

LANGUAGE IN INDIA
Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow
Volume 9 : 8 August 2009
ISSN 1930-2940

Managing Editor: M. S. Thirumalai, Ph.D.
Editors: B. Mallikarjun, Ph.D.
Sam Mohanlal, Ph.D.
B. A. Sharada, Ph.D.
A. R. Fatihi, Ph.D.
Lakhan Gusain, Ph.D.
K. Karunakaran, Ph.D.
Jennifer Marie Bayer, Ph.D.

Light Verbs in Gojri

Nadeem Haider Bukhari

Light Verbs in Gojri

Nadeem Haider Bukhari

Abstract

This paper focuses on the role of light verbs in Gojri. Contrary to previous works, I argue in this paper that the light verb can either be placed before or after the main verb in Gojri, although the canonical position for the light verb is clearly V_2 , as is generally agreed. Furthermore, it discusses why the light verb in some cases prefers to appear in the V_1 position. This paper introduces different light verbs used in Gojri and argues that they do not generate lexical meaning but contribute some aspectual reading. This paper also unfolds the fact that different light verbs are required to generate different reading, and some complex verbal formations such as complex predicates cannot be generated without them.

1. Introduction

Indo-Aryan languages are well known especially for their complex sentential structures. There are different phenomena that make the structures complex in these languages. Formation of complex predicates is one of them. In this formation, light verbs play a significant role for many reasons. For example, they add some aspectual meanings to the main verb, enter the agreement phenomenon etc. Typically, complex predicates are defined as predicates which are multi-headed and are composed of more than one grammatical element, each of which contributes part of the information associated with a head. Butt (1995:162) states that these structures have only one single predicate and a single subject.

Light verbs contribute to a number of constructions in Indo-Aryan languages. These include (N+V) V, (Adj+V) V and V_1V_2 complex forms made up of a lexical category and a light verb. Mohanan (1994) argues that in Hindi either *kar* 'do' or *ho* 'become' are commonly used as light verbs. However, Gojri possesses more light verbs as compared to other languages spoken in the region. For example, Akhtar (2000: 84) and Singh (1990) introduce 8 and 10 light verbs respectively which contribute in the formation of the Punjabi complex predicates. Butt (1995: 91) introduces 13 for Urdu, while Gojri exhibits 17 in these constructions.

In recent work on complex predicates (Akhtar 2000, Butt 1995, Mohanan 1994), it has been argued that the second verb V_2 in the V_1V_2 construction is a light verb. According to Akhtar (2000: 10), "The V_1 in this combination can either be a main verb stem or it can be a complex predicate in itself ..., e.g. N+V or Adj+V. As regards

the V₂ in this configuration, it is drawn from a class of verbs, which are often referred to as light verbs.” The widespread and productive V₁V₂ phenomenon is at least common in Urdu, Punjabi, Kashmiri, Pahari, Hindko, Marathi and Hindi. This form of verb sequence can also be seen in Persian, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese.

Light verb is relatively a new term that has replaced the old terminology. This term was first introduced by Jespersen (1965). Later on, Grimshaw and Mester (1988), Mohanan (1994), Butt (1995&1997), Akhtar (1998 & 2000) have frequently used this term. Earlier, the light verb was referred to as an ‘explicator’ (Bahl 1964, Van Olphen 1970, Bhatia 1993), whereas Barker (1967) and Bailey (1950) prefer to call it an auxiliary. Sharma (1982) treats these verbs as intensifiers. Kachru (1966, 1968) used the term ‘operator’, while Hook (1974) and Pray (1970) use the term ‘vector’ or ‘vector verb’. The light verb is taken to be a weaker or ‘bleached’ form of the corresponding lexical verb, as it does not convey its full/lexical meanings.

Akhtar (2000) and Butt (1995) note that all light verbs have a corresponding main verb. The following Gojri examples illustrate the point:

1. a. kaloo-nε kiren-nā əm diyo
kaloo-ERG kiren-DAT mango.SG.M-NOM give-PF.SG.M
‘Kaloo gave Kiren a mango (temporarily).’
- b. kaloo-nε kiren-nā əm de diyo
kaloo-ERG kiren-DAT mango-NOM give give-PF.SG.M
‘Kaloo gave Kiren a mango (for her use).’
2. a. kaloo-nε səkul chor diyo
kaloo-ERG school leave give-PF.SG.M
‘Kaloo left the school (for good).’
- b. kaloo-nε səntro kha choryo
kaloo-ERG orange-NOM eat leave-PF.SG.M
‘Kaloo ate the orange (tentatively).’

Both the above examples confirm the fact that light verbs have corresponding main verbs in Gojri. The examples in (1a) and (2a) involve the main verb *de* ‘give’ and *chor* ‘leave’ respectively. The examples in (1b, 2b), on the other hand, show that these verbs can also be used as light verbs, if placed second in the sequence of verbs. However, it is clear from the above examples that light verbs are in some sense a weaker form of their corresponding main verbs.

2. Light Verbs in Gojri

Light verbs can easily be identified easily in Indo-Aryan languages. This section aims at discussing some syntactic and semantic properties associated with light verbs that make them distinct from their corresponding main verbs.

Jespersen (1965) introduced the term light verb for English V+NP constructions such as *have a rest*, *take a sneak*, *give a sigh* etc. It is generally believed that light verbs like *take* and *give* etc. cannot predicate fully in such constructions. These types of ‘light’ verbs appear to be semantically light and they only contribute something to the joint predication. There has been a prevailing belief that light verbs develop from main verbs by losing some of their semantic content. They still look like verbs, though. Light verbs in Gojri carry tense, gender, number and agreement morphology and case mark the subject.

The complex nature of light verbs has given rise to a number of analyses. Butt (1995:90) believes that light verbs always contribute to the formation of a complex predicate. Adger (2003) proposes that light verbs are instantiations of *v*. Within minimalist theory *v* is taken to be a functional category universally present in transitive sentences. The idea that transitive verbs are made up of two heads, the root *V* and a transitivity head called *v*, was introduced by Hale and Keyser (1993) and is now widely adopted. It is now commonplace to assume that there are several ‘flavours’ of *v*. For instance, Chomsky (2000, 2001) assumes that there is *v* for intransitive verbs and *v** for transitive verbs.

As discussed above, there is no agreement on the exact number of light verbs in most Indo-Aryan languages including Hindi, Urdu, Punjabi, and Hindko. The same is true for Gojri. Bhatia (1993) says that there are about a dozen verbs which occur as Explicators (light verbs) in Punjabi. On the other hand, Akhtar (2000:126) provides a slightly different list from Bhatia. He argues that his criterion for selection is productivity. Another important point is that a few light verbs such as *de* ‘give’, *sut* ‘throw’ and *chor* ‘leave’ are interchangeable in many cases, so that replacing one with the other does not cause any change in meaning or intelligibility. Note that when an intransitive light verb comes with main verbs in the Gojri complex predicates, the result is always transitive. Here is a list of commonly used light verbs in Gojri:

3.

Light verbs in Gojri

(Di) Transitive		Intransitive	
de	‘give’	ja	‘go’
le	‘take’	aa	‘come’
kəḍ	‘take out’	bəs	‘sit down’
dekh	‘watch/see’	tə/pe	‘fall’
chor	‘leave’	rə	‘live’
tər	‘put’	cəl/ṭur	‘walk’
maar	‘beat/kill’	muk	‘finish’
		ləg	‘attach’

A common belief that prevails in the literature on complex predicates is that one of the components of the predicate is incomplete in some sense, yet it does contribute some semantic content, so it is classified as being something in between the auxiliary and a main verb. Akhtar (2000), Butt (1995), Grimshaw and Mester (1988), Masica (1976), and Jespersen (1954) are few among other who refer to this property of light verbs. Quite interestingly, in many Indo-Aryan languages (Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi,

Bangla, etc.) and Dravidian languages (Malayalam, Tamil) and some East Asian languages (Japanese and Korean), mostly the same set of light verbs tend to participate in complex predicates formation. Butt (1995:92) reports that these items include *give, take, go, come, put, hit, and fall*. However, in Gojri we have *do* and *leave* in addition to these common light verbs that contribute to aspectual information. Like other Indo-Aryan languages, this set of light verbs does have full or main verb analogs in Gojri as well. The following example will again illustrate the phenomenon:

4. a. us-nε saro kəm muka choryo
 he-ERG all work.M-NOM finish leave-PF.M
 ‘He finished all his work.’
- b. us-nε cor-nā chor diyo
 he-ERG thief-ACC leave give-PF
 ‘He let the thief go.’

The status of V_1V_2 verbal combination is controversial in many Indo-Aryan languages. Some traditional grammarians and scholars regard it as a tight lexical unit, a compound word, because other lexical items like the negative marker and emphatic markers cannot be inserted between the main verb and the light verb. Consider, the following Gojri examples.

5. a. kaloo-nε xat likh diyo
 kaloo-ERG letter-NOM write give-PF
 ‘Kaloo wrote a letter (completely/ for someone else).’
- b. kaloo-nε xat nī likh diyo.
 kaloo-ERG letter-NOM NEG write give-PF
 ‘Kaloo did not write a letter (for someone else).’
- c. *kaloo-nε xat likh nī diyo.
 kaloo-ERG letter-NOM write NEG give-PF
 ‘Kaloo did not write a letter (for someone else).’
6. a. ustaadā-nε kiren-nā hōshyaar kiyo
 teacher-ERG kiren-DAT intelligent do-PF
 ‘The teacher made Kiren intelligent.’
- b. ustaadā-nε kiren-nā nī hushyaar kiyo
 teacher-ERG kiren-DAT NEG intelligent do-PF
 ‘The teacher did not make Kiren intelligent.’
- c. %ustaadā-nε kiren-nā hōshyaar nī kiyo
 teacher-ERG kiren-DAT intelligent NEG do-PF
 ‘The teacher did not make Kiren intelligent.’

For some Gojri speakers a negation can intervene between a light verb and a preceding adjective or noun, as in (6c) (this is indicated by %). However, no speakers consulted allow a negation (or any other constituent) to intervene between the light

verb and a preceding main verb (in the VV complex). This holds true at least of the dialect spoken in the state of AJ&K.

Unlike English and other European languages, Indo-Aryan languages can express overtly, by grammatical means, whether an action described in a sentence is for the subject himself or someone else. For example, an English sentence like, “he cut an apple” is ambiguous in Gojri unless a light verb is added to it. It is ambiguous because it does not convey the sense of who the beneficiary is. Consider the following examples:

7. a. us-nε sεb kəpyo
 he.3.SG.M-ERG apple.3.SG.M-NOM cut-PF
 ‘He cut an apple.’
- b. us-nε sεb kəp liyo
 he.3.SG.M-ERG apple.3.SG.M-NOM cut take-PF
 ‘He cut an apple (for himself).’
- c. us-nε sεb kəp diyo
 he.3.SG.M-ERG apple.3.SG.M-NOM cut give-PF
 ‘He cut an apple (for someone else).’

In Gojri, (7a) is a simple statement about an action. It does not give any information about the beneficiary though it can usually be inferred from the context. On the other hand, the light verbs *le* ‘take’ in (7b) and *de* ‘give’ in (7c) clearly indicate who the beneficiary of the action is. This means that when the beneficiary of the event is not expressed by the main verb itself, and is not inferable from the context, it can be conveyed by a light verb. In recent literature on complex predicates (Akhtar 2000, Butt 1995, Mohanan 1994), it has been pointed out that the light verb contributes semantic information in the formation of complex predicates. This means that light verbs are different from auxiliaries.

Now consider the following example:

- 8. *us-nε sεb kəp reyo/ləgyo/peyo
 - he.3.SG.M-ERG apple.3.SG.M-NOM cut give/attach/fall-PF
- ‘He cut an apple (for someone else).’

(8) is ungrammatical because the light verbs used in this example are not allowed with *kəp* ‘cut’, the main verb. This means that light verbs in Gojri select certain predicates and are different from auxiliaries.

2.1. Agreement

One of the main characteristics of light verbs in Gojri is that they carry agreement inflections, as they generally occupy second position in complex formations. It is a common feature of Indo-Aryan languages that it is the last verb in the complex

formation which always takes agreement inflections. In (9a), the light verb *de* ‘give’ agrees with *sɛbji* ‘vegetable’ in feminine gender while in (9b), the light verb carries the morpheme *-o*, which stands for 3rd person masculine gender. This morpheme shows agreement with the object NP *ka* ‘grass’, which is masculine in Gojri:

9. a. us-nɛ sɛbji kuter dii
 s/he-ERG vegetable.3.SG.F-NOM. cut give-PF.F
 ‘S/he cut the vegetable.’
- b. us-nɛ ka kəp diyo
 s/he-ERG grass.3.SG.M-NOM cut give-PF.M.
 ‘S/he cut the grass.’

Light verbs also show agreement in number. In (10a), the light verb *le* ‘take’ agrees in number with a singular masculine object *gaã* ‘cow’ while in (10b) it shows agreement with the plural object *gaaiaã* ‘cows’:

10. a. kaloo-nɛ gaã xariid lii
 kaloo-ERG cow.3.SG.F-NOM buy take-PF.SG.F
 ‘Kaloo bought a cow.’
- b. kaloo-nɛ gaaiaã xariid lii-aã
 kaloo-ERG cow.3.PL.F-NOM buy take-PF.PL.F
 ‘Kaloo bought cows.’

2.2. Case Marking

It is also one of the characteristics of light verbs that they case mark one of the arguments. Ergative case marking on the subject is sensitive to the past/perfective form. In all other forms, the subject bears the nominative Case, except when it is dative or some other oblique case. Transitive light verbs like *le* ‘take’ and *de* ‘give’ always require the subject to be in the ergative Case in the past/perfective form. By contrast, intransitive light verbs like *bɛs* ‘sit’, *jaa* ‘go’, *aa* ‘come’ are only compatible with subjects bearing the nominative Case. The examples in (11) illustrate the pattern:

11. a. us-nɛ xat likh liyo
 s/he-ERG letter.3.SG.M-NOM write take-PF
 ‘S/he wrote the letter (completely/self-beneficiary).’
- b. wa xat likh bɛsii
 she-NOM letter.3.SG.M-NOM write sit-PF
 ‘She wrote the letter (mistakenly).’

In (11a), when the complex predicate involves the light verb *le* ‘take’, the subject obligatorily requires the ergative Case i.e. *-nɛ*. Contrast this to (11b), where the light verb *bɛs* ‘sit’ is intransitive, which requires that the subject be in the nominative Case. The reason why *bɛsii* rules out ergative is that it is a non-agentive, non-volitional light verb. So, regardless of the aspect, ergative can’t be assigned.

Consider some more examples:

12. a. kaloo-nε məchi kha leii
 kaloo.M-ERG fish.3.SG.F-NOM eat take-PF.F
 ‘Kaloo ate the fish (self-beneficiary).’
- b. kiren məchi kha geii
 kiren.F-NOM fish.3.SG.F-NOM eat go- PF.F
 ‘Kiren ate the fish.’
- c. *kiren-nε mechi kha geii
 kiren.F-ERG fish.3.SG.F-NOM eat go- PF.F
 ‘Kiren ate the fish.’

In (12a), the complex predicate contains the light verb *le* ‘take’ and requires the subject to bear the ergative Case i.e. *-nε*. By contrast, in (12b), the subject is in the nominative Case as the complex predicate involves the light verb *jaa* ‘go’. There is a mismatch between the type of the light verb and the ergative case marker in (12c), so it results in an ill-formed structure. It is clear from the above examples that the class of light verb plays a significant role in case marking of the subject in complex formations.

2.3. Semantic Properties

Butt (1995, 1997), Akhtar (1998, 2000), Choi (2003) and Lee (1992) are of the view that aspectual complex predicates determine the eventuality of the predicate. The two verbs in a complex predicate form a tight unit and express aktionsart that refers to telicity.¹ The following table illustrates aspectual meanings of light verbs in Gojri:

13.

Light verb (V2)	Lexical meanings	Aspectual meanings
<i>chor</i>	‘leave’	Completion/telic
<i>sut</i>	‘throw’	completion/telic
<i>re</i>	‘live’	continuity/atelic
<i>muk</i>	‘finish’	completion/telic
<i>maar</i>	‘hit’	completion/ atelic
<i>pe</i>	‘fall’	completion/ atelic
<i>le</i>	‘take’	completion/ telic
<i>de</i>	‘give’	completion/ telic

¹ Akhtar (2000: 304) argues that aspectual complexes denote telic events as they are specified for an endpoint. Accomplishment and achievement always refer to an end point of an action, hence regarded as telic. An achievement is a goal that has been reached, while an accomplishment is a job or project that has been completed. As regards the telicity of simple verbs, they denote an atelic event as they are not specified for an end point, therefore refer to simple activities. Singh (1990) also claims that these types of verbs are referred to as Activity verbs and typically refer to processes.

Dowty (1979) argues that telicity and atelicity described by the complex predicates can be well captured by a temporal adverb test. He observes that a telic action like ‘break’ can only be modified by *in an hour* but not *for an hour*. On the other hand, an atelic action such as ‘run’ needs modification with *for an hour*: Consider the following Gojri examples:

14. a. kaloo-nε ik kenta mā ka kəp diyo
kaloo-ERG an hour in grass-NOM cut give-PF.M
‘Kaloo cut the grass in one hour.’
- b. *kaloo-nε ik kenṭa ka kəp diyo
kaloo-ERG an hour (for) grass-NOM cut give-PF.M
‘Kaloo cut the grass for an hour.’

Unlike many other languages, Gojri does not take any adposition marking time-adverbials of duration. However, for telic actions it needs a marker like *mā* ‘in’ with the adverbial.

3. Position of Light Verbs

One more important point that I would like to raise here is about the position of the light verb in the V_1V_2 formation. It has been claimed repeatedly that in Indo-Aryan languages the light verb (V_2) always takes second position in the predicate and for this reason is labelled as V_2 . There is clear evidence that undermines this claim. Urdu, Punjabi and Gojri provide many examples that confirm that the light verb such as *de* ‘give’ may precede the main verb in some cases. The following examples would justify the claim that the position of the light verb is not fixed and it may either precede or follow the main verb in these languages:

- 15. a. kaloo-nε kiren-nā canḍ maar **di**
• kaloo-ERG kiren-ACC slap-NOM beat give-PF
• ‘Kaloo slapped Kiren (a volitional act).’
- b. kaloo-nε kiren-nā canḍ de **maari**
• Kaloo-ERG kiren-ACC slap-NOM give beat-PF.F
• ‘Kaloo slapped Kiren (an uncontrolled act).’

(15) shows that the V_1V_2 formation for complex predicates is not the only option available but we may have the other way round. It would be better to present it as $(V_L) V_M (V_L)$. In other words it can be said that the light verb can either precede or follow the main verb in complex predicates in this language. This exceptional position of the light verb is not found only in Gojri but Urdu, Hindi and Punjabi also show the same deviation from the general rule. This structural variation is very limited in its use and serves some specific purposes such as suddenness and mirativity. It shows that there are some semantic/discourse effects associated with these options and it is not just a matter of “optionality”. (16) shows some more examples with the very common light verb *de*:

- 16. a. kaloo-nε kiren-nã mukko **de** maaryo
- kaloo-ERG kiren-DAT punch-NOM give beat-PF
- ‘Kaloo gave a punch to Kiren.’

- b. kaloo-nε kiren-nã xat likh **diyo**
- kaloo-ERG kiren-DAT letter-NOM write give-PF
- ‘Kaloo wrote a letter for Kiren.’

It is interesting to note that in Gojri it is the second verb which is always inflected. It doesn't make any difference whether it is a main or a light verb. This phenomenon is confirmed from the above examples. In (16a) it is the main verb *maar* 'beat' that occupies the second position therefore it takes the inflection. It also confirms the variant structural positions of light verbs in complex predicates in Gojri. If it follows, it is inflected; otherwise the main verb takes this responsibility. The light verb *de* 'give' confirms the point in the above two examples. In (16a) it occupies the first position in the structure, therefore it is not inflected, while in (16b) it follows the main verb, so it attracts inflections. But this must be treated as an exceptional case because the general rule requires the light verb to be placed in the second position.

4. Role of Light Verbs in the Gojri Complex Predicates

Like many Indo-Aryan languages, light verbs contribute mainly in V_1V_2 pattern complex predicates, where V_1 stands for the main verb and V_2 generally stands for the light verb. This formation is commonly known as aspectual complex predicates in literature on Indo-Aryan languages. One of the chief characteristics of the aspectual complex predicates is that they refer either to Accomplishments or Achievements, in contrast to simple verbs, which generally refer to Activities (Akhtar 2000: 142). Consider the following Gojri examples in this regard:

- 17. a. kaloo-nε inaam jit liyo
- kaloo-ERG prize-NOM win take-PF
- ‘Kaloo won the prize.’

- b. kiren-nε patho-nã kuter choryo
- kiren-ERG fodder-ACC cut leave-PF
- ‘Kiren prepared the fodder.’

- c. kaloo-nε inaam jityo
- kaloo-ERG prize-NOM win-PF
- ‘Kaloo won the prize.’

In (17a), the complex predicate indicates that Kaloo hasn't only won the prize but was also awarded whatever the prize was. Similarly, (17b) conveys that Kiren has not only cut the fodder but completed the process of preparing it for the cattle. On the other hand, (17c) simply describes that Kaloo won the prize, yet it might have not been awarded to him. A native speaker of Gojri intuitively makes a distinction between such constructions.

It has been repeatedly pointed out in the literature that the light verbs in aspectual complex predicates contribute aspectual information (Singh 1990 and Butt 1995, 1997 for Hindi-Urdu) or emotive or attitudinal meaning to the clause (Bhatia 1993 for Punjabi). However, Akhtar (2000) points out that the characterisation of aspectual information in these proposals cannot adequately account for the semantics of aspectual complex predicates. Change of location is a basic requirement for a well formed aspectual complex predicate. In other words, if there is no change of location, the simple verb is used to express the meaning. Consider the following examples:

18. a. maĩ kiren-nã socyo
 I-ERG kiren-ACC think-PF
 ‘I thought about Kiren.’
- b. us-nε peyo-nã dikhyo
 s/he-ERG father-ACC look-PF
 ‘S/he looked at his/her father.’
- c. *maĩ kiren-nã soch diyo
 I-ERG kiren-ACC think give-PF
 ‘I thought about Kiren.’
- d. *us -nε peyo-nã dikh diyo
 s/he-ERG father-ACC look give-PF
 ‘S/he looked at his/her father.’

It is quite clear from (18a-b) that the theme argument has not undergone any change of location. In such cases, a well-formed structure only allows the main verb; no light verb is permissible, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (18c-d).

However, in the case of a change of location, either physical or abstract, the aspectual light verb is permitted. For change of physical location, consider the following examples:

19. a. us-nε derya mã jaal səṭ diyo
 s/he-ERG river in net throw give-PF
 ‘S/he threw the net into the river.’
- b. us-nε kaloo-nã derya mã jaal səṭ diyo
 s/he-ERG kaloo-DAT river in net throw give-PF
 ‘S/he threw the net into the river for Kaloo.’
- c. kaloo-nε koof mez wer tər diyo
 kaloo-ERG cup table on keep give-PF
 ‘Kaloo put the cup on the table.’
- d. *us-nε derya mã jaal səṭyo
 s/he-ERG river in net throw-PF
 ‘S/he threw the net into the river.’

(19a) is very interesting for two reasons. Firstly, note that (19a) is ambiguous as the light verb *de* ‘give’ generally suggests that the action is done for someone else, but this is not true in this structure. Here it shows that the subject of the sentence may himself be the beneficiary of the action. To remove this ambiguity, an additional argument is required which has been indicated in (19b). Secondly, (19a) indicates that the action brought a change of place for *jaal* ‘net’, from being not in the river to being in the river. To express such change of location, the structure needs an aspectual complex formation in Gojri. The same is true for (19c). The ill-formed structure (19d) confirms the claim regarding the need for the VV formation to express change of location.

The above discussed examples show that the stem form of the verb is generally used along with the light verb. However, these complex predicates in Gojri exhibit variety in the form of the main verb. We have two other forms of main verbs that are used in complex predicates for different readings than the one discussed above. This variation in these complex predicates involves either the infinitive form of the main verb or inflection of the causative marker with the root form of the main verb. The former one is used in the permissive and obligative constructions whereas the latter is used in causative structures. Here are some examples that illustrate the difference:

20. a. kaloo-nε kiren-nā jaṛō diyo
kaloo-ERG kiren-DAT go.INF.OBL give-PF
‘Kaloo let Kiren go.’ [Permissive]
- b. kaloo-nā pəllək toṛī rukurō peyo
kaloo-DAT tomorrow till stop.INF.OBL. fall-PF
‘Kaloo had to stop till tomorrow morning.’ [Obligative]
- c. kaloo-nε kiren-nā pəllək toṛī rukvaa liyo
kaloo-ERG kiren-DAT tomorrow till stop-CAUS take-PF
‘Kaloo made Kiren stop till tomorrow.’ [Causative]

There are many sharp contrasts which can be noted in the above examples. It seems that (20a-b) have the same structure because of the use of the infinitive oblique forms. However, this is not the case. In (20a), the subject of the sentence bears the ergative case marker as the only choice for such structures. Furthermore, permissives don’t allow any other light verb than *de* ‘give’. On the other hand, in (20b) the subject takes the dative case marker and the light verb cannot be anything other than *pe* ‘fall’. If we interchange either the case markers or the light verbs in both these examples, it would result in ill-formed structures. The case is, however, different in the causative structures. This type of structure has the causative inflectional morpheme *-vaa* on the root form of the verb. Unlike permissives and obligatives, the causative structures accommodate different light verbs with slight changes in meanings as an effect.

5. Conclusion

This paper has briefly investigated the role of light verbs in Gojri. They play an important role in different complex formations, especially complex predicates and are

considered the markers of telicity, Accomplishments or Achievements. Following Akhtar (2000:1994), I have also discussed the observation that a permanent change of location either spatial or abstract is another prerequisite that licenses that use of light verbs in such constructions. Though the light verb in these formations generally appears in the V₂ position, I have pointed out that this may be switched to V₁ position in some exceptional cases. This paper suggests that Gojri has grammaticalised the direction of the benefit, which is conveyed by means of light verbs. This can be seen in other languages of the region as well.

References

- Adger, D. 2003. *Core Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Akhtar, R. N. 1998. VV Complex Predicates in Punjabi. Paper presented at the SALA XIX Conference held at University of York in July 1998.
- Akhtar, R. N. 2000. Aspectual Complex Predicates in Punjabi. PhD thesis, University of Essex, Colchester.
- Bahl, K. 1964. *A Study in the Transformational Analysis of the Hindi Verb*. Chicago South Asia Language and Area Centre. University of Chicago.
- Bailey, T. 1950. *Teach Yourself Hindustani*. London: English Universities Press.
- Barker, A. R. M. 1967. *A Course in Urdu*. Vol. III. Montreal: Institute of Islamic Studies. McGill University.
- Bhatia, T. K. 1993. *Punjabi: A Cognitive-descriptive Grammar*. Routledge. London.
- Butt, M. 1995. *The Structure of Complex Predicates in Urdu*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Butt, M. 1997. Complex Predicates in Urdu, In Alsina, A., J. Bresnan and P. Sells (eds.), *Complex Predicates*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Choi, S. 2003a. *Complex Aspectual Structure in Korean*, ms. University of Sussex.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Martin, R, Michaels, D and Uriagereka, J (eds.), *Step by Step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 89-155.

- Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Kenstowicz, M. (ed.) *Ken Hale. A Life in Language*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. 1-52.
- Dowty, D. R. 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Grimshaw, J. and A. Mester. 1988. Light verbs and theta-marking. *Linguistic Inquiry*, **19**: 205-232.
- Hale, K. and S. J. Keyser. 1993. On Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Relation. In K. Hale and S. J. Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building*. Cambridge: MIT Press. **20**:53-109
- Hook, P.1974. *The Compound Verbs in Hindi*. The Michigan Series in South and South-east Asian Language and Linguistics. The University of Michigan.
- Jespersen, O. 1965. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principle*. London: George & Unwin.
- Kachru, Y. 1966. *An Introduction to Hindi Syntax*. Urbana-Champaign. University of Illinois.
- Kachru, Y. 1968. Pragmatics and Verb Serialization in Hindi-Urdu. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*. Vol. 9, Number 2.
- Lee, S. 1992. The Syntax and Semantics of Serial Verb construction. PhD thesis, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Masica, C, P. 1976. *Defining a Linguistic Area*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
- Mohanan, T. 1994. *Argument Structure in Hindi*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Pray, B. R. 1970. *Topics in Hindi-Urdu Grammar*. Berkeley California: Centre for South and Southeast Asia Studies, University of California.
- Sharma, J. C. 1982. *Gojri Grammar*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
- Singh, M. 1990. The aspectual contents of compound verbs. In Y. No and M. Libucha (eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventh Eastern States Conference on Linguistic*, 260-291.
- Van Olphen, H. 1970. The Structure of the Hindi Verb Phrase. PhD thesis, University of Texas at Austin.

Nadeem Haider Bukhari
University of AJ&K
Muzaffarabad, AK
Pakistan
nhb67@hotmail.com