB car-DEF.SG look(Noun) do.PFV-1PL
    ‘We looking did the car.’ [Literal meaning]
    ‘We saw the car.’
15. Aili tɻas **ta:ɻ**-ah ɻo:ɻ-u:
    Ali fear bring.IPFV-3SG child-DEF.SG
    ‘Ali brings fear [to] the child.’ [Literal meaning]
    ‘Ali frightens the child.’
    Aili tɻas **wa:d**-iʃ ɻo:ɻ-u:
    Ali fear bring.PFV-3SG child-DEF.SG
    ‘Ali brought fear [to] the child.’ [Literal meaning]
    ‘Ali frightened the child.’

The set of verbs that take part in Kumzari complex predicates have in fact a somewhat dichotomous usage, appearing independently in simple verb construction and jointly with other elements in complex constructions. Such double usage of these verbs is not an exotic language-specific behavior of Kumzari, for it is attested in several Indo-Iranian languages like Persian, Urdu, Kurdish and Hindi. The following examples juxtapose the use of some verbs in simple verbal constructions and LVCs in Persian and Kumzari, respectively.

Persian (Goldberg, 2004)

16. Ali mard-raa zad (simple construction: heavy verb)
    Ali man-OM hit-3SG
    ‘Ali hit the man.’
17. Ali baa Babak harf zad (LVC: light verb)
    Ali with Babak word hit-3SG
    ‘Ali talked with Babak.’

Kumzari

18. Aili gid-iʃ xair-u (simple construction: heavy verb)
    Ali do.PFV-3SG good-DEF.SG
    'Ali did [the] good [deed/act].'
19. Aili pa:k gid-iʃ xa:naʁ-u (LVC: light verb)
    Ali cleanliness do.PFV-3SG house-DEF.SG
    'Ali cleaned the house.'

Studies addressing complex predicates in Persian propose two main approaches with respect to their formation: syntactic and semantic. The syntactic approach entails that the syntactic category of a preverbal element is determined only by the syntactic context in which it appears (Dabir- Moghaddam, 1997; Megerdoomian, 2002; Folli et al., 2005). The lexical approach, on the other hand, entails that the syntactic category of a preverbal is lexically specified so that it is semantically compatible with the elements it combines with (Goldeberg, 2003; Shabani-Jadidi, 2012). Researchers in support of the syntactic approach to LVCs adopt the constructionalist view that LVCs in Persian are not lexical units due to the fact that the two elements of LVCs can be separated by other elements that may interpose between a preverbal and a light verb. For example, adjectives may interpose an LVC to modify its nominal constituent. Other studies, such as Goldeberg (2003) and Shabani-Jadidi, (2012), on another stand, argue against the syntactic approach to LVCs; they are in favor of the lexicalist approach which states that the construction, argument assignment and interpretation of LVCs happen in the lexicon since such constructions are constructed and stored in the lexicon. Proponents of this approach argue that the semantic choices of LVCs such as agnetivity, telicity, eventiveness and duration are determined by the combination of both elements as one unit rather than by one of the constituents. They base their argument on the point that when the two constituents of LVCs are separated by a syntactic unit, they transform into two separate lexical items rather than one single unit, which supports their stand that they both function as one lexical structure rather two separate ones. They do not show, however, whether LVCs are stored as two constituents or as a whole word in the lexicon.

Despite having such different views, the syntactic and lexical approaches to LVCs whether in Persian or elsewhere are, in fact, so intertwined that they pose some difficulties that require consideration of both sides. Syntactically, the light verb is the head of the construction that realizes the other constituent as its complement whereas semantically this constituent, not the light verb, is the head that contributes the major portion of the meaning (Butt & Lahiri, 2013; Vaidya et al., 2014). This make the reliance on solely one type of patterning/criterion for their identification unfeasible, especially that the linguistic notion of an LVC differs across languages and may fail certain features exhibited in certain languages (Begum et al., 2011; Vaidya & Pamler, 2016). It is also often highlighted that the precise syntax of LVC differs from one language to another, which gives rise to an indispensable need to establish internal language tests that suit any given language.It is, therefore, argued that the different properties

exhibited by LVCs in different languages may require certain adjustments in addition to the need for establishing language-specific tests that can be used for testing LVCs and the relationship between their composing elements (Folli et al., 2005; Butt, 2010; Ahmed & Butt; 2011). To that end, the paper uses some previously established LVC-identification tests as well as language-specific ones in its analysis of LVCs in Kumzari. Kumzari, as mentioned in previous work (Thomas, 1930; Anonby, 2003; Anonby & Yousftan, 2011; Al Jahdhami, 2013), shares numerous lexical and structural resemblance with Persian incurred by both linguistic and geographical proximity. Relying on Persian as a linguistically and geographically nearby sister language as well as taking into account the specific idiosyncratic properties of Kumzari, the analysis of its LVCs will be discussed using syntactic, semantic and interface criteria.

3.1 Syntactic Approach to Kumzari LVCs

A syntactic analysis of the LVC structure in Persian shows that it is composed of a light verb and a preverbal that can belong to several lexical categories. A preverbal can be a noun (gerye kardan 'tear-do'= 'to cry'), an adjective (daagh kardan 'hot-do'= 'to get mad'), a prepositional phrase (az bar kardan 'of-on-do' = 'to memorize'), an adverbial phrase (pish bordan 'forward-take' = to succeed'), or a complex nominal phrase (sar be sar gozaashtan 'head-to-head- put'= 'to tease'). Dabir-Moghaddam, 1997; Karimi-doostan, 2008; Karimi-doostan, 2011; Shabani-Jadidi, 2012). Nominal PVs are further divided into three sub-groups: verbal nouns, predicative nouns and non-predicative nouns, which explains the diachronic behavior of the two constituents of LVCs with regard to the separability or inseparability of its elements (Karimi-doostan, 2011). Unlike Persian, Kumzari LVCs exhibit less variation in terms of lexical categories of its preverbals, having chiefly nominal and adjectival preverbals that attach to a set of certain verbs. Since none of these two parts can make a proper LVC in isolation from the other, the contribution of both constituents is significantly required so that an LVC is well constructed. Preverbals do occur elsewhere in the language as independent nouns and adjectives that inflect to various forms to mark several features such as definiteness, number, and person. Apart from their usage in LVCs, light verbs can be used as 'heavy' main verbs in their simple form. Nominal preverbals combine mostly with the verb 'gidiʃ' 'to do/make' (literally s/he did/made), in addition to other verbs like to bring 'wadiʃ', to give 'dariʃ', to listen 'ʃnudiʃ', to buy 'xerdiʃ' and to eat 'xodiʃ', to make LVCs that roughly denote the meaning of X doing/making where X is a noun. Adjectival PVs, on the other hand, combine with the verb 'buriʃ' 'to become' (literally s/he became) to make LVCs that roughly denote the meaning of X become where X is an adjective. Such dichotomy, in fact, draws the difference between agentive actions and non-agentive actions in verbal formation, which somewhat goes in line with But's (2011) analysis of LVCs in Urdu. She found that the use of the verb 'do' versus 'come' in making LVC in Urdu draws a difference between agentive and non-agentive actions. The verb 'do' is used to make LVCs that express notions like 'write a book & eat food', for instance, whereas the verb 'come' is used to make LVCs that express notions like 'to be sick & to be happy.' The underneath table gives examples of Kumzari LVCs made of nominal preverbals that combine with light verbs.

Table 1. Kumzari LVCs made of nominal preverbals

Verb from in Kumzari	Literal meaning	Gloss
ʃna:w gidiʃ	swimming did/made	to swim
tɻas wadiʃ	fear brought	to frighten
ʔamɻ dariʃ	order gave	to give orders
waidi dariʃ	promise gave	to promise
walm gidiʃ	quarrel did/made	to fight
xo:ɻ dariʃ	food gave	to feed
na:n gidiʃ	bread did/made	to bake
xa:w miʃdiʃ	sleep /dream saw	to dream
ʔraf gidiʃ	smell did/made	to smell
madʒma ʃnudiʃ	word listened	to obey
ta:rt gidiʃ	prayer wash did/made	to wash for prayer
ka:ɻ xe:ɻiʃ	goods/work bought	to do shopping
daɻam gidiʃ	medicine did/made	to treat a patient
ʃa:z txo:ɻiʃ	dinner ate	to dine
ba:z gidiʃ	game/toy did/made	to play

Since each single composing element makes its own essential semantic contribution to the resulting predicate, the overall meaning of the LVC differs depending on the light verb and the preverbal it attaches to. This gives rise to the possibility of manipulating the structure of the LVC to denote certain related or different meanings. This can be noticeably observed in the combinational behaviors of certain nominal preverbals that can attach to different types of verbs to streamline the intended meanings of the LVCs. Not all nominal preverbals, however, have the elasticity to combine with different verbs to make LVCs of different meanings. The following table gives some examples of nominal preverbals that attach to different light verbs to make LVCs that have different or somewhat related meanings.

Table 2. Nominal preverbals that attach to different light verbs to make LVCs of different or related meanings

Verb from in Kumzari	Literal meaning	Gloss
madʒma ʃnudiʃ	word listened	to obey
madʒma gidiʃ	word did/made	to speak
madʒma gidiʃ asta	word did/made slowly/quietly	to whisper
xo:ɻ dariʃ	food gave	to feed
xo: ɻ gidiʃ	food did/made	to make food/ cook
ka:r xe:ɻdiʃ	work/goods bought	to do shopping
ka:r gidiʃ	work/goods did/made	to work
dasi gidiʃ	hand did/made	to shake hands
dasi dariʃ	hand gave	to help

The above examples show that the choice of the light verb depends on the overall intended meaning since light verbs can be used as tools to adjust the meaning to certain intentions made by the speaker (i.e. word listen= to obey vs. word make= to speak). Worth mentioning is that a subgroup of preverbal elements exhibit elasticity in their combinational patterns reflected in their ability to attach to different light verbs albeit with the same exact meaning rather than a new different one. The choice of the light verb that goes with the preverbal is subject to individual speaker's choice who may use both forms interchangeably, or may opt for one form only that does not coincide with the other. As mentioned above, the verb 'gidiʃ' 'to do/make' is more in use than the other verbs, which makes gidiʃ-forms more prevalent than forms used with other verbs. The underneath table shows some examples of these forms.

Table 3. Examples of LVCs formed by using the same preverbals attached to different light verbs

Verb from in Kumzari	Literal meaning	Alternative form	Literal meaning	Gloss
nushi dariʃ	advice gave	nushi gidiʃ	advice did/made	to advise
salam dariʃ	greetings gave	salam gidiʃ	greetings did/made	to greet
gawubi dariʃ	answer gave	gawubi gidiʃ	answer did/made	to answer
amar dariʃ	order gave	amar gidiʃ	order did/made	to order/ask
saoodi dariʃ	help gave	saoodi gidiʃ	help did/made	to help
hadya dariʃ	gift gave	hadya gidiʃ	gift did/made	to gift
xa:bar dariʃ	news gave	xa:bar gidiʃ	news did/made	to inform
tala:q dariʃ	divorce gave	tala:q gidiʃ	divorce did/made	to divorce

Adjectival preverbal elements, on the other hand, combine with the verb 'buriʃ' 'to become' (literally s/he became) to denote the meaning of X become where X is an adjective. It is noteworthy here that the agreement morpheme indicating 3SG –iʃ' is sometimes dropped with certain verbs yielding the form bur-Ø instead of bur-iʃ. Likewise, some adjectival preverbals of several exceptional cases attach with the verb 'waber' instead of bur-ʃ or bur- Ø, which is beyond the scope and focus of this paper. The underneath able gives examples of adjectival preverbals that combine with the light verb buriʃ to make LVCs of non-agentive actions.

Table 4. Kumzari LVCs made of adjectival preverbals

Verb form in Kumzari	Literal meaning	Gloss
ħaɻaɻa buriʃ	free became	to be free
ʁwja buriʃ	astray became	to go astray
ʔidu buriʃ	suffering became	to suffer
ɻadad buriʃ	reluctant became	to hesitate
tamaa buriʃ	greedy became	to be greedy
farah buriʃ	happy became	to rejoice
ala buriʃ	nostalgic became	to miss
ʃarma buriʃ	shameful became	to blush / to be shy
odu buriʃ	returning became	to come back
tayya buriʃ	done became	to finish
ħaska buriʃ	angry became	to be angry / to rage
mar buriʃ	awake became	to wake up

Remarkably, the nominal adjectival dichotomy of preverbals can be witnessed in the use of borrowed preverbals. As Kumzari has been subject to various historical and social factors that played a role in the influence of other languages in its lexicon and structure, there has been an influx of borrowings into its lexicon that could coincide or override the original forms (Anonby, 2003; Anonby & Yousftan, 20011; Aljahdhami, 2013) including those that are employed in making complex verbs. Since light verbs are said to act as verbalizers in LVCs, it is attested to be a very productive device to make new predicates by incorporating loanwords into the verbal system of several languages such as Persian, Kurdish, Urdu, Hindi and Korean (Choi & Wechsler, 2001; But, 2010; Shabani-Jadidi, 2012; Vaidya et al., 2014). The fact that Kumzaris are speakers of Omani Arabic, irrespective of their level of language proficiency in Kumzari, has played a major role in introducing many Arabic words into Kumzari. Paradoxically, Kumzari borrows verbs from Arabic and assigns them different lexical categories from their original ones in Arabic, along with some phonetic and/or morphological adjustments to conform to its phonetic and morphological systems. As Kumzari has no need in using these verbs as verbs per se, they are changed into deverbal nouns or adjectives via certain

modification to make them well-matched preverbals that can combine with light verbs to make proper LVCs. Not all borrowed verbs, however, undergo such divergent usage whereby they are used as both nominal and adjectival preverbals. Put differently, certain borrowed verbs are used as either nominal or adjectival preverbals while others are assigned both lexical categories. Even borrowed verbs that do not seem to undergo any noticeable change tend to lose their verbal features inherited from Arabic and turn into nouns or adjectives (i.e. preverbals) that combine with light verbs to make LVCs. The following table shows examples of Kumzari LVCs that use nominal and adjectival preverbals derived, so to speak, from the same exact Arabic borrowed verbs to make LVCs of different related meanings.

Table 5. Kumzari LVCs made of nominal and adjectival preverbals derived from the same exact borrowed Arabic verbs

Verb form in Kumzari	Literal meaning	Gloss
ʃafiya gidiʃ	recovery did/made	to heal somebody/ to treat
ʃafu buriʃ	recovered became	to heal
alamti gidiʃ	knowledge did/made	to teach
alamt buriʃ	knowledgeable became	to learn
dubuwi gidiʃ	melting did/made	to defreeze
dubu buriʃ	melted became	to melt
taab gidiʃ	exhaustion did/made	to tire
tabi buriʃ	exhausted became	to become tired/exhausted
farahi gidiʃ	happiness did/made	to make somebody happy
farah buriʃ	happy became	to rejoice

A noteworthy observable trend in the Kumzari verbal system is the move towards the use of complex verbs/ LVCs instead of simple ones due to the fact that certain verbs have two forms (simple and complex) that may coincide in use. The exposure to other languages, Omani Arabic in particular, increases the likelihood of using loanwords in LVCs and elsewhere in the language. This trend, in fact, is more noticeable among the younger speakers who have more exposure to Arabic and English in school and the work environment compared to elderly speakers. Intensive exposure to such languages makes them susceptible to introduce LVCs that coincide with simple verb constructions. Although this might not be generalizable to all young speakers, the great mass of them may use both forms interchangeably or may opt

for the LVC forms, which may override the simple ones and replace them eventually. The following table gives examples of verbal notions that can be expressed via both simple and complex forms (LVCs); the preverbals of such LVCs are usually borrowed from Arabic.

Table 6. Kumzari verbal notions expressed in both simple and complex forms (LVCs)

Simple form	Equivalent complex form	Gloss
xwandiʃ	qaɻaʔa gidiʃ	to read
ʃma:ɻidiʃ	hasaba gidiʃ	to count
kaɻdistiʃ	ħattama gidiʃ	to demolish/ to smash
fa:ndiʃ	aɻsala gidiʃ	to send
ka:ʃid	zaɻʔ gidiʃ	to plant
da:nidiʃ	ʔarafa gidiʃ	to know
dʒi:ɻiʃ	ħarra gidiʃ	to see
giftiʃ	xabar gidiʃ	to inform
ɻesid	wasal gidiʃ	to arrive
kiʃtiʃ	qatala gidiʃ	to kill

Indeed it is evident that exposure to Omani Arabic has also lead to the replacement of some native LVCs with the so-called Arabic-borrowed LVCs. Detected cases of preverbals taken from Arabic seem to compete in use with native ones. These newly made forms are more in use among the younger speakers, especially those who do not have a solid command of the language compared to their parents and grandparents. Examples of such forms are shown in the underneath table.

Table 7. Original LVCs and their newly made equivalents made of borrowed preverbals

Original form	Newly made form	Gloss
gambal gidiʃ	ħafaɻa gidiʃ	to dig
gaʃta gidiʃ	tagawala gidiʃ	to make a tour
na:n gidiʃ	xabaza gidiʃ	to make bread
pa:k gidiʃ	ʔazala gidiʃ	to clean
ʃna:w gidiʃ	sabaħa gidiʃ	to swim/take a shower
qaza gidiʃ	kaɻaha gidiʃ	to hate
bagi gidiʃ	badja gidiʃ	to start

Apart from Omani Arabic spoken as a first or second language among Kumzaris, the use of borrowings by Kumzari speakers is in fact a byproduct of intense interaction with speakers of several other languages due to the strategic location of its stronghold, the little village of Kumzar. The oldest detected study on Kumzari (Thomas, 1930) as well as modern ones (Anonby, 2003; Anonby & Yousftan, 2011; Al jahdhami, 2013) emphasize a tangible influence of other languages apart from Arabic (e.g. Persian, Kurdish and English) on the structure and lexicon of Kumzari. This is noticeably manifested in a number of Kumzari LVCs that use words of Persian origin as preverbals. It is forsooth questionable if using the term ‘loanwords’ here is accurate or whether referring to them as ‘shared lexical items’ is more appropriate since both languages are sisters belonging to the same language family. Anonby (2003) and Anonby and Yousftan (2011) suggest that Kumzari and Laraki, a minority language spoken in the Iranian Larak Island, are variation of one another due to the evident lexical resemblance between the two languages as well as the fair mutual intelligibility among their speakers. Each language, however, has been influenced by the lexicon of the dominant language spoken in the vicinity, namely Omani Arabic in Kumzar and Persian in Larak Island. They even suggest that Kumzari and Laraki are two dialects of the same language, which, in turn, have common words found in Persian. Although Kumzari speakers deny any mutual intelligibility to Persian, the least that can be said is that both Persian and Kumzari have words in common that are intelligible to speakers of both languages. Apart from preverbals of Arabic and Persian origin, borrowed preverbals can also be noticed in certain LVCs that use English words, which are likely to be borrowed into Kumzari through Omani Arabic since speakers of Omani Arabic, including Kumzaris, use the same English loanwords in their everyday speech. The following tables show examples of LVCs made of preverbals borrowed from Persian and English, respectively.

Table 8. Kumzari LVCs formed by using preverbals of Persian origin

Persian form	Gloss	Verb from in Kumzari	Gloss
pa:k	clear	pa:k gidiʃ	to clean
drugh	lie/falsehood	dru gidiʃ	to lie
darman	treatment	darma gidiʃ	to treat
derya	sea	derya gidiʃ	to sail
kaʃt	tour	gaʃta gidiʃ	to go into a tour
namaz	prayer	nwaz gidiʃ	to pray
kar	work	ka:r gidiʃ	to work
bazi	game	ba:z gidiʃ	to paly
ʃana	swimming	ʃnaw gidiʃ	to swim
sokand	oath	songu gidiʃ	to swear

Table 9. Kumzari LVCs formed by using preverbals of English origin

LVC	Literal meaning	Gloss
kansal gidiʃ	cancelation did/made	to cancel
se:f gidiʃ	saving did/made	to save
tilifo:n gidiʃ	phone call did/made	to make a phone call
ʃajk gidiʃ	check did/made	to check

3.2 Semantic Approach to Kumzari Verbs

Semantically, LVCs in Persian fall between two ends of a continuum, ranging from those that are completely compositional (transparent/non-idiomatic) to those that are completely idiomatic (opaque). A more general and diluted division classifies them as either semantically transparent or semantically opaque (Karimi-Doostan, 2011; Shabani-Jadidi, 2012). Semantic transparency refers to the compositionality of the compound resulting out of a preverbal and a light verb. An example is the combination of the preverbal ‘qazaa = food’ and the light verb

‘xordan = to eat’ to make the LVCs ‘qazaa xordan = to eat’. Opacity of LVCs, in contrast, refers to uncompositionality of the resulting compound of preverbals and light verbs. For example, the combination of the preverbal ‘qasam = oath’ and the light verb ‘xordan = to eat’ signifies ‘to swear’ not ‘to eat an oath’(Shabani-Jadidi, 2012). Other terms such as non-decompositional versus decompositional and combinational versus incorporational are also used to refer to these two groups. The formers terms refer to LVCs that can be broken down into constituents that can be processed disjointedly based on their overall parts whereas the latter terms refer to LVCs that must be processed as a whole since there is a mismatch between the meaning of the constituents and the meaning of the full form (Folli et al., 2005). The following examples juxtapose these groups in Persian.

20. Ali kar-as-ra: ʔanja:m da:d (transparent)
    Ali work-his-DOM performing give.PST
    ‘Ali did his wok’.

21. Ali be ra:dyo guʃ kard (opaque)
    Ali to radio ear do.PST
    ‘Ali listened to the radio’.

Not so different from Persian LVCs, Kumzari LVCs fall between two main categories: opaque/non-compositional LVCs and transparent or compositional LVCs. The former refers to LVCs whose overall meanings is not really a combination of the semanticity of both elements. The meaning is somewhat idiomatic rather than literal. The latter, on the other hand, refers to LVCs whose overall meaning is compositional since both elements contribute literally to the meanings of the LVCs. Compared to compositional LVCs, the idiomatic LVCs are not just less in number, but more likely to be replaced with compositional ones either by using native preverbals or borrowed ones. The following table gives examples of idiomatic LVCs.

Table 10. Examples of idiomatic LVCs

Verb form in Kumzari	Literal meaning	Gloss
tras wadiʃ	fear brought	to frighten
dru wadiʃ	lie/falsehood brought	to lie
magma ʃnudiʃ	word listened	to obey
mgama gidiʃ	word did/made	to speak
idu buriʃ	sick became	to suffer
naʃabal gidiʃ	fishing line did/made	to fish [by using fishing line]
diria gidiʃ	sea did/made	to sail
arfa gidiʃ	perfume did/made	to smell
talaq dariʃ	divorce gave	to divorce
ka:r xerdiʃ	work/goods bought	to do shopping
darma gidiʃ	medicine did/made	to treat
xaisam gidiʃ	enemy /adversary did/made	to hate/ to become an enemy

It is cited that LVCs in Old and Middle Persian texts make use of very limited sets of light verbs with a big majority of transparent LVCs. Modern usage of LVCs, however, triggers opacity of LVCs especially that borrowing can influence the use of some LVCs. This opacity is often linked to the fact that more modern light verb are used as one of the LVC constituents (Goldeberg, 2003; Folli et al., 2005; Shabani-Jadidi, 2012). Unlike Persian, nowadays Kumzari has more transparent LVCs than opaque ones, especially those made by preverbals borrowed from Arabic, which tend to coincide with or replace original opaque LVCs. The extensive exposure to Omani Arabic along with the fast-paced changes in life style that requires interaction with non-Kumzari speakers have played a key role in pushing more Arabic borrowings into the language, including those used as preverbals. The newly made LVCs, compared to the original ones, are easier to compose and grasp, which tend to be introduced by the younger speakers who have more exposure to Arabic coagulated with less sloid command of Kumzri compared to their elders. The following table shows examples of transparent LVCs.

Table 11. Examples of transparent LVCs

Verb form in Kumzari	Literal meaning	Gloss
xor dariʃ	food gave	to feed
salam dariʃ	greeting gave	to greet
xabir dariʃ	news gave	to inform
bagi gidiʃ	beginning did/made	to start
ʃnaw gidiʃ	swimming did/made	to swim/take a shower
nat gidiʃ	waiting did/made	to wait
miʃ gidiʃ	walking did/made	to walk
tart gidiʃ	ablution did/made	to wash for prayer
s̲wa:l gidiʃ	question did/made	to ask a question
ʃarma buriʃ	shameful became	to blush
ʃa:z xodiʃ	dinner ate	to dine
pa:k gidiʃ	cleanliness did/made	to clean
gambal gidiʃ	hole did/made	to dig
walam gidiʃ	quarrel did/made	to fight
haska buriʃ	angry became	to become angry
dagʃah buriʃ	busy became	to become busy
ʃam xodiʃ	launch ate	to have lunch
na:n gidiʃ	bread did/made	to bake
ba:z gidiʃ	game/toy did/made	to play
nwa:z gidiʃ	prayer did/made	to pray
x:aw miʃdiʃ	sleep/dream saw	to dream

The making of LVCs in Persian via both approaches (compositional versus idiomatic), however, is not a loose process that makes its own choices randomly; even non-compositional LVCs are subject to certain constraints that favor some patterns and override others. It is argued that the possibilities of verbs to combine with nouns to make LVCs are governed in part by the lexical semantic compatibility of the verb and the noun. Such constraints, in fact, suggest that the function of light verb goes beyond being mere

licensors of predication since they make their own contribution to the semanticicity of the verbal constructions (Ahmed & Butt, 2011; Vaidya et al., 2014). The same holds true for Kumzari since certain semantic constraints control the formation of LVCs, favoring certain combinations and making other ones illegal. The verb ‘gidiʃ’ ‘to do/make’ is semantically compatible with preverbals that result in LVCs expressing agentive actions only (e.g. s̲wa:l gidiʃ ‘question did/made= to ask). Likewise, the verb ‘buriʃ’ mismatches with preverbals that make LVCs of agentive actions and favors preverbals of non-agentive actions (i.e. ala buriʃ ‘nostalgic became = to miss). This division, as discussed above, is also syntactically marked since the verb ‘gidiʃ’, as well as other verbs, combine with nominal preverbals whereas the verb ‘buriʃ’ combines with adjectival preverbals. Mixing between these combinational patterns yields semantically unacceptable structures. Nominal preverbals do not combine with the verb ‘buriʃ’ to make complex verbs whose meaning is X become where X is a noun (e.g. * magma buriʃ ‘word become = to speak’). Similarly, adjectival preverbals do not combine with the verb ‘gidiʃ’, or other verbs that attach to nominal preverbals, to make complex verbs whose meaning is X do/make where X is an adjective (e.g. ħazanah gidiʃ ‘sad do/make = *to grieve’). The underneath examples show that violation of these combinational patterns results in making ill-formed and /or semantically odd LVCs.

22. *mih ʃafja gid-um piːh maɻaz mih
    1SG.SUBrecovered do.PFV-1SG from sickness 1SG.POSS
    *‘I recovered from my sickness.’
23. mih ʃafja buːɻ-um piːh maɻaz mih
    1SG.SUB recovered become.PFV-1SG from sickness 1SG.POSS
    ‘I recovered from my sickness.’
24. *mih s̲wa:l bur-um Ahmed
    1SG.SUB question become.PFV-1SG Ahmed
    *‘I asked Ahmed.’
25. mih s̲wa:l gid-um Ahmed
    1SG.SUB question do.PFV-1SG Ahmed
    ‘I asked Ahmed.’

The following table gives examples of semantically illegal LVCs versus well-constructed ones based on the abovementioned compatible combinational patterns.

Table 12. Semantically illegal LVCs juxtaposed with their well-formed ones

Semantically illegal LVCs	Literal meaning	Well formed LVCs	Literal meaning	Gloss
tɻas buriʃ	fear became	tɻas wadiʃ	fear brought	to frighten
gambal dariʃ	hole gave	gambal gidiʃ	hole did/made	to dig
talaq wadiʃ	divorce brought	ta:laq dariʃ	divorce gave	to divorce
xa:w ʃnudiʃ	sleep listened	xa:w miʃdiʃ	Sleep/dream saw	to dream
madʒma buriʃ	word became	madʒma ʃnudiʃ	word listened	to obey
xo:ɻ wadiʃ	food brought	xo:ɻ dariʃ	food gave	to feed
naʃbal dariʃ	fishing line gave	naʃbal gidiʃ	fishing line did/made	to fish [using a fishing line]
salam ʃnudiʃ	greetings listened	salam dariʃ	greetings gave	to greet
gaʃta buriʃ	tour became	gaʃta gidiʃ	tour did/made	to make a tour
ʃa:z wadiʃ	dinner brought	ʃa:z xo:diʃ	dinner ate	to dine

As mentioned earlier, the fact that Kumzari speakers are speakers of Omani Arabic has paved the road for having plenty of borrowings from Omani Arabic into Kumzari. The easy access to Arabic words has resulted into a number of LVCs made of Arabic preverbals. Young speakers tend to introduce new loanwords mostly from Arabic, which happen on a very large scale, in addition to some loanwords from English. The newly made LVCs are mainly transparent in nature in which the Arabic preverbal contributes the semantic content, and the light verb grants the structure its verbal features. Consequently, a competition ensued between LVCs made of original preverbals and those that use borrowed preverbals. Serval cases are found where both forms may coincide with one another or those in which borrowed preverbals win over the native ones.

3.3 Interface Criteria

The fact that LVCs tend to exhibit different features in various languages has resulted in using language-specific features to set them apart from other types of complex predicates. One of these features are the morphosyntacitc behaviors they exhibit in a given language.

Morphosyntactic features proposed to identify LVCs in Persian include the ability of LVCs to form nominalization by attaching the present tense stem of the light verbs, their ability to be modified by an adverb, and their ability to be separated by direct object clitics (Karimi, 1997; Karimi-Doostan; 2008 Karimi-doostan, 2011; Shabani-Jadidi, 2012). It also is attested that objects of LVCs in Persian take the suffix –ra, a behavior that is also observed in other languages like Kurdish and Korean, which attach the suffixes –ga and –lul respectively to the objects of their LVCs (Karimi-Doostan, 2008). Another identified feature is the presence of an indefinite determiner before nominal predicates (Stevenson et al., 2004). Likewise, verbal nouns taking part in LVCs, which are viewed as predicative nominals with the same a-structure as their lexical verb equivalents, cannot be pluralized, be used with determiners or take EZAFE. (Karimi-Doostan, 2001; Karimi-Doostan, 2008). In her analysis of noun-verbs compounds in Persian, Shabani-Jadidi (2012) states that heavy verbs in Persian are capable of combining with the morpheme 'aːn' to produce a type of adverbials of manner. Light verbs, on the other hand, cannot undergo this morphological operation independently of their preverbals. Likewise, while heavy verbs can be modified or preceded by adverbs, light verbs cannot do this independently of their preverbals (Stevenson et al., 2004; Karimi-Doostan, 2011).

A look into Kumzari LVCs shows that Kumzari predicative and deverbal nouns taking part in making LVCs do not accept the attachment of nominal morphemes that normally attach to nouns when used elsewhere in Kumzari such as the definite article –u (miʃ-u 'the fly'), plural marker -an (nam-an 'clouds') and possessive pronouns (kaʃmaɻ-jajh 'his/her glasses'). These predicative and deverbal nouns, however, accept the attachment of these morphemes in other contexts, when used as subjects or objects for instance as shown in (26) underneath. Additionally, Kumzari preverbals cannot be pronominalized (27) or modified by an adjective (28). Likewise, the light verb cannot be modified by an adverb separately from its preverbal. The only case in which adverbs in Kumzari modify verbs isolated from any other elements is when these verbs are used in single verb structures; adverbs, however, modify the whole complex predicate (the light verb and its preverbal) when used in LVCs structures (29). Also, auxiliary verbs cannot interpose between the two elements of an LVC; instead, they precede the LVCs, just like the case when auxiliaries are used with heavy verbs in simple verb constructions (30). The requirement of having adverbs preceding both elements of the LVC, instead of interposing between them, shows that these elements (preverbals and light verbs) function as one unit rather than two separate elements. The following examples exemplify the observations mentioned above.

26. ʃan gambal gid-in nafaq-u
3PL.SUB hole do.PFV-3PL tunnel-DEF.SG
'They dug the tunnel.'

*ʃan gambal-u gid-in nafaq-u
3PL.SUB hole-DEF.SG do.PFV-3PL tunnel-DEF.SG
'They dug the tunnel.'

*ʃan gambal-an gid-in nafaq-u
3PL.SUB hole-PL do.PFV-3PL tunnel-DEF.SG
'They dug the tunnel.'

*ʃan gambal-mih gid-in nafaq-u
3PL.SUB hole-1SG.POS do.PFV-3PL tunnel-DEF.SG
'They dug the tunnel.'

27. ʃan gambal gid-in jajh
3PL.SUB hole do.PFV-3PL 3SG.OBJ
'They dug it.'

*ʃan jajh gid-in nafaq-u
3PL.SUB 3SG.OBJ do.PFV-3PL 3SG.OBJ
*'They dug the tunnel.'

*ʃan jajh gid-in jajh
3PL.SUB 3SG.OBJ do.PFV-3PL 3SG.OBJ
*'They dug it.'

28. Aili s̲wa:l gid-iʃ pis jajh
Ali question do.PFV-3SG sun 3SG.OBJ
'Ali asked his sun a question.'

*Aili swa:l dʒw:an gid-iʃ pis jajh
Ali question good do.PFV-3SG sun 3SG.OBJ
*'Ali asked his sun a good question.'

29. Aili s̲wa:l gid-iʃ bsirat pis jajh
Ali question do.PFV-3SG quickly sun 3SG.OBJ
'Ali asked his sun a question quickly.'

*Aili s̲wa:l bsirat gid-iʃ pis jajh
Ali question quickly do.PFV-3SG sun 3SG.OBJ
*'Ali asked his sun a question quickly.'

30. Aili wna<u>s</u>wa:l tik-ah pis jajh
Ali FUT question do.IPFV-3SG sun 3SG.OBJ
'Ali will ask his sun a question.'
*Aili <u>s</u>wa:l wna tik-ah pis jajh
Ali question FUT do.IPFV-3SG sun 3SG.OBJ
*'Ali will ask his sun a question.'
Aili batar <u>s</u>wa:l tik-ah pis jajh
Ali should question do.IPFV-3SG sun 3SG.OBJ
'Ali should ask his sun a question.'
*Aili <u>s</u>wa:l batar tik-ah pis jajh
Ali question should do.IPFV-3SG sun 3SG.OBJ
*'Ali should ask his sun a question.'

Another plausible proposed criterion for detecting LVCs is their ability to predicate different argument structures from their heavy counterparts. Unlike heavy verbs which tend to predicate a specific number of arguments, light verbs can predicate different numbers and types of arguments depending on the type of LVCs they make (Stevenson et al., 2004; Shabani-Jadidi, 2012; Vaidya et al., 2014). Since these verbs do not predicate their own events independently, but they rather combine with other event predications that require various types of argument structures, they acquire the ability to predicate different argument structures that depend on the predication of the preverbals. The following are examples of three verbs in Persian that predicate different argument structures depending on the preverbal that partakes in the making of the LVC (Samvelian, 2001; Karimi-Doostan, 2008; Karimi-doostan, 2011; Fleischhauer, 2016).

31. Omid harf zad
Omid word strike.PST.3SG
'Omid spoke.'
Omid in hard-ha ra zad
Omid that world-PL ra strike.PST.3SG
'Omid said those things.'
Egarg ba ba:q-e man latme zad
Hail to garden-EZ 1.POSS damage strike.PST.3SG
'The hail damaged my garden.'

32. Ali ba John sohbat kard
Ali with John talk do.PST.3SG
'Ali talked to John.'

John aroosak-ra be Mary ehda kard
John doll-ACC to Mary giving do.PST.3SG
'John gave the doll to Mary.'

John fout kard
John death do.PST.3SG
'John died.'

33. Ali este?fa dad
Ali resignation do.PST.3SG
'Ali resigned.'

Ali Sasan-ra neja:t dad
Ali Sasan-ACC rescue do.PST.3SG
'Ali rescued Sasan.'

Ali in rahnama?i-ra be Sasan dad
Ali DEM advice-ACC to Sasan do.PAS.3SG
'Ali gave Sasan this advice.'

As far as argument structure is concerned, Kumzari verbs taking part in making LVCs give predication of different argument structures from those they predicate when used as simple verbs. The very common verb of making LVCs in Kumzari (i.e. gidiʃ) requires a subject and an object argument structures when used in simple verbal structures. When used in LVCs, however, it can have zero, one or two argument structures depending on the preverbal it attaches to, which grants it the ability to appear as an intransitive, transitive and di-transitive verb. The same holds true for the verb 'buriʃ'. Its predication requires a subject and an object arguments in it its simple usage whereas it requires a subject argument only when used as a light verb since it is used to form non-agentive actions as opposed to the verb 'gidiʃ' that is used to form agentive actions. The ability to predicate different types and numbers of argument structures applies to all other verbs that take part in making LVCs other than the verbs 'gidiʃ' and 'buriʃ'. The following examples contrast the argument structures predicated by the verbs 'gidiʃ' and buriʃ when used in simple verb constructions and LVCs.

34. Sami gid-iʃ xair-u (simple verb construction)
Sami do.PFV-3SG good-DEF.SG
'Sami did [the] good [deed/act].'

soʁ-u nabaħa gid-iʃ (LVC)
dog-DEF.SG barking do.PFV-3SG
'The dog barked.'

Talib-u marda gid-iʃ mualim jajh (LVC)
Student-DEF.SG disobedience do.PFV-3SG teacher 3SG.POSS
'The student disobeyed his teacher.'

Aysha hadya gid-iʃ mih tair-ah (LVC)
Aysha gifting do.PFV-3SG 1SG.OBJ bird-INDEF.SG
'Aysha gifted me a bird.'

35. Aili bur-iʃ teibab-Ø (simple verb construction)
Ali become.PFV-3SG doctor-IDEF.SG
'Ali became a doctor.'

Aili ʃarma bur-iʃ (LVC)
Ali shameful become.PFV-3SG
'Ali blushed.'

The aforementioned examples that show the inability of LVC preverbals to be inflected, pronominalized, or modified by adjectives in addition to the inability of light verbs to be modified separately from their preverbals or to allow interposition between them and their preverbals demonstrate that both preverbals and light verbs behave as one unified unit that disallows inspecting them as two separate elements. By the same token, the fact that Kumzari verbs used in making LVCs tend to predicate different types and numbers of argument structures from those arguments they predicate when used in simple verb construction gives support to the idea that both preverbals and light verbs work jointly to predicate the argument structures. Predication is equally dependent on both elements of the composite structure - the preverbal and the light verb.

4. Conclusion

The paper shed light on the 'preverbal plus verb' constructions found in the verbal system of Kumzari language. It argued that such complex predicates are LVC constructions made of preverbals and light verbs that make their own selections of compatible nominal or adjectival preverbals to construct proper meaningful LVCs. Such combinations are both syntactically and semantically governed. Nominal preverbals attach to certain verbs, mainly the verb 'gidiʃ', to make LVCs of agentive actions. Adjectival preverbals, nonetheless, do not allow such combination, joining with the verb 'buriʃ' only to make LVCs of non-agentive meanings. The combinations of light verbs with preverbals may result in opaque meanings whereby the meanings is viewed holistically or may give meanings that are the result of both meanings given by preverbals and light verbs joined together. Both elements of LVCs have proven to work as one unified unit since they reject inflection, prenominalization, interposition and modification separated from one another. Likewise, they work jointly in making their argument structures, those that are different in number and nature from argument structures made by the verbal elements when used in simple verbal structures. Such features exhibited by both preverbals and verbal elements give evidence that these elements work jointly to make LVCs.

References

Ahmed, T., & Butt, M. (2011). Discovering Semantic Classes for Urdu N-V Complex Predicates. In *Proceedings of the International References / 27 Conference on Computational Semantics (IWCS 2011)*, Oxford. Retrieved from http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W11-0132

Al Jahdhami, S. (2013). *Kumzari of Oman: A Grammatical Analysis* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Florida, USA.

Alba-Salas, J. (2002) *Light Verb constructions in Romance: A syntactic Analysis* (Doctoral dissertation). Cornell University.

Allerton, D. J. (2002). *Stretched verb constructions in English*. London, England: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203167649

Anonby, E. (2003). Update on Luri: How many languages?. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 13*(2), 171-9. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186303003067

Anonby, E., & Yousefian, P. (2011). *Adaptive multilinguals a survey of language on Larak Island*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Studia Iranica Upsaliensia

Babych, B., Hartley, A, & Sharoff, S. (2009). Evaluation-guided pre-editing of source text: improving MT-tractability of light verb constructions. *Bogdan Proceedings of the 13th Annual Conference of the EAMT*, pages 36–43, Barcelona, May 2009. European Association for Machine Translation.

Begum, R., Jindal, K., Jain, A., Husain, S., & Sharma, D. M. (2011). Identification of Conjunct Verbs in Hindi and their effect on Parsing Accuracy. In *In Proceedings of the 12th CICLing*, Tokyo, Japan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-19400-9_3

Butt, M., & Geuder, W. (2001). On the (semi)lexical status of light verbs. In N. Corver, & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *Semilexical categories: On the content of function words and the function of content words* (pp. 323-370). Berlin: Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110874006.323

Butt, M. (2013). Control vs. complex predication: Identifying non-finite complements. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory, 32*(1), 165-190. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-013-9217-5

Butt, M., & Lahiri, A. (2013). Diachronic pertinacity of light verbs. *Lingua, 135*, 7-29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2012.11.006

Butt, M. (2003). The light verb jungle. In G. Aygen, C. Bowern, & C. Quinn (Eds.), *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics* (Volume 9, Papers from the GSAS/Dudley House workshop on light verbs), 1-49.

Butt, M. (2010). The Light Verb Jungle: Still Hacking Away. In M. Amberber, M. Harvey, & B. Baker (Eds.), *Complex Predicates in CrossLinguistic Perspective* (pp. 48-78). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511712234.004

Choi, I., & Wechsler, S. (2001). Mixed categories and argument transfer in the Korean LVCs. In *Proceedings of Eighth International HPSG Conference*, Norwegian University of Science and Technology. https://doi.org/10.21248/hpsg.2001.7

Dabir-Moghaddam, M. (1997). Compound verbs in Persian. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 27*(2), 25-59.

Family, N. (2006). *Explorations of semantic space: The case of light verb constructions in Persian.* Ph.D. dissertation, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Science Sociales.

Fleischhauer, J. (2016). Degree expressions at the syntax-semantics interface. In J. Fleischhauer, A. Latrouite, & R. Osswald (Eds.), *Explorations of the syntax-semantics interface* (pp. 209-246). Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110720297-008

Folli, R., Harley, H., & Karimi, S. (2005). Determinants of event type in Persian complex predicates. *Lingua, 115*(10), 1365-1401. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2004.06.002

Goldberg, A. (2004). Words by default: The Persian complex predicate construction. In E. Francis, & L. Michaelis (Eds.), *Mismatches.* Benjamins.

Karimi, S. (1997). Persian Complex Verbs: Idiomatic or Compositional. *Lexicology, 3*, 273-318.

Karimi-Doostan, G. (1997). *Light Verb constructions in Persian*, PhD, University of Essex.

Karimi-Doostan, G. (2001). N + V Complex Predicates in Persian. In N. Dehe, & A. Wanner (Eds.), *Structural Aspects of Semantically Complex Verbs* (pp. 277-292). Peterlang, Frankfort.

Karimi-Doostan, G. (2008). Predicative nouns and adjectives. *Grammar 3: The Journal of Iranian Academy of Persian Language and Literature, 3,* 187-202.

Karimi-Doostan, G. (2011). Separability of light verb constructions in Persian. *Studia Linguistica, 65*(1), 70-95. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9582.2011.01178.x

Kearns, K. (2002). *Light verbs in English.* Manuscript, MIT, Cambridge, MA. Retrieved from http://reference.kfupm.edu.sa/content/l/i/light_verbs_in_english_86486.pdf

Lamberg-Karlovsky, C. C. (2002). Archaeology and language: The Indo-Iranians. *Anthropology, 43*(1), 1-27, 63-88. https://doi.org/10.1086/324130

Megerdoomian, K. (2001). Event structure and complex predicates in Persian. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics, 46*(1/2), 97-125. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008413100017953

Megerdoomian, K. (2002). *Beyond Word and Phrases: An unified Theory of Predicate composition*, PhD diss.. University of Southern California

Miyamoto, T. (1999). *The Light Verb Construction in Japanese.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.29

Ozihel, H. (Ed). (2011). *Kumzari language: Iranian languages, Musandam Governorate, Arabian Peninsula.* USA: Frac Press.

Park, K. (1992). *Light Verb Constructions in Korean and Japanese*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel.

Saito, M., & Hoshi, H. (2000). The Japanese Light Verb Construction and the minimalist Program. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, & J. Uriagereka (Eds.), *Step by Step* (pp. 261-95). MIT Press.

Salkoff, M. (1999). *A French-English Grammar: a contrastive grammar on translational principles*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lis.22

Samvelian, P. (2001). Le statut syntaxique des objets "nus" en person. *BLS XCVI-1*, 349-88. https://doi.org/10.2143/BSL.96.1.503748

Shabani-Jadidi, P. (2012). *Processing Compound Verbs in Persian.* PhD Thesis, University of Ottawa.

Sims-Williams, N. (Ed). (2003). *Indo-Iranian Languages and People.* British Academy: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.5871/bacad/9780197262856.001.0001

Smardžić, T. (2008). *Light verbs and the lexical category bias of their complements*. MA thesis, Université de żenéve.

Smolka, E., Komlósi, S., & Rösler, F. (2009). When semantics means less than morphology: Processing German prefixed verbs. *Language and Cognitive Processes, 24*(3), 337-375. https://doi.org/10.1080/01690960802075497

Stevenson, S., Fazly, A., & North, R. (2004). Statistical measures of the semi-productivity of light verb constructions. In *Proceedings of the ACL-04 Workshop on Multiword Expressions: Integrating Processing*, pp. 1-8. https://doi.org/10.3115/1613186.1613187

Thomas, B. (1930). The Kumzari dialect of the Shihuh tribe, Arabia, and a vocabulary. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 62,* 785-854. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00071860

Vaidya , A., & Palmer, M. (2016). Syntactic composition and selectional preferences in Hindi Light Verb Constructions. *LiLT, 17,* 1-30. https://doi.org/10.33011/lilt.v17i.1419

Vaidya, A., Rambow, O., & Palmer, M. (2014). Light verb constructions with 'do' and 'be' in Hindi: A TAG analysis. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Lexical and Grammatical Resources for Language Processing*, pp. 127-136, Coling 2014, Dublin, Ireland, August 24 2014. https://doi.org/10.3115/v1/W14-5816

Vincze, V., & Csirik, J. (2010). Hungarian Corpus of Light Verb Constructions. *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics* (Coling 2010), pp. 1110-1118, Beijing, August 2010.

Vincze, V., Nagy, I., & Berend, G. (2011). Detecting noun compounds and light verb constructions: a contrastive study. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Multiword Expressions:*

from Parsing and Generation to the Real World (MWE 2011), pp. 116-121, Portland, Oregon, USA, 23 June 2011. c 2011 Association for Computational Linguistics.

Wittenberg, E. (2014). *With Light Verb Constructions from Syntax to Concepts*. https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.2349.4401

Yuancheng, & Roth, D. (2011). Learning English Light Verb Constructions: Contextual or Statistical. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Multiword Expressions (MWE 2011)*, 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (ACL-HLT 2011).

Copyrights