

Loan Words and Their Implications for the Categorical Status of Verbal Nouns

Author(s): Yukiko Morimoto

Proceedings of the 25th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (2000), pp. 371-382

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Loan words and their implications for the categorial status of verbal nouns*

YUKIKO MORIMOTO
Stanford University

1. Introduction

Japanese (J) and Korean (K) have a large class of lexical items borrowed from Chinese such as those given in (1). They typically appear in construction with the light verb *suru* (J)/*hata* (K) 'do' either as the complement of the light verb as in (2a) or as part of the verbal complex with 'do' taking a direct object as in (2b). The relevant terms are in boldface.

(1) *unten* (J)/*wuncen* (K) 'drive', *rensyuu* (J)/*yensup* (K) 'practice', *undoo* (J)/*wundong* (K) 'exercise', *tootyaku* (J)/*tochak* (K) 'arrive' . . .

- (2) a. kyoo-wa piano-no **rensyuu-o** sita. (J)
 onul-un phiano(-uy) **yensup-ul** hayssta. (K)
 today-TOP piano-GEN practice-ACC did
 '(I) practiced piano today.'
- b. kyoo-wa piano-o **rensyuu** sita. (J)
 onul-un phiano-lul **yensup** hayssta. (K)
 today-TOP piano-ACC practice did
 '(I) practiced piano today.'

These so-called 'Verbal Nouns' (VNs) exhibit properties of both nouns (e.g. taking a genitive modifier) and verbs (e.g. taking case-marked arguments) when they appear with an aspectual suffix *-tyuu* (J)/*-cwung* (K), as shown in (3).

- (3) a. (VN = N)
 [piano-no [N **rensyuu**]]-tyuu-ni denwa-ga natta. (J)
 [phiano-uy [N **yensup**]]-cwung-ey chenwa-ka ossta. (K)
 piano-GEN practice-during-at telephone-NOM rang.
 'The phone rang while (somebody was) practicing piano.'
- b. (VN = V)
 [piano-o [V **rensyuu**]]-tyuu-ni denwa-ga natta. (J)
 [phiano-lul [V **yensup**]]-cwung-ey chenwa-ka ossta. (K)
 piano-ACC practice-during-at telephone-NOM rang.
 'The phone rang while (somebody was) practicing piano.'

In (3a), the verbal noun *rensyuu/yensup* takes the genitive-marked modifier *piano-no/phiano-uy*. In (3b), on the other hand, the accusative marker on *piano* shows that it is the complement of *rensyuu/yensup*, presumably of category V. Thus the categorial status of verbal nouns has been the subject of debate as to

whether they are Ns (e.g. Miyagawa 1987), Vs (e.g. Shibatani and Kageyama 1988), or VNs (e.g. Miller 1967). Others such as Hasegawa (1991) and Manning (1993) have argued that these verbal nouns are either Vs or Ns.

One of the questions I address in this paper is whether the observed differences between Chinese origin VNs and native Vs (or Ns) should be attributed to grammatical category differences or some other properties. I argue that the correct analysis of VNs should be based on their morphophonological properties, not category membership: their ability to function like nominals is due to the fact that, like nouns, they are morphologically free forms and never take inflections such as tense suffixes, whereas native/canonical Vs are morphologically bound and must be inflected.

As evidence for this claim, I will draw on some facts about loan words and bilingual codeswitching from English to Japanese and Korean. I hope to show that borrowing neither imposes a categorial restriction specific to the phenomenon nor introduces a hybrid category such as VN that is unique to borrowed lexical items. The main question I want to try to answer is how borrowed lexical items are categorized in the host language, and what that might tell us about the categorial status of Verbal Nouns. Throughout, I will use the terms borrowing and loan word interchangeably, and treat codeswitching as part of the same phenomenon. (My use of these terms has no theoretical significance.)

2. Borrowing: Categorial restriction?

In the literature on borrowing, it is commonly assumed that verbs are typically borrowed as nouns. English loan words in (4a) and codeswitching in bilingual speech in (4b) (all attested examples from Japanese) typically appear with the light verb *suru* like the Chinese origin VNs, and are analyzed as Ns (or VNs) (e.g. Kageyama 1982, Nishimura 1985, Poser 1994, Azuma 1993, 1996; but see Romaine 1985 for her analysis of English verbs used in a Panjabi light verb construction).¹

- (4) a. Loan Words: *doraibu suru* 'to drive', *purinto suru* 'to print', *fakkusu suru* 'to fax', *oopun suru* 'to open', *rirakkusu suru* 'to relax', *nokku suru* 'to knock'
- b. Codeswitching: *push suru* 'to push', *entertain suru* 'to entertain', *stop suru* 'to stop', *help suru* 'to help'

Drawing on Miyagawa's (1987) feature system,² Azuma (1996) argues, for example, that the code-switched lexicon is limited to [+N] items. Poser (1994:3) likewise simply assumes without further discussion that "Japanese rarely borrows verbs directly, so virtually all loan verbs are borrowed as verbal nouns and used in the periphrastic construction".

However, closer examination of English loan words and codeswitching suggests otherwise: when verbs in English are borrowed into Japanese and Korean, they are used as verbs, and behave like verbs in the host language. One

piece of evidence for this claim is the fact that none of the loans or code-switched verbs in (4) admit case marking *-o* (J)/-*(l)ul* (K), as shown in (5).

- (5) a. Loan Words: **doraibu-o suru* 'to drive', **purinto-o suru* 'to print', **fakkusu-o suru* 'to fax', **oopun-o suru* 'to open', **rirakkusu-o suru* 'to relax', **nokku-o suru* 'to knock' (J)
- b. Codeswitching: **push-o suru* 'to push', **entertain-o suru* 'to entertain', **stop-o suru* 'to stop', **help-o suru* 'to help' (J); *respect(*lul) hata* 'to respect', *give-up(*ul) hata* 'to give up', *suggest(*lul) hata* 'to suggest', *communicate(*lul) hata* 'to communicate', *negotiate(*lul) hata* 'to negotiate', *compromise(*ul) hata* 'to compromise' (K)

This contrasts with Chinese origin verbal nouns in that, roughly speaking, all transitive unergative Chinese origin verbal nouns admit case-marking in the light verb construction (also see (2)):

- (6) *unten-o suru* (J)/*wuncen-ul hata* (K) 'to drive', *rensyuu-o suru* (J)/*yensup-ul hata* (K) 'to practice', *undoo-o suru* (J)/ *wundong-ul hata* (K) 'to exercise', *honyaku-o suru* (J)/*penyek-ul hata* (K) 'to translate', *ryokoo-o suru* (J)/*yeheyng-ul hata* (K) 'to travel, . . .

This suggests that perhaps these Chinese origin verbal nouns have come to be used as nouns, much like English deverbal nominals such as *drive*, *practice*, and *exercise*, whereas verbs borrowed from English are (still) fully verbal in this construction. This effectively shows that borrowing is not limited to a particular lexical category such as N, as has been assumed at least for Japanese and Korean. More generally, I take the view that borrowing involves taking meaning and sounds and adapting them to fit the grammar of the host language, including phonotactics and morphological well-formedness. Now the questions that arise are: (i) What motivated the analysis that English verbs are borrowed as nouns—that is, in what sense are they like nouns, or different from native verbs? (ii) How are borrowed phonological materials categorized in the host language? I will deal with these questions in turn.

3 Morphological constraints

In a paper discussing constraints on so-called word-internal codeswitching—that is, combinations of morphemes from two languages to form a word (Morimoto 1999), I argued that such use of two languages is subject to one constraint: a borrowed item must minimally be a well-formed phonological word. The examples of word-internal codeswitching involving a variety of language pairs in (7)-(13) illustrate this point. In the examples, the matrix language (the language of the whole utterance) is in italics, and the borrowed/code-switched items are in small caps. (Examples (7)-(11) are taken from Myers-Scotton 1993 (M-S), all cited in Morimoto [1999].)

- (7) *Ellaam* CONFUSED -*aa* *irundadu*.
everything -ADV COP.PAST
"Everything was confused." (Tamil/English; M-S p.33)
- (8) *I'm LAV-ing PANDEKAGE-s*.
"I'm making pancakes." (English/Danish; M-S p.33)
- (9) *El agua está* BOIL-*ando*.
"The water is boiling." (Spanish/English; M-S p.34)
- (10) *Hapa* FLAME *hiyo inaenda juu-haiwezi ku-ku-BURN*.
INFIN-2SOBJ
"The flame is going upwards, it can't burn you."
(Swahili/English; M-S p.30)
- (11) *Ja mä* KOKA-*sin* *kahvin*.
and I cook-PAST coffee
"And I made coffee." (Finnish/Swedish; M-S p.108)
- (12) *Ba-GARÇON-s wans ba-zo-mi-DEFENDRE kata pamba*.
PL-boy-PL there they-be-?-defend just for.nothing
"Those boys are arguing (in self-defense) just to save face."
(Lingala/French; Choi 1991:893)
- (13) *I want one of those* KOKI-*s*
meat
"I want one of those pieces of meat." (Korean/English; Choi 1991:885)

On the other hand, examples in which a borrowed item is not a well-formed phonological constituent (i.e. free-standing element) in the borrowing language are unacceptable, as shown in (14).

- (14) a. **They're* YOM-*ing*.
"They're reading." (borrowing a Japanese verb root yom-)
- b. **They're* MEK-*ing*.
"They're eating." (borrowing a Korean verb root mek-)
- c. **The water is* HERV-*ing*.
"The water is boiling." (borrowing a Spanish verb root herv-)

Now, having seen that only a well-formed phonological word can be borrowed, we need to recognize one other fact about borrowings. As illustrated in (15), we

see that borrowed verbs can never take verbal inflections in Japanese and Korean.³

- (15) **doraibu-ta* (drive-PAST), **purinto-ta* (print-PAST) (J); **communicate-ss-ta* (communicate-PAST-DECL), **negotiate-ss-ta* (negotiate-PAST-DECL) (K)

I suggest that this is due to a constraint on morphological combination independently motivated for Japanese and Korean: verbal and adjectival inflections select only for a bound host (cf. Cho and Sells 1995, Yoon 1995). And this is key to the proper distinction between Chinese origin verbal nouns and native Vs: as a necessary consequence of the borrowing process, all borrowed words are morphologically free forms, and thus they can never take native inflections.

These facts about borrowings and how they are integrated into the syntax of the host language also shed light on the categorial status of Chinese origin verbal nouns, which have exactly the same properties of morphology and syntax: like English loan words and codeswitches, they are uninflectable phonological words, as shown in (16).

- (16) **uten-ru* (J)/**wuncen-ta* (K) 'to drive', **rensyuu-ru* (J)/**yensup-ta* (K) 'to practice', **undoo-ru* (J)/ **wundong-ta* (K) 'to exercise', **tootyaku-ru* (J)/**tochak-ta* (K) 'to arrive' . . .

The morpho-phonological and morpho-syntactic properties of native verbs, English borrowings and Chinese origin verbal nouns are summarized in (3).

(17)

	Native verbs	English verbs	Chinese origin verbs
Take Inflection	√	—	—
Combine w/ Light V	—	√	√
Morphological Property	Bound	Free	Free

Coming back to the first question we raised earlier, we now see how borrowed verbs and Chinese origin verbal nouns are different from native Vs: they are distinct in terms of their morpho-phonological and morpho-syntactic properties, not in terms of category membership. To function as verbs in the syntax, borrowed verbs and Chinese origin Vs are combined with the light verb ('do') rather than native inflection.

As mentioned earlier, if we take the view that borrowing involves taking a concept and phonological material that represents the concept, whatever the

syntactic category of that material might be in the original language, then we need to come to the second question—how borrowed words are categorized in the host language. In the following section, I propose that in the borrowing process, lexical items are assigned a category in the host language based on the conceptual prototypes discussed in the typological literature (e.g. Croft 1991) and categorial distinctions available in the host language. This will also explain the dual behavior of Chinese origin verbal nouns.

4 Category assignment

One of the fairly robust generalizations about syntactic categorization in the typological literature is that cross-linguistically, there is a strong correlation between ontological category and word class. As shown in (18) (Croft 1991:55), prototypically, the category Noun represents the semantic class of object and serves the pragmatic function of reference; the category Adjective represents the semantic class of property and functions as modification; the category Verb correlates with the semantic class of action, and its unmarked function is predication.

(18) Prototypical correlations of syntactic categories

	Syntactic Category		
	<i>Noun</i>	<i>Adjective</i>	<i>Verb</i>
Semantic class	Object	Property	Action
Pragmatic function	Reference	Modification	Predication

The notion of markedness used here is based on structural criteria (Greenberg 1966), one of which is that the unmarked value is indicated by the absence of an additional morpheme, and the marked value is indicated by the presence of an additional morpheme.⁴ So the marked correlation of category, semantic class, and pragmatic function is generally indicated by overt marking such as derivational morphology, or by a marked construction. Such morphosyntactic expression of the unmarked and marked correlations along these dimensions is shown in (19) (Croft 1991:67). So for example, when nouns and adjectives function as predicates, they appear with a copula, whereas verbs can function as predicates without an auxiliary element; other non-prototypical correlations are marked by various kinds of morphology.

(19) Function-indicating morphosyntax

	Reference	Modification	Predication
Objects	UNMARKED NOUNS	genitive, adjectivalizations, PPs on nouns	predicate nominals
Properties	deadjectival nouns	UNMARKED ADJECTIVES	predicate adjectives
Actions	action nominals, complements, infinitives, gerunds	participles, relative clauses	UNMARKED VERBS

Drawing on these typological generalizations, I propose that the category assignment of borrowed vocabulary items follows these prototypical correlations of ontological category and word class, given in (20).

(20) **Prototypical Lexical Category Assignments:**

- a. If referential then the unmarked category is N.
- b. If descriptive/stative then the unmarked category is A.
- c. If eventive then the unmarked category is V.

Code-switched items like *consider* in (21) denote an event and hence are categorized as V in the host language as well. As such, they do not admit case marking.

- (21) *nay-ka* *ceney malhayss-ten kes* **consider(*-Iul)** *hay-pwa.* (K)
 I-NOM before said-NML fact consider(-ACC) please.do
 'Please consider what I said before.'

Likewise, loan words like *purinto* 'to print' in (22a) refer to an event and thus are used as V and do not allow case marking. As (22b) shows, *purinto* is also borrowed as N to refer to a result.

- (22) a. *ima purinto(*-o) simasita.* (J)
 now print(*-ACC) did.
 '(I) just printed (it) out.' (lit. '(I) just did the printing (of it)')
- b. *ima-kara purinto-o kubarimasu.*
 now-from handout-ACC distribute
 '(I'll) distribute a handout now.'

Another more striking example from Japanese that illustrates the category assignments in (20) is *sando suru* 'to press something in between two objects like a sandwich' in (23), which shows that the English word *sandwich* has been

borrowed as N to refer to an object *sandoitti* (conforming to the Japanese phonotactics), but part of that word *sando* has been reanalyzed as V to refer to an action of making something into a sandwich. This illustrates that a unit which has no category can be categorized as V if speakers use it to denote an action.⁵

(23) *sando suru* 'to sandwich'

English	Japanese N	Japanese V
sandwich →	[_N <i>sandoitti</i>] →	[_N [_V sando] _{itti}]

These data also offer some insight to the use of Chinese origin verbal nouns. Their dual properties as Ns and Vs can be explained if we take the view that in a given construction, if a VN denotes an event, then it is used as a verb and behaves like a verb; if, on the other hand, it is referential, it is used as N and exhibits nominal properties.

All these data show, more generally, that the typological generalizations about the prototypical correlation between the conceptual class and grammatical category are most clearly observed when new vocabulary items are added to the existing lexicon. This view of categorization is also illustrated by the ways in which Japanese and Korean adopt adjectives borrowed from English. Illustrating this point further with adjectives, I will also show that the data on adjective borrowings help us reexamine the categorial status of another hybrid category, Adjectival Nouns (ANs) in Japanese.

5. Adjectives and Adjectival Nouns

Like verbs and verbal nouns, in Japanese two classes of adjectives are recognized: regular Adjectives which are morphologically bound forms and inflect for tense, as in (24), and Adjectival Nouns which are free forms and appear with the copula *-da* when used predicatively and *-na* prenominally, as in (25).

(24) *kawai-i/katta* 'pretty-NPAST/PAST', *huru-i/katta* 'old-NPAST/PAST',
kitana-i/katta 'dirty-NPAST/PAST', *utukusi-i/katta* 'beautiful-
 NPAST/PAST', *samu-i/katta* 'cold-NPAST/PAST', *kata-i/katta* 'hard-
 NPAST/PAST', . . .

(25) *sizuka-da* 'quiet', *genki-da* 'healthy', *teinei-da* 'polite', *kappatu-da*
 'energetic', *odayaka-da* 'calm', . . .

When English adjectives are borrowed into Japanese, they are borrowed as As; however, as English adjectives are free forms, they cannot be inflected like canonical As in Japanese—the same combinatorial restriction as the verbal morphology holds here for adjectives. So they combine with the copula *-da* as in (26a). Korean lacks category A, and so borrowed As are categorized as stative Vs and combine with the light verb *hata*, rather than the copula, which is generally reserved for non-verbal predication (26b).

- (26) a. *kuuru-da* 'cool', *riizunaburu-da* 'reasonable', *kyuuto-da* 'cute', *syai-da* 'shy', *sinpuru-da* 'simple' (J)
 b. *khwul hata* 'cool', *simphul hata* 'simple', *miin hata* 'mean', *haysem hata* 'handsome', *naisu hata* 'nice' (K)

These data show that in terms of category assignment, borrowing simply involves fitting borrowed items into the existing category system of the host language, again, according to their conceptual prototypes. This point is further illustrated by the use of English *now* and *shock* in Japanese, shown in (27). The adjectival use of *now* in *nau-na kakko* in (27a) describes the state of being cool, modern, or trendy. The use of *shock* in *shokku-na dekgigoto* in (27b) describes an event that is shocking/surprising.

- (27) a. *nau-na kakko* (now-cop fashion) 'fashionable'
 English Japanese
 [_{Adv} now] → [_A nau] cf. **nau-ni* (now-ADV)
- b. *shokku-na dekgigoto* (shock-cop event) 'shocking event'
 English Japanese
 [_{N/V} shock] → [_A shokku] cf. **shokku suru* 'to shock'

Note that an adverbial use of *now* as in *nau-ni* or the verbal use of *shock* in *shokku suru* is not possible, indicating that *now* and *shock* are not borrowed as Adverb and Verb respectively in Japanese, precisely because they are both used to describe a state/property, not a referent, action, or manner.⁶ These examples thus show that regardless of the syntactic category in the original language, words can be categorized as A in the host language when used to denote a state/property. The data on borrowing of English adjectives into Japanese and Korean illuminate a striking parallelism between what have been categorized as VNs and Adjectival Nouns (ANs) in (5). These ANs have been claimed to constitute a genuine lexical category AN because they exhibit combinatorial properties of both adjectives and nouns (e.g. Miyagawa 1987). However, just as we saw with borrowed Vs and Chinese origin VNs (see (17)), the proper distinction seems to be in terms of the morphological property—the free-bound distinction: ANs as well as English adjectives such as those in (26) are morphologically free forms, and as such, they never take Japanese adjectival inflection and instead combine with the copula (also see Kubo (1992)). These observations are summarized in (28).

(28)

	Canonical As in Jp	English As	Japanese ANs
Take Inflection	√	—	—
Combine w/ copula	—	√	√
Morphological Property	Bound	Free	Free

6. Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued for the following points:

- Borrowing imposes no categorial restriction, nor does it create a new hybrid category such as VN or AN.
- Categorization of borrowed items follows the prototypical correlations between ontological category and word class in the borrowing language.
- All borrowed words are morphologically free forms, and hence they never take native inflections. Chinese origin verbs have the same property, so even as Vs, they must combine with the light verb *suru* or *hata* to function in the syntax.

Once these morpho-phonological and morpho-syntactic aspects of words from English or Chinese are properly sorted out, we see that Verbal Nouns (and Adjectival Nouns) fall into the regular category system of the language, and do not require any special treatment.

Notes

¹ I would like to thank Eleanor Olds Batchelder, Joan Bresnan, Eve Clark, Yuriko Hatori, and Peter Sells for comments and suggestions. Thanks also go to the audience at the BLS-25 meeting for questions and comments, and to Hanjung Lee and Eunjin Oh for assistance with Korean data. All remaining errors and misrepresentations are my own.

¹ In her discussion of English-Panjabi codeswitching, Romaine (1985) claims that English lexical items such as *involve*, *depend*, and *cut off* that are borrowed into Panjabi form "mixed V-V compounds" with the Panjabi light verb *hona* 'do', and provides evidence that these are not N-V sequences.

² Building on Chomsky's (1970) binary feature decomposition for major lexical categories (V:[+V, -N], N:[-V, +N], A:[+V, +N], P:[-V, -N]), Miyagawa (1987) argues for the following feature system for Japanese lexical categories:

- | | |
|--------------------|----------|
| (i) Verb: | [+V, -N] |
| Noun & Verbal Noun | [-V, +N] |
| Adjective | [+V] |
| Adjectival Noun | [+V, +N] |
| Postposition | [-V, -N] |

³ There are exceptions, however, where we get borrowed verbs taking native inflections. Some examples are given below, by Eleanor Batchelder (email communication, March 25, 1999). The (a) examples are generally considered relatively well-established and wide-spread in the language, whereas the (b) examples seem to be relatively new and age-specific.

- | | | | |
|--------|---------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| (i) a. | hamo-ru | harmonize-NPAST | 'to harmonize' |
| | dabu-ru | double-NPAST | 'to double, make double' |
| | misu-ru | mistake-NPAST | 'to make a mistake' |
| | memo-ru | memo-NPAST | 'to write a memo' |
| | sabo-ru | sabotage-NPAST | 'to neglect work' |
| | ziko-ru | accident-NPAST | 'to have/cause an accident' |
| b. | azi-ru | agitate-NPAST | 'to agitate' |
| | pato-ru | patrol-NPAST | 'to patrol' |
| | nagu-ru | neglect-NPAST | 'to neglect' |
| | taku-ru | taxi-NPAST | 'to take a taxi, go by taxi' |

⁴ More precisely, markedness here should be interpreted as implicational in that in no case is the marked member of the category expressed by zero marking and unmarked member by overt marking (Greenberg, 1966:26-28)

⁵ Alternatively, *sandwich* could have been borrowed both as N and V, and the verb use of the word has been shortened, though it is not clear why only the verb form is shortened and the noun form is not. In any case, my point remains the same, namely that *sando*, which has no category of its own in English, can be used as a verb in the host language when used to denote an action.

⁶ There is also a noun use of *shock* in Japanese, *shokku-o ukeru* '(lit.) to receive a shock (to be shocked)', but the crucial point here is that the word is never an Adjective in English.

References

- Azuma, Shoji. 1993. Word order vs. word class: Portmanteau sentences in bilinguals. In Patricia M. Clancy (ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, Vol. 2, 193-204. Stanford, CA, CSLI.
- Azuma, Shoji. 1996. The linguistic unit in code-switching: Japanese/English in Japan. Paper presented at the LSA Symposium on Code-switching, San Diego, January 1996.
- Cho, Young-Mee Y., and Peter Sells. 1995. A lexical account of inflectional suffixes in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 4 (2), 119-174.
- Choi, Jae Oh. 1991. Korean-English code switching: Switch-alpha and linguistic constraints. *Linguistics* 29, 877-902.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. In Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, 184-221. Waltham, MA/Toronto/London, Ginn and Company.
- Croft, William. 1991. *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1966. *Language Universals*. The Hague, Mouton.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko. 1991. On head movement in Japanese. In *Proceedings of Sophia Linguistics Society*, Vol. 6, 8-32.
- Kageyama, Taro. 1982. Word formation in Japanese. *Lingua* 57(1), 215-258.
- Kubo, Miori. 1992. *Japanese Syntactic Structures and Their Constructional Meanings*. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Manning, Christopher. 1993. Analyzing the verbal noun: Internal and external constraints. In Soonja Choi (ed.), *Japanese Korean Linguistics*, Vol. 3, 236-253. Stanford CA, CSLI publications.

- Miller, Roy Andrew. 1967. *The Japanese Language*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1987. Lexical categories in Japanese. *Lingua* 73(1-2), 29-51.
- Morimoto, Yukiko. 1999. Making words in two languages: A prosodic account of Japanese-English language mixing. *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 3(1), 23-44.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Dueling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Nishimura, Miwa. 1985. *Intrasentential Codeswitching in Japanese and English*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Poser, William. 1994. Japanese periphrastic verbs and noun incorporation. ms., Stanford University.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1985. The syntax and semantics of the code-mixed compound verb in Panjabi/English bilingual discourse. In Deborah Tannen and James E. Alatis (eds.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics* 1985, 35-49. Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi, and Taro Kageyama. 1988. Word formation in a modular theory of grammar: Post syntactic compounds in Japanese. *Language* 64, 451-484.
- Yoon, James Hye Suk. 1995. Nominal, verbal, and cross-categorial affixation in Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 4 (4), 325-356.