SOMETHING'S GOTTA GO, SOMETHING'S GOTTA GIVE: COMPLETION, MIRATIVITY AND TRANSITIVITY IN ODIA LIGHT VERB CONSTRUCTIONS

Maarten Lemmens, Kalyanamalini Sahoo

Author version. Published ahead of print, *Studia Linguistica* (2016) ; http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/stul.12046/full

SOMETHING'S GOTTA *GO*, SOMETHING'S GOTTA *GIVE*: COMPLETION, MIRATIVITY AND TRANSITIVITY IN ODIA LIGHT VERB CONSTRUCTIONS

Maarten Lemmens & Kalyanamalini Sahoo

Abstract. This paper deals with asymmetric complex predicates (combining a main verb and a 'light' verb) in Odia, an Indo-Aryan language. The main focus is on the two most common light verbs *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give'. We argue that these light verbs are constructions in their own right affecting the interpretation of the event in two ways: (i) they necessarily refer to ***completion*** of the event (as opposed to the single verb construction) and (ii) they typically express ***unexpectedness*** or ***abruptness*** and can as such be considered a mirative construction as defined by Delancey (2012). Transitivity plays a major role not only in the distinction between *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' but also in differences of degree of completion and unexpectedness.

1. Introduction

Many South-Asian languages have asymmetric complex predicates where a lexical verb combines with a so-called light verb, typically form-identical with a lexical verb.[1] This type of complex predicates remains a difficult matter for linguistic analysis. As Butt (2010:48) puts it: "the study of light verbs and complex predicates is fraught with dangers and misunderstandings". In the few studies on such complex predicates (mostly generative grammar or grammaticalisation studies), there is some debate concerning the grammatical and semantic status of these light verbs. Some researchers (e.g., Hook 1991, Traugott & Hopper 1993) consider them to be grammaticalised forms of lexical verbs as an intermediate step towards further evolution to auxiliaries, a point that others (e.g., Butt & Ramchand 2005, Butt & Lahiri 2002, 2013) take issue with. At the same time, there seems to be a general consensus in the literature that light verbs function as perfective markers (mostly following Hook 1991), but quite often, light verbs do more than just that and they add some further meaning to the predication. In Butt's words, they "neither retain their full semantic predicational content, nor are they semantically completely empty [but] appear to be semantically *light* in some manner that is difficult to identify" (2010:48).

This paper aspires to solve this difficulty and to contribute to the further characterization of such light verbs via a more detailed analysis of two frequent such light verb constructions in Odia, an Indo-Aryan language, spoken predominantly in Odisha, an eastern state in India. More precisely, we analyse the function and use of the constructions with the light verbs *-jaa* '*go'* and *-de 'give'*. As our analysis will show, these light verbs have indeed become bleached semantically, having lost their original lexical content as well their argument structure. Instead, in Odia, their semantic value, not so "elusive" as Butt (2010) suggests, is twofold: firstly, they express the ***completion*** of the event expressed by the main verb (not unlike what the particle *up* contributes in the English phrasal verbs *eat/drink up*) and secondly, they have a mirative value, expressing the speaker's attitude that this event (or its completion) is ***unexpected*** or ***not supposed*** to have happened (for whatever reason).[2] This is not unlike what Butt and Lahiri (2002), drawing on Butt and Geuder (2001), say, namely that light verbs perform some kind of "event modification". This modification is done, they say, "by adding further contextually defeasible information […] about suddenness, force, agentivity or benefaction as well as further specification as to *Actionsart*" (Butt & Lahiri 2002:30).[3] We largely agree with the idea of event modification, but argue that this has become part and parcel of the meaning of the construction itself, rather than contextually defeasible information.

The article is structured as follows. In the next section (section 2), we will give a brief general presentation of Odia light verb constructions including an overview of the different verbs that can occur in Odia. Subsequently, in section 3 we will discuss the light verb constructions with *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' which will be presented in three different parts: firstly, we will illustrate the meaning of the light verb constructions by contrasting them to single verb constructions; secondly, we zoom in on the particular differences between *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' (mostly, but not exclusively, related to differences in transitivity); thirdly, we will consider the intricate relationship of light verb constructions with other elements that pertain to the event

constellation, such as the causative marker and the passive construction. In the last section of the paper (section 4), we will offer some explanations for the origin and motivation of the double meaning of the light verb constructions (completion and surprise).

2. A short overview of Odia light verb constructions

There are two types of complex predicate constructions in Odia: ***symmetric*** and ***asymmetric*** serial verb constructions. In the ***symmetric*** serial verb constructions, illustrated in (1) below, several verbs (along with their complements and adjuncts) form a sequence in a mono-clausal construction, with one subject and one tense value, and without any overt co-ordination or subordination (Sahoo 2001).[4]

(1) ମୁଁ ମାଛଟେ କିଣି କଚ୍ଚାଇ ଭାଜି ଖାଇଲି

mũ	*maachha-Te*	***kiN-i***	***keLaa-i***	***bhaaj-i***	***khaa-il-i***
I	fish-CL.INDEF.SG	buy-CONJ	clean-CONJ	fry-CONJ	eat-PAST-1SG

'Having bought, cleaned, fried a fish, I ate (it).'

In this type of serial verb construction, all the verbs are main verbs; the Tense, Aspect and Mood (TAM) marking is always on the last verb. In the above example, all the verbs share the same subject and object, but in principle they can each have their own object and adverbial modifiers; the subject, however, is always shared by all the verbs in the series.

This article will not consider this type of constructions but instead focus on ***asymmetric*** serial verb constructions, so-called light verb constructions (V-v, for short), which combine a main verb and a fully or partially bleached light verb, where the main verb carries the lexical semantic information and determines the argument structure. Although the second verb in the V-v sequences is form-identical with a main (lexical)

verb in the language, it is a light verb because of its semantic and grammatical bleaching. Like the symmetric serial verb constructions, light verb constructions are mono-clausal (cf. also Butt 2010 on Urdu). Such V-v constructions containing light verbs are also known as *Vector verb constructions* (Hook 1993), *Explicator Compound Verbs* (Abbi & Gopalakrishnan 1991), *Complex Predicates* (Butt 1995), or *Asymmetric Serial Verb Constructions* (Sahoo 2001). In this paper, we will use the term *light verb constructions*.[5]

Unlike in Marathi, a Southern Indo-Aryan language, where the order of the verbs can vary (see Deoskar 2006), the word order of Odia light verb constructions is fixed: the lexical verb always precedes the light verb (except occasionally in poetic language) and they are always spelled as a single word, the two verbs being linked with the conjunctive marker *-i-*. (Note that the same conjunctive marker is used with the symmetrical V-V predicates illustrated above.) Light verb constructions thus always take the form $V_{[lexical]}$-*i*-$V_{[light]}$, where the main verb occurs in its root form and the TAM marking occurs on the light verb. In fact, the light verb can be combined with several morphemes carrying grammatical features like ASPect, AUXiliary, Tense, AGReement, etc. Interestingly, the ASP and AUX morphemes are interdependent for their occurrence in a verbal form; i.e., if one occurs, so does the other. However, in the absence of ASP and AUX, the verbal root can occur with the Tense and AGR morphemes (in present tense, only with the AGR morpheme, as PRES tense is not morphologically realized).

The light verbs themselves can be grouped according to their original lexical semantic value (which is, however, fully or partially bleached in these grammaticalised constructions) as follows:

(1) MOTION verbs: *-jaa* 'go', *-chaal* 'walk', *-paD* 'fall', *-pakaa* 'drop', *-uTh* 'rise', *-aas* 'come'

(2) STATIVE verbs: *-bas* 'sit', *-rah* 'stay'

(3) TRANSFER verbs: *-de* 'give', *-ne* 'take'

The STATIVE verbs *-bas* 'sit' and *-rah* 'stay' are semantically quite different from the others: they express continuous aspect and not completion or unexpectedness. They will not be considered in the present paper. The notion of unexpectedness is only present with the group of MOTION and TRANSFER verbs.[6]

These light verbs cannot co-occur randomly with any verb, but show clear semantic and grammatical constraints as well as clear frequency differences. As far as the lexical semantic constraints are concerned, the light verb *-de* 'give' can, for example, not be combined with the lexical verb *ne* 'take' (**ne-i-de-l-aa* *'take-give') and conversely, the light verb *-ne* 'take' cannot occur with the lexical verb *de* 'give' (**de-i-ne-l-aa* *'give-take'). Instead, the light verb occurring with the lexical verb *ne* 'take' is *-jaa* 'go' (*ne-i-jaa*' take-go'), the one occurring with *de* 'give is *-de* 'give' (*de-i-de* 'give-give'). Even if the light verbs have been bleached semantically, the reason for this constraint supposedly lies in the (original) semantic incompatibility of the giving and taking events expressed by these verbs. (We will return to such deviant formations in section 3.2.2 below.)

The grammatical constraints essentially concern transitivity. For example, the light verbs *-jaa* 'go' and *-paD* 'fall' only combine with intransitive verbs, *-de* 'give' and *-pakaa* 'drop' only combine with (di)transitive verbs. This will be elaborated in more detail in section 3 below.

Finally, there are also considerable differences in frequency of use. For example, the light verb *-aas* 'come' turns out to be fairly infrequent, and while *-jaa* 'go' and *-paD* 'fall' can sometimes occur in the same context (e.g., *bas-i-jaa* 'sit-CONJ-go' and *bas-i-paD* 'sit-CONJ-fall' both having a meaning which approximates "go and sit down"), *-jaa* 'go' is much more common which is clearly related to its higher productivity overall. In fact, of all the light verbs, both *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' are the most productive, which is why this paper focuses on these two in particular, even if we will occasionally relate

these to the other light verbs. Here are some examples illustrating the use of the light verbs *-jaa* 'go', *-de* 'give', *-paD* 'fall', *-ne* 'take', and *-aas* 'come' with a brief discussion of their semantics in contrast to the single verb construction which, for most of these examples, is not possible or quite marked. A more detailed discussion of the different semantic and grammatical values of *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' (also in comparison to single verb constructions) will be presented later.

-jaa 'go'

(2) a. ଗ୍ଲାସଟା ଭାଙ୍ଗିଯାଇଛି / *ଭାଙ୍ଗିଛି

glas-Taa ***bhaang-i-jaa-i-ch-i*** / ****bhaang-i-ch-i***

glass-the break-CONJ-go-PERF-AUX-3SG / *break-PERF-AUX-3SG

'The glass is broken.'

b. ଗାଡି ଶବ୍ଦରେ ମୋ ନିଦ ଭାଙ୍ଗିଗଲା / *ଭାଙ୍ଗିଲା

gaaDi sabdare mo nida ***bhaang-i-ga-l-aa*** / ****bhaang-il-aa***

vehicle sound-PP my sleep break-CONJ-go-PAST-3SG / break-PAST-3SG

['my sleep got broken in the sound of the vehicle.']

'I woke up from my sleep because of the sound of the vehicle.'

In both these examples with the light verb *-jaa* 'go', the verb *bhaang* 'break' is used intransitively ('the sound of the vehicle' in (2b) is an adjunct); the light verb construction indicates completion and unsupposedness (one does not really want to be woken up by noise). The single verb construction is impossible because *bhang* 'break' is a transitive verb and requires an AGENT; in fact, they only alternate in the light verb constructions: the (intransitive) light verbs *-jaa* 'go' or *-paD* 'fall' are required for it to function in an intransitive construction. In the presence of an AGENT, it can combine with *-de* 'give'.

-de **'**give'

(3) a. କିଏ ଗ୍ଲାସଟା ଭାଙ୍ଗି ଦଇଛି / ?ଭାଙ୍ଗିଛି

kie *glas-Taa* ***bhaang-i-de-i-ch-i*** / ?***bhaang-i-ch-i***

somebody glass-the break-CONJ-give-PERF-AUX-3SG / break-PERF-AUX-3SG

'Somebody has broken the glass (impl.: accidentally) / ?as planned.'

b. ସେ ଭାତତକ ଖାଇଦଲେ। / ଖାଇଲ।

se *bhaata-taka* ***khaa-i-de-l-aa*** / ***khaa-il-aa***

he rice-QUAN eat-CONJ-give-PAST-3SG / eat-PAST-3SG

'He ate up all the rice (unexpectedly) / (expected).'

In these examples, the light verb *-de* occurs in a transitive construction with the verbs *bhaang* 'break' and *khaa* 'eat' and expresses both completion and surprise or unexpectedness. The single verb construction with *bhaang* 'break' is semantically odd, since it would imply that someone did this on purpose. Note that if said with rising intonation, the single verb construction does become acceptable, but then functions as a question 'Who has broken the glass?'

-paD 'fall'

(4) a. ସେ ସନ୍ଧ୍ୟା ନହଉଣୁ ଶେ ାଇପଡ଼ିଲ। / ଶେ ାଇଲ।

se *sandhyaa* *naheuNu* ***soi-(i)-paD-il-aa*** / ***soi-l-aa***

he evening NEG-happen sleep-(CONJ)-fall-PAST-3SG / sleep-PAST-3SG

'He (unexpectedly) slept off before evening (lit. 'evening had not happened') / went to sleep (bed) before evening but not necessarily slept.'

b. ବହୁତ ଗୁଡାଏ ଖାଦ୍ୟ ବଳିପଡ଼ିଲ। / ବଳିଲ।

bahuta *guDaae* *khaadya* ***baL-i-paD-il-aa*** / ***baL-il-aa***

too much food leave-CONJ-fall-PAST-3SG / leave-PAST-3SG

'Too much of food was left out (unexpectedly) / possibly pre-planned.'

In the first example with *soi* 'sleep', the light verb construction expresses that he did fall asleep but was not supposed or expected to, whereas the single verb construction remains neutral as to whether he actually fell asleep or not. It is more or less the equivalent of English *he went to bed.* In the b-sentence, the light verb construction indicates that it was not planned for food to be left over, whereas the single verb suggests pre-planned (expected) left-overs, e.g. to have cooked more food than required (either to avoid shortage, or having cooked extra food for the next day or for some other purpose). Notice that the completion reading may be somewhat backgrounded here, given the resultative semantics of "left over".

*-**ne*** 'take'

(5) a. ସେ ଯିବା ପୂର୍ବରୁ ତାର ସବୁ କାମ କରିନଲେ। / କରିଲ।

*se jibaa purbaru taara sabu kaama **kar**-i-**ne**-l-aa* / ***kar**-il-aa*

he go.INF before his all work do-CONJ-take-PAST-3SG / do-PAST-3SG

'He did all his work (completely) before he left / started, but not sure if completed.'

b. ସେ ରାଜାଦ୍ୱାରା ତା'ର ସବୁ କାମ କରାଇନଲେ। / କରାଇଲ।

*se raajaa-dwaaraa taa'ra sabu kaama **kar**-aa-i-**ne**-l-aa/ **kar**-aa-il-aa*

he Raja-by his all work do-CAUS-CONJ-take-PAST-3SG / do-CAUS-PAST-3SG

'He got all his work (completely) done through Raja / started, but not sure if completed.'

The light verb *-ne* 'take' is somewhat different from the other light verbs in that the element of surprise is slightly less strong (possibly because it has retained a bit more of its original semantics of agentive verb). Notice, however, that the light verb still

expresses completion whereas the single verb is neutral to that. A final point should be made about the causative morpheme in (5b). As explained above, the light verb construction is usually the combination of a verbal root, a conjunctive infix (usually *-i-*) and a light verb. In example (5b), however, the causative morpheme *-aa-* comes in between the verbal root and the CONJ morpheme, giving the sequence V-CAUS-*i*-v. The CAUS-marker adds an extra causative layer; in other words, it expresses the causation relationship between the subject (*se* 'he') and *Raja* (in an Instrumental role) who did the actual work. The interaction between the light verbs and the CAUS marker will be discussed in more detail in section 3.2.3 below.

-aas 'come'

(6) ସେ ବହିଟେ ନଇଆସିଲା / ନେଲା

se bahi-Te ***ne-i-aas-il-aa*** / ***ne-l-aa***

he book-one take-CONJ-come-PAST-3SG / take-PAST-3SG

'He brought a book (unexpected) / 'He took a book. '

Here, the combination 'take-come' means "bring"; see more on the main verb *ne* 'take' below.

Notice also in these examples the various transitivity combinations that we mentioned above: in (2), the intransitively used verb *bhaang* 'break' combines with *-jaa* 'go'); in (3), the same verb used transitively combines with *-de* 'give'; and in (4), the intransitive verb *so* 'sleep' combines with *-paD* 'fall'. As already specified above, *-de* 'give' only combines with transitive or ditransitive verbs (e.g., 'kill-give' vs. *die-give'; 'give-give'), whereas *-jaa* 'go' typically combines with intransitives ('come-go'), yet does also occur with transitives ('take-go') and ditransitives ('give-go'). As we will detail below, this occurs in specific uses only. As shown by the contrast between (2a) and (3a), for alternating main verbs (allowing an intransitive and a transitive

construction), such as *bhaang* 'break', either *-jaa* 'go' or *-de* 'give' is possible; the former selects the intransitive variant ('the glass break-go'), the latter, the transitive ('somebody the glass break-give').

To summarize then, while form-identical with full lexical verbs, the Odia light verbs are semantically bleached constructions that no longer project any arguments (yet still preserve a marked tendency to have all arguments overtly expressed) and that have acquired a new, double, meaning (at least for the MOTION and TRANSFER verbs): they express the completion of the event and the idea of unexpectedness or "unsupposedness" (mirativity). The following section will describe in more detail the most frequent representatives of these two verb groups, the light verbs *-jaa 'go'* & *-de 'give'*. After that, we will be in a better position to present an account of the origin of the mirative reading of the light verb constructions (section 4).

3. Analysis of use of light verbs *-jaa 'go'* & *-de 'give'*

Our analysis of the Odia light verbs *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' will proceed via three different comparisons:

(1) the use of a single verb as opposed to a V-v construction, which reveals how the latter indicates completion and, typically, unexpectedness,
(2) the differences between these two constructions regarding transitivity and event construal (notably the relationship with the causative marker *–aa–*),
(3) differences in the degree of unexpectedness.

3.1. *Single verb versus light verb construction*

A first approximation of the semantics of the light verbs *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' can be obtained by comparing the single verb construction with that with a light verb. In addition to the cases already discussed above, these examples further substantiate our hypothesis that the light verb construction indicates the completion and unexpectedness of the event.

(7) a. ତୁ ଏଠି ବସ, ମୁଁ ସେଠି ବସୁଛି

*tu eThi **base**, mũ seThi **bas**-u-ch-i*

you[-Hon] here sit-IMP, I there sit-PROG-AUX-1SG

'You sit here, I will sit there.'

b. ତୁ ଏଠି ବସିଯା, ମୁଁ ସେଠି ବସି ଯାଉଛି

*tu eThi **bas-i-jaa**, mũ seThi **bas-i-jaa**-u-ch-i*

you[-Hon] here sit-CONJ-go-IMP, I there sit-CONJ-go-PROG-AUX-1SG

'You (manage to) sit here, I will (manage to) sit there.'

The verb *bas* 'sit' is an intransitive verb, referring either to being in a sitting position (static use) or getting into a sitting position (dynamic use), as illustrated by the two possible readings in, for example, (*aasa*) *mo paakhare basa* '(come.IMP) my next-to sit.IMP', (come and sit next to me). The use of the single verb as in (7a) indicates that the seating has been planned beforehand (reserved seats), or that there are many seats available, or that there is a good reason for taking a particular seat, or some other kind of plan (in short: 'doing what one is supposed to do'). The light verb construction as in (7b) is used in cases where there are no reserved seats or no plan, or free seats become available unexpectedly, etc. This is a typical context in which the light verb construction is used, in the bus or train, when seats become available. In other words, the sitting is more improvised, depending on the situation (e.g., of

possibly/unexpectedly seats becoming available). In line with the "completion" meaning that the light verb brings to the event, the V-v construction thus construes the event as a whole, with salient end-point focus, the (unexpected, unplanned yet successful) sitting down, whereas the single verb construction designates the onset and/or the sitting state without such salient focus on the result. (See section 4 for a more detailed discussion of the relationship between event onset, event completion and unexpectedness.)

The light verb *-jaa* 'go' should not be confused with *go* as used in English *go and V* (e.g., *go (and) sit over there*), as indicated by the following contrastive sentences where the full verb *jaa* 'go' is used in a meaning similar to that of the English construction and is followed by either the single verb *bas* 'sit' (8a) or the light verb construction *bas-i-jaa* 'sit-go' (8b).

(8) a. ସେଠାରେ/ସେଠାକୁ ଯାଇ ବସ

sethaa-re/sethaa-ku ***jaa-i*** ***bas-a***

there-LOC/there-ACC go-CONJ sit-IMP

'Go and sit there.'

b. ଯାଇ ସେଠାରେ ବସିଯା

jaa-i *sethaa-re* ***bas-i-jaa-a***

go-CONJ there-LOC sit-CONJ-go-IMP

'Go and sit (occupy the seat) there.'

In (8a), the construal is sequential, first you go (there), then you sit (there). In (8b), the same holds for the V-V sequence ('go sit'), but not for the light verb construction (V-v 'sit-go'), which has a meaning as described above, for example, when seats (unexpectedly) become available. In line with that meaning, more situationally anchored, the 'there' in (8b) is typically a location visible to the speaker, whereas in (8a)

it can be invisible (e.g., 'go home and sit there'). Notice that in (8a), either the locative or accusative case can be used (foregrounding either the motion or the targeted location) whereas in (8b) the preferred position for the adverb is closest to *bas* 'sit', in which case only the locative case is acceptable.[7]

In the next example, the light verb construction 'eat-give' indicates that the eating has been completed, whereas in the single verb construction the completion of the action is not in focus or presupposed.

(9) a. ତୁ ଆଗ ଖା, ତା'ପରେ ମୁଁ ଖାଇବି

tu *aaga* ***khaa***, *taa'pare* *mũ* ***khaa****-ib-i*

You$_{[-Hon]}$ first eat-3SG, then I eat-FUT-1SG

'First, you eat, then I will eat.' (both eaters may share the same dish; eating may not be completed).'

b. ତୁ ଏବେ ଖାଇ ଦିଏ, ମୁଁ ପରେ ଖାଇବି

tu *ebe* ***khaa****-i-****di****-e,* *mũ* *pare* ***khaa****-ib-i*

You$_{[-Hon]}$ now eat-CONJ-give-3SG, I later eat-FUT-1SG

' You eat (complete eating) now, I will eat later.'

The light verb construction also indicates that this is unplanned (i.e., improvised action given the situation), whereas the single verb construction suggests that this is the way it should be done or the way it is habitually done.

In the (scarce) literature on light verb constructions, the function of the light verb is often said to be that of a perfective or telicity marker (an idea notably defended by Hook 1991); however, we argue (as do Butt 2010 and Butt & Geuder 2001 for Urdu) that it is still different and that it does more than just mark perfectivity or telicity, which is further indicated by the fact that the light verb can still have a perfective morpheme (*-i-*), as in the following example.[8]

(10) ମୁଁ ବହିଟା ଆଣିକରି ତୁମକୁ ଦଇେଦଇେଥିଲି

mũ bahi-Taa ***aaN-i-kar-i*** *tuma-ku* ***de-i-de-i-th-il-i***

I book-CL bring-CONJ-do-PERF you-ACC give-CONJ-give-PERF-AUX-PAST-1SG

'(Me) having brought the book, I gave (it) to you.'

If the light verb were a mere marker of perfectivity, the addition of the PERF-morpheme in the example above would be difficult to explain (even if redundancy is of course never fully excluded). Butt and Geuder (2001) also mention this argument for Urdu and add that light verbs can occur in non-perfective readings, such as the progressive, which they characterize as "clearly an imperfective construction" (2001:336). Also in Odia, progressive marking for light verb constructions is possible as already indicated by example (7b) above. The interaction with the progressive marker is a point to which we will return in section 3.2.2 below.

Note that also future tense marking is possible, preserving the completive meaning as in the following example; we add the single verb for contrastive purposes.

(11) ତୁ ପଳା, ମୁଁ ବହିଟା ଲାଇବ୍ରରୀରେ ଫରୋଇଦବେି / ଫରୋଇବି

tu paLaa, mũ bahi-Taa library-re ***pheraa-i-de-b-i*** / ***pheraa-ib-i***

You leave-IMP, I book-CL library-PP return-CONJ-give-FUT-1SG / return-FUT-1SG

'You leave, I will return the book in the library.'

The light verb construction expresses that the event was unplanned (for example, it is not the task of the I-person to return the book) and it projects the (future) event as

completed. The single verb construction does not have these two values (e.g., I was the one who borrowed it, so I should also be the one returning it).

In the context of a temporal sequence of events, the light verb indicates a completive aspectual feature. Consider the following constructions (V-v sequences, and their corresponding single verb sequence constructions):

(12) a. ମୁଁ କ୍ଳାସରେ ପହଞ୍ଚିବା ପୂର୍ବରୁ ସେମାନେ ପହଞ୍ଚିଯାଇଥିଲେ

*mũ klaasre pahanchibaa purbaru semaane **pahanch-i-jaa-i-th-il-e***

I class-in arrive before they arrive-CONJ-go-PERF-AUX-PAST-3PL

'They had arrived in the class before I arrived.'

b. *ମୁଁ କ୍ଳାସରେ ପହଞ୍ଚିବା ପୂର୍ବରୁ ସେମାନେ ପହଞ୍ଚିଥିଲେ

mũ klaasre pahanchibaa purbaru semaane **pahanch-i-th-il-e*

I class-in arrive before they arrive-PERF-AUX-PAST-3PL

'They had arrived in the class before I arrived.'

In (12a), the light verb *pahanch-i-jaaithile* 'arrive-go' expresses completive meaning, i.e., their reaching the class is completed before my arrival. Thus, only the temporally previous sequence of events is acceptable with the light verb construction denoting a completed event.

Another test showing the completive feature of the light verb is given in (13). The ungrammaticality of (13b) indicates that there is a completive meaning associated with the light verb, which necessarily denotes the completion of the event expressed by the main verb and thus, does not allow negation of the successful outcome of the event.

(13) a. ବହିଟା ମୁଁ ତାକୁ ଦଲି, କିନ୍ତୁ ସେ ନଲାନି

*bahi-Taa mū taaku **de**-l-i, kintu se ne-l-aa-ni*

book-CL I him give-PAST-1SG but he take-PAST-3SG-NEG

'I gave him the book, but he didn't take it.' [= 'I offered it to him, but he didn't take it.']

b. *ବହିଟା ମୁଁ ତାକୁ ଦଇଦଲି କିନ୍ତୁ ସେ ନଲାନି

bahi-Taa mū taaku **de-i-**de**-l-i kintu se ne-l-aa-ni*

book-CL I him give-CONJ-give-PAST-1SG but he take-PAST-3SG-NEG

'I gave him the book, but he didn't take it.' [means, the 'giving' act is completed, but as the receiver didn't take it...]

In sum, the comparison of the single verb and the light verb construction shows that the light verb indicates completion, as further confirmed by additional morphological aspect and/or tense marking. This is also supported by the other Indo-Aryan languages like Hindi where the contribution of light verb has often been characterized via aspectual terms such as perfectivity (Hook 1991, Singh 1994) or inception/completion (Butt 1995). Hook (1973) considers light verbs (which he calls *vector verbs*) as a subtype of auxiliaries having completive aspectual functions. We agree with Butt & Ramchand (2005) and Butt & Lahiri (2002, 2013) that, syntactically, light verbs are not like auxiliaries which, moreover, in Odia are always bound morphemes and not independent lexical entries. We disagree with their conclusion that light verbs therefore should be (semi-)lexical and that there is one underspecified lexical entry for both the lexical verb and the light verb (a point to which we will return briefly in section 4.2). What is important, as already stated earlier and clearly illustrated by the examples above, is that there is an additional meaning to the light verb construction with *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give', *viz.* the idea that the event was not supposed or expected to happen but happened nonetheless.

Having established the difference between single verb and light verb constructions, we will in the next two sections look in more detail at what distinguishes the two light verbs *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' themselves. The major difference concerns their different transitivity constraints, which we will discuss first in section 3.2; a second difference concerns a different degree in unexpectedness, discussed in section 3.3.

3.2 *Transitivity related differences with -jaa 'go' and -de 'give'*

The light verbs *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' have different transitivity constraints. The following discussion will first present the general tendencies and give some typical patterns (section 3.2.1); next, it will discuss some deviations from the general rule, considering lexically specific cases as well as more general ones (section 3.2.2); finally, we consider the complex interaction with the causative marker *-aa-* which affects the transitivity value of the construction (section 3.2.3).

3.2.1. *Overall patterns for -jaa 'go' and -de 'give'*

As a general rule, *-jaa* 'go' combines with intransitive verbs or intransitive readings of alternating verbs, *-de* 'give' is restricted to transitive and ditransitive verbs. Here are two examples with *-jaa* 'go' combining with the intransitive main verb *aas* 'come' and intransitively used *chir* 'tear'; notice that for the latter, *-jaa* 'go' cannot combine with the transitive construction, as shown by the unacceptability of (15b).

(14) ଭାରି ଥଣ୍ଡା ଲାଗୁଛି, ଘର ଭିତରକୁ ଆସି ଯା

*bhaari thanDaa laag-u-ch-i, ghara bhitara-ku **aas-i-jaa-a***

very cold feel-PROG-AUX-3SG house inside-ACC come-CONJ-go-IMP

'Come inside the house, it is very cold.'

(15) a. ମଉ। ବହିଟା ଚିରିଗଲା

*mo bahi-Taa **chir-i-ga-l-aa***

my book-CL tear-CONJ-go-PAST-3SG

'My book got torn.'

b. *କିଏ ମଉ। ବହିଟା ଚିରିଗଲା

kie mo bahi-Taa **chir-i-ga-l-aa*

somebody my book-CL tear-CONJ-go-PAST-3SG

'Somebody my book got torn' [intended= 'Somebody tore my book.']

The light verb *-de* 'give', in contrast, only occurs with transitives or ditransitives. The opposition in example (16) between combinations with the main verb *paD* 'fall' (intransitive, combining with *-jaa* 'go') and *pakaa* 'drop' (transitive, combining with *-de* 'give') is in this respect quite revealing. Similarly, as shown by example (17), intransitive *mar* 'die' and transitive *maar* 'kill' combine with *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' respectively.

(16) a. ମଉ। ଟଉପିଟା ତଳେ ପଡିଯାଇଛି

*mo Topi-Taa taLe **paD-i-jaa-i-ch-i***

my cap-CL down fall-CONJ-go-PERF-AUX-3SG

'My cap has fallen down/on the ground.'

b. କିଏ ମତ। ଟତ।ପିଟା। ତଳତ ପକାଇଦଇଛି

kie *mo* *Topi-Taa* *taLe* ***pakaa-i-de-i-ch-i***

somebody my cap-CL down drop-CONJ-give-PERF-AUX-3SG

'Somebody has dropped my cap on the ground'

(17) a. କୁକୁରଟା ମରିଗଲା

kukura-Taa ***mar-i-ga-l-aa***

dog-DEF-CL die-CONJ-go-PAST-3SG

'The dog died.'

b. କିଏ କୁକୁରଟାକୁ ମାରିଦଲା

kie *kukura-Taa-ku* ***maar-i-de-l-aa***

somebody dog-CL-ACC kill-CONJ-give-PAST-3SG

'Somebody killed the dog.'

Below we give a (non-exhaustive) overview of some common combinations with *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* ('go'); for ease of readability, the conjunctive morpheme *-i-* and other grammatical morphemes have not been glossed.

(i) alternating verbs: *V-i-jaa* 'V-go' (intransitive) or *V-i-de* 'V-give' (transitive)

ଭାଙ୍ଗିଗଲା *bhaang-i-galaa* 'break-go'	ଭାଙ୍ଗିଦଲା *bhaang-i-delaa* 'break-give'
ଚିରିଗଲା *chir-i-galaa* 'tear-go'	ଚିରିଦଲା *chir-i-delaa* 'tear-give'
ଖତ ।ଲିଗଲା *khol-i-galaa* 'open-go'	ଖତ ।ଲିଦଲା *khol-i-delaa* 'open-give'
ଛାଡ଼ିଗଲା *chhaaD-i-galaa* 'fade-go'	ଛାଡ଼ିଦଲା *chhaaD-i-delaa* 'leave-give'[9]

(ii) intransitive verbs: *V-i-jaa* 'V-go' (V-i-de* 'V-give')**

ଖସିଗଲା *khas-i-galaa* 'slip-go'	(*ଖସିଦଲା **khas-i-delaa* 'slip-give)
ପଳାଇଗଲା *paLaa-i-galaa* 'flee-go'	(*ପଳାଇଦଲା **paLaa-i-delaa* 'flee-give')
ପଡ଼ିଗଲା *paD-i-galaa* 'fall-go'	(*ପଡ଼ିଦଲା **paD-i-delaa* 'fall-give')
ଭାସିଗଲା *bhaas-i-galaa* 'float-go'	(*ଭାସିଦଲା **bhaas-i-delaa* 'float-give')
ଚଢିଯା *chaDh-i-jaa* 'climb-go'	(*ଚଢିଦତ **chaDh-i-de* 'climb-give')

ଚାଲିଯା *chaal-i-jaa* 'walk-go' (*ଚାଲିଦେ **chaal-i-de* 'walk-give')
ଲିଭିଗଲା *libh-i-galaa* 'extinguish-go' (*ଲିଭିଦଲୋ **libh-i-delaa* 'extinguish-give')
ମରିଗଲା *mar-i-galaa* 'die-go' (*ମରିଦଲୋ **mar-i-delaa* 'die-give')
ଶେ ଇଯା *so-i-jaa* 'sleep-go' (*ଶେ ଇଦେ **so-i-de* 'sleep-give')
ଫାଟିଗଲା *phaaT-i-galaa*' burst-go' (*ଫାଟିଦଲୋ **phaaT-i-delaa* 'burst-give')
ତରଳିଗଲା *taraL-i-galaa* 'melt-go' (*ତରଳିଦଲୋ **taraL-i-delaa* 'melt-give')
ଭିଜିଗଲା *bhij-i-galaa* 'soak-go' (*ଭିଜିଦଲୋ **bhij-i-delaa* 'soak-give')
ଲାଗିଗଲା *laag-i-galaa* 'CONTACT-go' [10] (*ଲାଗିଦଲୋ **laag-i-delaa* 'CONTACT-give')
କମିଗଲା *kam-i-galaa* 'decrease-go' (*କମିଦଲୋ **kam-i-delaa* 'decrease-give')
ବଢିଗଲା *baDh-i-galaa* 'increase-go' (*ବଢିଦଲୋ **baDh-i-delaa* 'increase-give')
ହଜିଗଲା *haj-i-galaa* 'misplace-go' (*ହଜିଦଲୋ **haj-i-delaa* 'misplace-give')

(iii) transitive verbs: *V-i-de* 'V-give'

ଖାଇଦଲୋ *khaa-i-delaa* 'eat-give'
ଖୁମ୍ପିଦଲୋ *khump-i-delaa* 'nibble-give'
ଖେ ଲିଦଲୋ *khol-i-delaa* 'open-give'
କରିଦଲୋ *kar-i-delaa* 'do-give'
ବାନ୍ଧିଦବୋ *baandh-i-deba* 'tie-give' (*ବାନ୍ଧିଯିବା **baandh-i-jiba* 'tie-go')
କିଣିଦେ *kiN-i-de* 'buy-give'
ଆଣିଦେଇଛି *aaN-i-deichi* 'bring-give' (*ଆଣିଯାଇଛି **aaN-i-jaa*ichi 'bring-go')
ଧରିଦଲୋ *dhar-i-dele* 'catch-give'
ଫେ ପାଡ଼ିଦଲୋ *phopaaD-i-dele* 'throw-give'
ପଠାଇଦଲୋ *paThaa-i-dele* 'send-give'
*{*ଶର / ଚାପୁଡ଼ାଟାଏ *shara / chaapuDaa(Taae) }* ମାରିଦଲୋ *maar-i-delaa* '{arrow / (a) slap} hit-gave'

As illustrated in the list above, *-de* 'give' cannot occur with intransitive motion verbs such as 'walk', 'fall', 'climb', etc.

In sum, the use of the light verbs *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' is determined by the transitivity properties of the main verb: *-jaa* 'go' is used in intransitive constructions and *-de* 'give', in transitive ones. In view of their lexical origin, the intransitive motion verb *jaa* 'go' and the ditransitive *de* 'give', the transitivity difference is no coincidence.

However, despite this general transitivity constraint, there are some deviations and complexities that need to be mentioned; some of these are lexically specific, others are of a more general kind transcending individual verbs.

3.2.2. *Deviant patterns for -jaa 'go' and -de 'give'*

Beginning with the lexically specific cases, we observe that while *-jaa* 'go' typically occurs with intransitives (including intransitively used alternation verbs), it *can* occasionally occur with transitive verbs, but this is a smaller set and for these, some of the lexical meaning of the light verb (referring to being away or disappearing) seems to have been retained.

One case, which has already been mentioned, is the combination with the transitive verb *ne* 'take', illustrated in the example below.

(18) କିଏ ମୋ । କଲମଟା ନେଇଗଲା ।

kie mo kalama-Taa ***ne-i-ga-l-aa***

somebody my pen-CL take-CONJ-go-PAST-3SG

'Somebody took away my pen.'

As a transitive verb, *ne* 'take' should combine with the light verb *-de* 'give', but as already said above, the (historical) semantic incompatibility of 'take' and 'give' is most likely responsible for making that combination impossible, despite the semantic bleaching of the light verb.[11] There are other 'transitive' light verbs that can occur with *ne* 'take', like *-ne* '-take' or *-pakaa* 'drop'; however, other semantic constraints are at work here. The combination *ne-i-ne* 'take-take' is reserved for "self-beneficiary taking", i.e., taking for yourself or taking what belongs to you. For example, 'take-take books' means that you take the books that are yours (hence, it is less unexpected and may

even be planned). The combination *ne-i-pakaa* 'take-drop' has a strong negative connotation and usually refers to taking without permission (like stealing); in other words, it has a strong unsupposedness reading (taking what you are not supposed to take). Consequently, if for the main verb *ne* 'take' a light verb construction is needed to express surprise or unexpectedness, there are only two possibilities left: (1) the combination with the light verb *-jaa* 'go' if the motion is away from the speaker (or from a vantage point from which the scene is viewed) and (2) the combination with *-aas* 'come', if the motion is towards the speaker (as shown in example (6) above *ne-aas* 'take-come' actually means "bring"). Strikingly, these deviations do no occur with semantically similar *aaN* 'bring', which can only be combined with *-de* 'give'. In fact, this points at a semantic difference for these verbs in Odia: the meaning of *ne* 'take' is very much tied to motion, whereas *aaN* 'bring' is more closely associated with a giving or receiving event. For example, where in English you could say *Can you take a book for me from the library?*, in Odia you would rather say, *can you 'take-come' or 'bring-give' a book for me from the library*. In sum, for the particular case of the verb *ne* 'take', different semantic constraints overrule the transitivity constraint of *-jaa* 'go'.

In fact, the constraint that *-jaa* 'go' only occurs with intransitive verbs is overruled in some other lexically specific contexts as well. Consider again example (9b) above with the transitive combination 'eat-give', where all of the food has (unexpectedly) been eaten (i.e., has disappeared). In principle, *-jaa* 'go' should not be allowed in combination with a transitive verb, but in fact, it is possible, but not in reference to regular eating: it is typically used metaphorically, for example, in reference to money that has been embezzled or a flood that has 'eaten' away the riverbanks. Another example is the combination 'forget-go' (with transitive *bhul* 'forget') where the object forgotten is not (or no longer) with the speaker. It thus seems that *-jaa* 'go' can occur in transitive contexts where the idea of (total) disappearance is expressed, which can still be related to the semantics of its lexical counterpart *jaa* 'go (away)'. This suggest that the semantic bleaching of *-jaa* 'go' may be less than that of *-de* 'give' for which little if

anything of the transfer meaning (including the thematic roles) seems to have been retained.

The above deviations of the transitivity constraints all relate to verb-particular semantic constraints. However, there are also deviations from the general tendency that go beyond individual verbs and that have to do with other aspectual values. One of these is the difference between the construal of an event as a single event or as a multiplex event, consisting of the repetition of the same event or action. A good example is the difference between 'buy-go' and 'buy-give'. In the combination with 'give', the event is seen as a single, complete event; in that with 'go', there are multiple buy-events making up the whole of the buying, e.g., such as buying things when they become available (one after one), or the same things being bought in different shops, etc. In other words, each buying event has different spatio-temporal properties. A possible paraphrase would be 'keep buying for a period of time'. Here is an example contrasting 'buy-go' with 'buy-give'.

(19) a. ଗତ ସପ୍ତାହ ବୁଧବାରଦିନ ଷ୍ଟକ ମାର୍କଟେରେ ମୁଁ ଆପୁଲର ସବୁ ଶୟୋର କିଣିଗଲି

gata	*saptaaha*	*budhabaaradina*	*stock-maarket-re*	*mũ*	*Applera*	*sabu*
	share	*kiN-i-**ga**-l-i*				
last	week	Wednesday	stock-market-LOC	I	Apple's	all
	share	**buy**-CONJ-**go**-PAST-1SG				

'On Wednesday last week, I kept buying Apple's all the market's shares for that day.'

b. ଗତ ସପ୍ତାହ ବୁଧବାରଦିନ ଷ୍ଟକ ମାର୍କଟେରେ ମୁଁ ଆପୁଲର ସବୁ ଶୟୋର କିଣିଦଲି

*gata saptaaha budhabaaradina stock-market-re mũ Apple-ra sabu share **kiN-i-de-l-i***

last week Wednesday stock-market-LOC I Apple-GEN all share **buy**-CONJ-**give**-PAST-1SG

'On Wednesday last week, I bought all the market's shares for that day.'

The first example ('buy-go') clearly indicates there was successive buying for a certain period of time, whereas the second example ('buy-give') does not, and could refer to a single buying of all the shares at once. Note that on its own, the 'buy-go' combination is still different from a progressive, as this can still be overtly expressed by adding the progressive morpheme (*-u-*):

(20) ମାର୍କଟେରେ ପଶୁ ପଶୁ ସେ ସବୁ ଶୟୋର କିଣିଯାଉଛି

*Market-re pas-u pas-u se sabu share **kiN-i-jaa-u-chh-i***

market.LOC enter-PROG enter-PROG he all share **buy**-CONJ-**go**-PROG-AUX-3SG

'The moment he enters the market, he keeps (lit. is keeping) buying all the shares.'

A similar example would be when a parrot has nibbled from different pieces of fruit, where you can either say *khump-i-galaa* ('nibble-go'), focusing on the repetition of nibbling, or *khump-i-delaa* ('nibble-give') referring to a single event (the parrot came and nibbled). Similarly, *lekh-i-galaa* ('write-go') refers to multiple or repeated writing (e.g., a child writing a word many times to remember its spelling), while *lekh-i-delaa* ('write-give') refers to a single writing event. Similarly, one can have the combination

'kill-go', if it refers to repeated action, e.g., *maar-i-jaa-u-th-il-e* 'kill-CONJ-go-PROG-AUX-PAST-3 PL' which could refer to a situation where soldiers kept on coming killing people.

In the example below, *de-i-jaa* 'give-go' expresses repeated events of giving money (notice also the progressive marking) where the implication is that the giver has not exhausted all of his money.

(21) ସେ ମତେ ସବୁବେଳେ ବହୁତ ପଇସା ଦେଇଯାଉଛି, କିନ୍ତୁ ମୁଁ ତାକୁ କିଛି ଦେଇ ପାରୁନି

se mote sabubeLe bahuta paisa de-i-**jaa**-u-ch-i, kintu mũ taaku kichhi de-i paar-u-ni

he me always much money give-CONJ-go-PROG-AUX-3SG,but I him anything give-CONJ-can-PROG-NEG-1SG

'He always gives me a lot of money, but I cannot give him anything.'

The above example where the giving does not exhaust the giver's resources (i.e., there is still some of his money left) can be contrasted with the example below, where the 'eat-give' construction refers to the chocolates being eaten up progressively to exhaustion (completion) during the keeping of the chocolates (note again the use of the progressive).

(22) a. ଚକଲଟେ ରଖୁରଖୁ ତ ତୁ ସବୁ ଖାଇଦଉଛୁ

chakleT rakh-u rakh-u ta tu sabu ***khaa-i-de***-*u-chh-u*

chocolate keep-PROG keep-PROG EMPH you all eat-CONJ-give-PROG-AUX-2SG

['Chocolate keeping keeping, you are eating up all (the chocolates).']

'While keeping the chocolates, you are eating up all of them.'

In many of these cases, there is overt progressive marking; in some cases, it is even obligatory. For example, in the case of repeated killing by the soldiers, the PROG

marking is obligatory *maar-i-jaa-u-th-il-e* 'kill.CONJ-go-PROG-AUX-PAST-3PL vs. **maar-i-ga-il-e* 'kill.CONJ-go-PAST-3PL'.

All in all, the light verb *-jaa* 'go' is more typical with progressive than *-de* 'give', even if the latter is not excluded, as illustrated by example (22) above ('eat-give-PROG chocolates').

In short, in the combination with transitive verbs, the light verb *-jaa* 'go' expresses what could be termed "accumulative repetition", where (identical) repeated events all lead up to completion of the whole event but not beyond the point that it could not be continued anymore. In other words, there could be another repetition of the event (e.g., buying yet more shares, giving yet more money, etc.).[12] Even if combinations with the light verb *-de* 'give' may refer to events that similarly build on repeated events, as is the case in (19b), (21), and (22) above, in line with the overall transitive semantics of the construction, they construe these events holistically and imply that a full endpoint has been reached (illustrated in the examples above by the exhaustion of resources). The light verbs *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' thus imply a different degree of completion, a point to which we will return later, after having discussed a last issue with respect to transitivity, *viz.* the interaction with the causative morpheme and the passive construction.

3.2.3. *Causatives and passives*

As already mentioned above, there is a set of verbs for which both light verbs are possible, that of alternating verbs, but there are only a handful of such alternating verbs. In the list above, only four such verbs are listed: *bhaang* 'break', *chir* 'tear', *khol* 'open' and *chhaad* 'fade (intr.) or leave (trans.)'; they combine with *-jaa* 'go' when used intransitively (recall from section 2 that the light verb is obligatory for these verbs to be used intransitively), and with *-de* 'give' when used transitively. Strikingly, many of the ***intransitive*** verbs in the list above (which necessarily combine with *-jaa* 'go') are

change of state verbs that in English would be alternating verbs, such as *taraL* 'melt', *libh* 'extinguish' or *phaaT* 'burst'. For these verbs, a sequence with *-de* 'give' is possible, provided one adds the causative marker *-aa-* which signals that an external causer is involved in the change of state.

Let us consider the example of *taraL* 'melt'. In English, *melt* is an alternating verb, allowing an intransitive construction (*The butter melted*) and a transitive one (*I melted the butter*).[13] However, in Odia, the situation is more complex, via the light verb construction and the causative morpheme *-aa-* that is attached to the main verb to build an agentive (transitive) construction. Compare the following two constructions (main verb, causative morpheme *-aa-*, and the light verb are marked in boldface):

(23) a. ଲହୁଣୀ ତରଳି ଗଲା

lahuNi ***taraL-i-ga-l-aa***

butter melt-CONJ-go-PAST-3SG

'The butter (got) melted'

b. ମୁଁ ଲହୁଣୀ ତରଳାଇଲି

mũ lahuNi ***taraL-aa-il-i*** (single verb construction)

I butter melt-CAUS-1SG

'I melted the butter.'

c. ମୁଁ ଲହୁଣୀ ତରଳାଇଦେଲି

mũ lahuNi ***taraL-aa-i-de-l-i*** (light verb construction)

I butter melt-CAUS-CONJ-give-PAST-1SG

'I made the butter melt.' [not supposed to melt it, but melted; it was too difficult to melt the butter, but I managed]

The b- and c-sentences would be ungrammatical without the CAUS morpheme; in other words, the CAUS morpheme is necessary to make the intransitive verb transitive;

it brings in the Agent or Cause. The difference between the single verb construction (b) and the light verb light construction (c) is, as explained above, that the latter indicates the completion of the event, whereas with the single verb construction, this is left open. The light verb *-de* 'give' is to be used here, since that is the one that combines with transitives.

The story gets more complicated when the passive voice is considered. In Odia, the passive is marked by a complex morpheme *-aa=jaa* that consists of two parts: the *-aa-* morpheme (homonymous with the CAUS morpheme) and the (passive) auxiliary *-jaa* 'go'. This auxiliary is form-identical with, yet different from, the light verb in asymmetric complex predicates that we discuss in this paper. (To clarify this difference, the complex passive morpheme will be marked as *aa=jaa* in the glosses; *aa=galaa* in the past tense.) For example, the passive counterpart of the single causative verb construction in (23b) would be the following:

(24) (ମଡ଼ ।ଦ୍ୱାରା।) ଲହୁଣୀ ତରଳାଗଲା।

(mo-dwaara) lahuNi ***taraL-aa=ga-l-aa***

(I-INSTR) butter melt=PASS-PAST-3SG

'The butter was melted (by me).'

Notice that the causative morpheme can no longer be present in the passive construction (**taraL-**aa-aa=ga**-l-aa* 'melt-CAUS-PASS-3SG), most likely for phonological reasons. It is of course possible to passivize light verb constructions such as in (23c) above ('I melted the butter'); the result would be the following:

(25) (ମଓ। ଦ୍ୱାରା) ଲହୁଣୀ ତରଳାଇଦିଆଗଲା।

(mo-dwaara) lahuNi ***taraL-aa-i-di-aa=ga-l-aa***

(I.INSTR) butter melt-CAUS-CONJ-give=PASS-PAST-3SG

'The butter got melted (by me).'

In the light verb construction, the two *-aa-* morphemes, the CAUS morpheme (needed in the 'melt-give' construction) and that of the passive morpheme (*-aa+jaa*) are preserved, as the light verb occurs in between them.

Being intransitive, the light verb constructions with *-jaa* 'go' (as listed above), cannot occur in the passive as such; in order to passivize a construction such as *libh-i-jaa* ('extinguish-go'), one needs to (i) add the causative marker *-aa-* and (ii) change the light verb to *-de* 'give':

(26) a. ନିଆଁ ଲିଭିଗଲା।

niã ***libh-i-ga-l-aa***

fire extinguish-CONJ-go-PAST-3SG

'The fire went out.'

b. ନିଆଁ ଲିଭାଇ ଦିଆଗଲା।

niã ***libh-aa-i-di-aa=ga-l-aa***

fire extinguish-CAUS-CONJ-give-PASS-PAST-3SG

'The fire got extinguished.'

This lines up perfectly with the overall constraint that the light verb *-jaa* 'go' only combines with intransitives: in order to have a passive construction, the whole must be converted to a causative construction via the causative *-aa-* for which then the light verb *-de* 'give' is required.

In other words, the causative morpheme adds another layer of causation to processes that are (typically) intransitive. Here is another telling example, where the causative morpheme in (27b) is added to the (inherently) intransitive action of sitting down and thus brings in a secondary Agent (which in English would be typically expressed by a periphrastic causative, e.g., *make someone sit down*). This is possible with both single and light verb constructions (this difference revolving around unexpectedness and completion, as explained above).

(27) a. ସେ ଆସି ମୋ । ଯାଗାରେ ବସିପଡିଲା / ବସିଲା

se aasi mo jaagaa-re ***bas-i-paD**-il-aa* / ***bas**-il-aa*

He come my place in sit-CONJ-fall-past-3SG / sit-PAST-3SG

'He came and sat in my place [not supposed to, but did it /pre-planned].'

b. ଶିକ୍ଷକ ତାକୁ ମୋ । ଜାଗାରେ ବସାଇଦେଲେ/ ବସାଇଲେ

shikhyaka taaku mo jaagaa-re ***bas-aa**-i-de-l-e* / ***bas-aa**-il-e*

Teacher him my place-in sit-CAUS-CONJ-give-PAST-3SG / sit-CAUS-PAST-3SG

'The teacher made him sit in my place [by mistake / pre-planned].'

Adding a secondary agent is not limited to intransitives, but is also possible, via the same causative morpheme, with transitive verbs; again, in English, this will often be expressed via a periphrastic coding (e.g., *make someone do something*). Here is a contrastive example (with a light verb construction), where the a-sentence gives the simple transitive, the b-sentence is the 'augmented' transitive.[14]

(28) a. ପିଲାଟି ଚିଠିଟା ଲେଖିଦେଲା / ଲେଖିଲା

pilaa-Ti chiThi-Taa ***lekh-i-de-l-aa*** / ***lekh-il-aa***

child-CL letter-CL write-CONJ-give-PAST-3SG / write-PAST-3SG

'The child wrote the letter (completely)'

b. ମା ପିଲାଦ୍ୱାରା ଚିଠିଟା ଲେଖାଇଦେଲେ

maa pilaa-Ti-dwaaraa chiThi-Taa ***lekh-aa-i-de-l-e*** / ***lekh-aa-il-e***

mother child-CL-by letter-CL write-CAUS-CONJ-give-PAST-3SG$_{[+Hon]}$ / write-PAST-3SG$_{[+Hon]}$

'Mother made the child write the letter (completely) '

To summarize this longer description of transitivity in the contexts of Odia light verb constructions, the following observations can be made:

- *-jaa* 'go' combines with intransitive constructions, *-de* 'give' with transitives or ditransitives; for alternating verbs (infrequent), it is the construction that will determine which light verb is to be used;
- the causative morpheme *-aa-* can be added to intransitive predicates to make them transitive (adding an Agent) in which case the light verb *-de* 'give' is used; this morpheme is also used to add a secondary Agent who causes someone else (the primary Agent) to do something;
- there are some verb-specific deviations, such as, e.g. with the verb *ne* 'take', or some contexts where disappearance is in focus;
- *-jaa* 'go' can also be used with transitive verbs when repetition is at stake or with a multiplex event; the suggestion of completion is often less strong in these cases, in contrast to coding with *-de* 'give'.

The latter point, the different degree of completion, can be related to a different degree of unexpectedness, which is the last point of difference between the two light verbs, discussed next. After that, in section 4, we will consider the grounds for the association of completion and unexpectedness.

3.3. *Degrees of unexpectedness with -jaa 'go' and -de 'give'*

From the preceding two sections, it can be retained that light verb constructions with *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' differ from single verb constructions in that they express completion and unexpectedness, that the two light verbs can be distinguished from each other in terms of transitivity, and that there seems to be a difference of degree regarding the notions of completion, as it appeared in the discussion of the "accumulative repetition" reading of $V_{[trans]}$-*jaa*. This difference of degree of completion seems to align with a difference in degree of unexpectedness: *-jaa* 'go' typically indicates sudden and/or accidental events whereas *-de* 'give' indicates more deliberate actions and has an even stronger suggestion of completion than does *-jaa* 'go'. This difference of mirativity can actually be related to the transitivity differences discussed above: transitive verbs typically denote actions where an Agent deliberately does something even though this action, and surely its result, may be surprising to the hearer/speaker. In other words, there is a certain tension between the deliberate action of the Agent and the unexpectedness (of its result) that this may have for the speaker. Clearly, the mirative reading is one that concerns the relationship between the speaker and the event, not that of the Agent toward his actions. This also applies to the cases with the causative morpheme adding another (typically volitional) Agent. The stronger suggestion of completion that *-de* 'give' has (compared to *-jaa* 'go') can also be related to (prototypical) transitivity: a prototypical transitive verb not only encodes goal-direction (an Agent volitionally targeting his actions toward some goal), but also

implies goal-achievement, i.e. that the Agent successfully achieves this goal (cf. Nishimura (1993) and Lemmens (1998) for some discussion of goal-directedness and goal-achievement and their relation to prototypical transitivity). The (originally) transitive nature of *-de* 'give' (as opposed to the (originally) intransitive *-jaa* 'go'), may have given rise to a stronger suggestion of completion. Note that Butt & Geuder make a comparable point on Urdu light verb *de* 'give' which they say "retains as a core meaning such components as agentivity and completion" (2001:347).

In sum, the main and strongest factor differentiating the two light verbs *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' concerns different transitivity constraints. The different degrees of completion and unexpectedness are secondary features that can be argued to be an indirect result of these transitivity differences. It is no coincidence, we believe, that the light verb *-jaa* 'go' is used in the context of repetitive events discussed earlier (expressing what we have termed "accumulative repetition") which have a less strong commitment to transitivity and completion of the multiplex event. Nevertheless, the two light verb constructions with *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' both express completion and unexpectedness, which makes them markedly different from single verb constructions. The question that we have not yet answered, however, is where this notion of unexpectedness comes from and how it can be linked with completion. The next section will take up this issue in more detail.

4. Sources of unexpectedness

Invariably, the light verb constructions with *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' express completion and unexpectedness. But how can these two notions be reconciled in a grammatically and semantically coherent model? In other words, how can you go from completion to unexpectedness and/or vice versa? Two possible accounts will be suggested here that could provide a motivation for these two notions to co-occur: one

is inspired by Wiklund's (2009) analysis of (Swedish) light verb constructions (with 'go' and 'take') that similarly have the notion of SURPRISE; the other is an account from a usage-based perspective.

4.1. *Wiklund's "syntax of surprise"*

Wiklund's (2009) paper deals with two Swedish complex predicates, the inceptive *gå och V* ('go and V') and *ta och V* ('take and V'). She shows how these encode the notions INCEPTION and SURPRISE (a cover term she uses for surprise, unexpectedness, and suddenness). She argues that the two things needed for the surprise effect are: (1) an inceptive reading (the onset of the event expressed by second V is focalised) and (2) a punctual verb. The latter is either provided by the light verb (in the case of *ta och V* 'take and V') or by the embedded predicate (in the case of *gå och V* 'go and V'). Punctuality is essential here, since Wiklund says that "the surprise reading cannot be derived from the mere expression of the initiation of an event" (2009:200). She hypothesizes that "a punctual event is a necessary ingredient for the surprise reading to arise" (idem:201), which is the result of pragmatic inferencing: "this combination yields an onset reading (inceptive) of an event with no internal duration (punctual), which is funny from a pragmatic perspective, yielding surprise" (idem:211). Since in the case of *ta och V* ('take and V') the punctuality is derived from the light verb, this light verb construction always encodes surprise, whereas the one with *gå och V* ('go and V') only does when combined with a punctual event verb.

In sum, punctuality gives rise to a surprise reading because the light verb construction focalises both the inception and the completion of the event. In Wiklund's terms (building on Ramchand's (2008) model), what is involved here is "the encoding of a result state; i.e. a [res] feature in the lexical specification" (2009:204) of either the light verb (*ta och V*) or the embedded verb (*gå och V*): "[res] has to be present on either of the verbs in the inceptive construction in order to yield surprise" (idem:205).

For Odia, the requirement that the main verb be punctual does not hold; note, moreover, that the most common light verb is not *-ne* 'take' but *-jaa* 'go'. Wiklund's analysis can thus not be simply transposed to Odia. Note for example Wiklund's discussion of a sentence like *Han gick och åt upp mackan* 'he went and ate up the sandwich': in Swedish there is no surprise reading here (*gå* is said to be distantive here), "since the verb *eat* does not simultaneously identify both process and result ([res] is identified by the particle), the eating event refers to an extended process" (idem:207). For this reason, Wiklund specifies that result augmentation is not sufficient, i.e. "the mere presence of a result state in the sentence should not yield a surprise result".

Nevertheless, there is a relevant parallel that can be drawn here with the Odia light verbs: first of all, most of the main verbs in light verb constructions are change of state verbs, the result is always present in the verb's lexical specification and, secondly, the major semantic feature of the light verb construction in Odia is that it focalises the completion of the event. In other words, one could follow Wiklund's line of reasoning that it is the ***combination*** of the focus on the inception and the completion of the event that gives rise to the surprise effect.

The punctuality of either predicate is thus no longer a prerequisite, since this was only necessary for the [res] feature to be activated in the Swedish constructions; importantly, in Odia, the two features [incept] and [result] are part of the (complex) predicate structure itself, so in some sense Wiklund's hypothesis that the [res] feature should be present either in the light verb or in the main verb is respected. More accurately, the [res] feature is inevitably present in the light verb, while the main verb carries [incept], a feature that is present in the case of single verb constructions too. Note that the main verb carries the [incep], but lacks the [res] or completion feature even in the past tense:

(29) ମୁଁ ସଓଟେ ଖାଇଲି, କିନ୍ତୁ ପୂରାପୂରି ନୁହଁ

mun seoTe khaa-il-i, kintu puraapuri nuhen

I apple.CL eat- PAST-1SG, but completely be.NEG

'I ate an apple but not completely.'

In other words, the light verb is most indispensable here for the completion reading. Schematically, this can be represented as [$V_{inception}$-$v_{completion}$]. This lines up with Wiklund's observation that "take-V and go-V may include a final temporal bound or a result state while also adding emphasis to the initiation of the event" (idem:187). Wiklund correctly predicts that there may be languages that have *fall* and *throw* as light verbs that may have similar meanings because they incorporate the feature [res] in their lexical specification. This is clearly true for Odia, where the light verbs 'fall' and 'throw' both have the surprise/unexpected reading, even if also including deliberateness in certain contexts. While Wiklund's account is quite plausible, it attributes the surprise reading to pragmatic inferencing, because an onset reading is activated for an event with no internal duration (cf. above). However, this is only true for punctual events and while this may have been the origin of the surprise reading, it does not explain why this reading is also present with constructions with non-punctual events. In other words, the (initially) pragmatic reading has become part and parcel of light verb constructions (at least in Odia) regardless of the type of main verb that is being used. This invites a different kind of account, *viz.* a usage-based account, where such an evolution is naturally accounted for as the outcome of recurrent usage.

4.2. *A usage-based account*

In a usage-based, constructional account (see, among others, Tomasello 2003, Goldberg 2006, Bybee 2006, Hilpert 2014), light verbs would be regarded as

"constructions", that is, form-meaning pairings. More accurately, the different combinations form a network of interrelated constructions of nodes (low-level schemas) each with its own formal and semantic specifications. More specifically, at the lower level in the network one has schemas for the different light verbs, such as *V-i-jaa* ('V-CONJ-go'), *V-i-de* ('V-CONJ-give'), *V-i-ne* ('V-CONJ-take'), *V-i-paD* ('V-CONJ-fall'), *V-i-pakaa* ('V-CONJ-drop'), etc., each with their own syntactico-semantic properties. For example, the lesser degree of completion and unexpectedness as well as the looser transitivity constraint that have been identified for *V-i-jaa* 'V-CONJ-go' can be accounted for as being part of the structure of that particular light verb construction. In addition, certain specific (lexicalised) meanings may be stored for particular combinations; recall, for example, the combination *ne-pakaa* 'take-drop' where the 'unsupposed taking' has become equivalent to stealing.

A usage-based account holds that these schemas are in fact generalisations of numerous contextualised instances with different verbs. At the highest level of schematization, there would be a highly schematic construction that has the form *V-i-v* and its semantic value would be COMPLETION and UNEXPECTEDNESS, which captures the semantic commonality between the different subschemas (despite differences in salience of these two features for the different subschemas). The data discussed above clearly indicate that these meaning components are part and parcel of the semantic structure of the light verb constructions themselves. The opposition with single verb constructions, which do not have these meanings, strengthens these notions as being an integral part of the light verb construction(s) itself.

But where do these features come from? A usage-based account holds that the formal and semantic characteristics of light verb constructions are the result of generalisations over numerous contextualised instances with individual verbs. As it happens, the light verb constructions are used in contexts where there is a focus on completion and such focus is often motivated by the fact that the completion (or goal-achievement) of the event is unexpected or unsupposed, abrupt or accidental. Through

repeated use, the pragmatic (i.e., contextual) meaning of unexpectedness becomes entrenched as one of the semantic characteristics of the construction itself. This is not unlike Kay and Fillmore's (1999) study of the (semi-open) construction *What is X doing Y*, as instantiated by *What is this fly doing in my soup?* or *What is this child doing with a knife?* While the form of this construction is a regular WH-question, its meaning is not merely a question for information. Rather, this construction is typically used to express that X is not expected or supposed to be at a given location or be doing some activity at that location. For example, if I ask *What are **you** doing here?* I am most likely not inquiring about your actions at the given location, but express my surprise at finding you there. Similarly, *What is this child doing with a knife?* is not asking for what the child is doing, but expresses disapproval for the fact that it has a knife (children are not supposed to be playing with knives). Because of the construction being invariably used in such contexts of surprise or disapproval, this reading has become part of the semantic structure of the construction itself. In other words, the meaning of surprise or disapproval is stored with the *What is X doing Y* construction in the grammar (or "construction" as it is sometimes called in Construction grammar approaches).[15]

A similar analysis can be suggested for Odia light verb constructions where, in line with the principles argued for by Traugott and Dasher (2002), contextual features (including certain pragmatic inferences) occurring (sufficiently) frequently may have gotten entrenched over time as part of the semantics of the construction. As already observed above, this analysis is not incompatible with Wiklund's view relying on the simultaneous presence of the syntactic features [incept] and [res]. A usage-based account does, however, make fundamentally different claims concerning the status of the construction, especially in relation to the form-identical main verb. For example, Butt & Lahiri (2002:30*ff*) argue that light verbs are not "derivative", i.e. they are not derived from a full lexical verb, but that there is "one underspecified lexical entry which allows both full verbs and light verb uses". Their main argument for having one underspecified lexical entry, rather than two separate lexical entries or a system where

the light verb is derived from the main verbs, is the diachronic change, or rather the absence of it: they point out that the light verb is historically a dead end and that it continues its synchronic relationship with the main verb. In their terms, "historical change could never affect the light verb without also affecting the main verb" (2001:46). This is clearly different for auxiliaries: "there is no synchronic relation in the lexicon which connects auxiliaries to main verbs in the same intimate fashion" (ibid.). Surely, light verbs behave differently from auxiliaries; however, given the semantically specific properties of light verb constructions (unexpectedness and completion), which supposedly have arisen over time, to the extent even that they have become sufficiently autonomous from the main verb, it is not at all clear how changes in the light verb would affect the main verb (or vice versa) nor on what this prediction would be based. A usage-based account along the lines sketched here provides a more unified account, capturing what unites all of the light verb constructions (in opposition to single verb constructions) as well as what distinguishes them individually (via the particular syntactico-semantic properties associated with each subschema).

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we have argued that while Odia light verbs are form-identical to main verbs, they form a constructional category of their own, with their own semantic and syntactic properties. For all the light verbs mentioned here, the original lexical meaning has been bleached, which indicates their high degree of grammaticalisation. Notice, however, that the form identity is preserved and that there is thus no phonological reduction, which is one of the criteria that Heine (2003) claims to be necessary for (full) grammaticalisation. As shown in our description, Odia light verb constructions have their own semantic value, expressing the completion of the event as well as its unexpectedness. Light verb constructions thus form a semantic opposition with single

verb constructions that do not have either of these features (or remain neutral to them). Our analysis thus provides further evidence to MIRATIVITY as a relevant semantic and/or grammatical category (see DeLancey 2012 for a more detailed discussion of this category from a typological perspective). We have also shown clear constraints on the light verbs that pertain to the transitivity of the main verb, which we have illustrated with the two most common light verbs, *–jaa 'go'* and *–de 'give'*, where the former combines with intransitive verbs (or alternating verbs occurring in intransitive constructions) and the latter with transitive verbs (or alternating verbs occurring in transitive constructions). As the interaction with the causative and the passive marking has shown, it is in fact not the verb as such, but the construction as a whole which is transitive or intransitive. The light verbs *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' were further shown to differ in the degree of completion and unexpectedness, a feature which we suggest is related to differences in transitivity, where the transitive light verb construction with *-de* 'give' implies some degree of control on behalf of the Agent and thus a stronger goal-directedness and achievement than in those with intransitive light verb *-jaa* 'go' where the process is construed independent of any controlling Agent. Importantly, this is a matter of degree, as both light verb constructions still express unexpectedness and completion, in contrast to single verb constructions.

We surmise that the mirative reading has evolved from their frequent occurrence in contexts where the (unexpected) completion is at issue and that it thus has become part of the semantics of the construction, similar to what has been observed in the grammaticalisation literature (see, notably, Traugott & Dasher 2003 and Bybee 2006). Notice that such a claim does not entail that light verbs are auxiliaries or that they should necessarily evolve to auxiliaries. While the data presented here holds promise for such a usage-based account, more extensive corpus-based research, which discusses all the light verbs and includes some diachronic analysis, is needed to provide further support.

Abbreviations used

CONJ: conjunctive particle
CL: classifier
(IN)DEF: (in)definite
SG: singular
PL: plural
AUX: auxiliary
ASP: aspectual marking
PERF: perfective
PROG: progressive
NEG: negative marker
CAUS: causative marker
PASS: passive
IMP: imperative
ACC: accusative
LOC: locative
GEN: genitive
INST: instrumental
FUT: future
PAST: past
HON: honorific
PP: postposition
EMPH: emphatic particle

References

BUTT, M. 1995. *The Structure of Complex Predicates in Urdu*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

BUTT, M. 2010. The light verb jungle: still hacking away. In: Amberber, M., Baker, B., & Harvey, M. *Complex Predicates: Cross-linguistic Perspectives on Event Structure*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 48–78.

BUTT, M. and GEUDER, W. 2001. On the (semi) lexical status of light verbs. *Semi-lexical Categories: On the Content of Function Words and the Function of Content Words*. eds. Corver, N. & H. van Riemsdijk, 323–370. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

BUTT, M. and A. LAHIRI. 2002. Historical Stability vs. Historical Change. Ms (available at http://ling.uni-konstanz.de/pages/home/butt/.

BUTT, M. and A. LAHIRI. 2013. Diachronic pertinacity of light verbs. *Lingua* 135:7–29.

BUTT, M. and G. RAMCHAND. 2005. Complex Aspectual Structure in Hindi/Urdu. *The Syntax of Aspect: Deriving Thematic and Aspectual Interpretation*, eds. N. Erteschik-Shir and T. Rapoport, 117–153. Oxford Scholarship. Online: January 2010. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199280445.001.0001.

BYBEE, J. 2006. From usage to grammar: the mind's response to repetition. *Language* 82:711–733.

CROFT, W. 2012. *Verbs. Aspect and Causal Structure.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DeLancey, S. 2012. Still mirative after all these years. *Linguistic Typology* 16:529–564.

DEOSKAR, T. 2006. Marathi Light Verbs. *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society* 42,183–198.

GOLDBERG, A. 2006. *Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HILPERT, M. 2014. *Construction Grammar and its application to English*. Edinburgh University Press.

HEINE, B. 2003. Grammaticalisation. *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. eds. Joseph, B. D. & R. Janda, 575–601. Oxford, Blackwell.

HOOK, P. E. 1973. *The compound verb in Hindi*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Michigan.

HOOK, P. E. 1991. The Emergence of perfective aspect in Indo-Aryan languages. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. eds. E. Traugott & B. Heine, 59–89. Amsterdam: Benjamins Publication.

HOOK, P. E. 1993. Aspectogenesis and the Compound Verb in Indo-Aryan *Complex Predicates in South Asian Languages.* ed. Manindra K. Verma, 97–113. New Delhi; Manohar Publication.

KAY, P. & FILLMORE, C. 1999. Grammatical constructions and linguistic generalisations: The *What's X doing Y?* construction. *Language* 75:1–33.

LEMMENS, M. 1998. *Lexical Perspectives on Transitivity and Ergativity. Causative Constructions in English*. [CILT 166]. Amsterdam & Philadelphia : John Benjamins.

RAMCHAND, G. 2008. *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon: a First Phase Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SAHOO, K. 2001. *Oriya verb morphology and complex verb constructions*. Doctoral dissertation, Norwegian University of Science & Technology, Trondheim, Norway.

SINGH, M. 1994. *Perfectivity, definiteness, and specificity: A classification of verbal predicates Hindi*. Phd Thesis, University of Texas, Austin.

TOMASELLO, M. 2003. *Constructing a language. A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

TRAUGOTT, E. C. & DASHER, R. B. 2002. *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WIKLUND, A. 2009. The syntax of surprise. Unexpected event readings in complex predication. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 84:181–224.

Received January 5, 2013

Accepted September 19, 2014

Maarten Lemmens

Université de Lille, UMR 8163 - STL - Savoirs Textes Langage, France

B.P. 60149

59653 Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex

France

maarten.lemmens@univ-lille3.fr

Kalyanamalini Sahoo

English and Foreign Languages University

Hyderabad

India

kalyanirs@gmail.com

Notes

[1] The research in this paper has been made possible thanks to funding by the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), New Delhi, India, and by the Indo-French Programme of the Fondation Maison des Sciences de l'Homme (FMSH), Paris, France; the authors gratefully acknowledge this support. The authors would also like to thank Dagmar Divjak, Kurt Feyaerts and Maya Hickmann for their comments on an orally presented version of this paper at the AFLiCo 5 conference (Univ. Lille, April 15-17, 2013). We also thank Frank Brisard and the anonymous reviewer(s) of *Studia Linguistica* for their valuable comments on the earlier version of this paper.

[2] In the remainder of this article we will not make the distinction between "unexpectedness" or "unsupposedness", since these are contextually determined; we will use the term unexpectedness throughout indiscriminately.

[3] In fact, Butt & Lahiri's (2002) term "event modification" does not refer to the same concept as the same term in Butt & Geuder's paper, where it entails the property of "[modulating] the contents of the semantic roles of a full verb's arguments", (2002:364), and not by adding contextually defeasible information.

[4] Each example will first be given in the Odia script, then in Latin transcription (in italics, to increase the readability). In the latter, the verbs under consideration will each time be marked in boldface. For the light verb constructions, both the main verb and the light verb will be in boldface.

[5] To distinguish light verbs from their form-identical lexical counterparts, we will systematically mark the light verb with a preceding hyphen; for example e.g., *-de* refers to the light verb 'give'; *de* to the lexical verb 'give'.

[6] The degree of unexpectedness is not the same for each of these motion verbs, but this is a point that we will not be concerned with all that much in the current paper, except for the light verbs *-jaa* 'go' and *-de* 'give' that we focus on.

[7] The place of *seThaare* 'there.LOC' is variable: either it precedes the main verb ('there go and sit') or comes between the two verbs ('go and there sit'); in the first case, it functions as the endpoint of the motion, in the second case it is the location of the sitting. It is only in the first context that the alternate encoding with an accusative form (*seThaaku* 'there.ACC') can be used, where the location is explicitly coded as the endpoint of a path.

[8] The *–th–* morpheme is the auxiliary that co-occurs with the aspectual marker (here PERF, but it can also be PROG, cf. example (7) above, for past and future tense (both distal); in the present tense, the auxiliary *–achh–* is to be used.

[9] The lexical meaning of *chhaaD* changes depending on the light verb; with *–jaa* 'go' it refers to fading (like for colours), when combined with *–de* 'give' it means "leave (behind), separate" (for example, leaving one's partner, send someone in exile in the jungle, or quitting one's job).

[10] The sequence *laag-i-galaa* ('CONTACT-go') has many meanings that all relate to (unexpected or unwanted) contact of some sort; for example, colours that have rubbed off on other clothes in the laundry, oil that got smeared on my hands when working on an engine, an accidental ink marking on my paper, the curry that got burned after all the water had evaporated, etc.

[11] This raises interesting questions as to the extent to which light verbs are indeed still linked with their form-identical lexical counterparts: is this a semantic constraint that is still operational today (which would indicate a semantic link between light verb and lexical verb) or is it a constraint that finds its origin in the past but has been fixed in the grammar? The answer to that question is beyond the scope of the present article.

[12] Note that this is different from what is often called in Vendlerian terms "incremental accomplishments", like *write a letter* or *eat a pizza*, where the writing of

(different) words or the taking of (different) bites incrementally lead to the result state. See Croft (2012:Ch.2) for some interesting discussion.

[13] See Lemmens 1998 for a discussion of these alternations and layers of causativity in English.

[14] In the Urdu examples given by Butt & Geuder (2001:344) a formally and semantically similar causative morpheme *aa* appears, and in similar contexts of a "CAUSED INTRANSITIVE" (e.g., their examples (33) 'make s.o. run', (38) 'he made the horse climb', (40) 'make s.o. cry'). While their concern is admittedly with a different question (i.e., the range of event descriptions the light verbs can occur with), it is striking that they overlook the role that this morpheme plays in the construction, saying that it is the light verb itself that sometimes does and sometimes does not involve "exertion of an unspecified effect on a target" (ibid.).

[15] Note that ignoring this "contextually acquired" constructional meaning of surprise, gives rise to a humorous effect, as pointed out by Kay and Fillmore themselves quoting the popular joke *Diner: 'Waiter, what's this fly doing in my soup?' – Waiter: 'Why, madam, I believe that's the backstroke.'* The syntactic structure still being identical to that of a bona fide WH-question, sanctions this clever answer by the waiter, which could thus be regarded as syntactic punning.