Reverse complex predicates or something else?
The case of Hindi *de* 'give' and *jaa* 'go'

Andriana Koumbarou, Shubham K. Srivastava
& Sarada B. Biswas

Abstract
"Aspectual" complex predicates (ACPs) in Hindi are formed by a sequence of two verbs that together describe a single event. The main verb is realised in root form and contributes lexical meaning, followed by a light verb which carries TAM morphology and somehow modifies the event ($V_{MAIN}V_{LIGHT}$ ordering). However, it has been noted that some verb-verb combinations allow a "reverse" order in which a light verb in root form precedes the main verb inflected for TAM ($V_{LIGHT}V_{MAIN}$ ordering). In this paper we take the light verbs *de* 'give' and *jaa* 'go' as case studies and trace their use in standardly ordered complex predicates, as well as what look like cases of reversal. We present our initial findings and argue that the unusual $V_{LIGHT}V_{MAIN}$ sequences are not simply a reordered variant of a standard complex predicate but, in fact, exhibit interpretational differences (e.g., intentionality) that stem from the initial placement and lexical semantics of directed-action *de* 'give' and directed-motion *jaa* 'go'.

Keywords: (reverse) complex predicates, light verbs, intentionality, directionality, Hindi

1. Introduction

This paper explores little discussed constructions in Hindi[1] which at least at first glance look like reordered variants of standard "aspectual" complex predicates (term introduced by Butt 1995; henceforth ACPs).[2] Standard ACPs consist of a main verb in root form which contributes lexical meaning, followed by a light verb that carries TAM morphology and provides additional information about the event (Abbi & Gopalakrishnan 1991; Butt & Ramchand 2005; Butt 1995; Butt 2010; Butt & Lahiri 2013; Poornima 2012; Hook 1973; Hook 1993). Examples of standardly ordered ACPs with the light verbs *jaa* 'go' and *de* 'give' ($V_{MAIN}V_{LIGHT}$ ordering) are given in (1).[3]

(1) **Standard ACP: $V_{MAIN}V_{LIGHT}$**

    a.   laṛkii   seb   **kʰaa gayii**
            girl.F apple.M eat   go.PFV.F.SG
            'The girl ate the apple.'

---

[1] Hindi and Urdu are structurally very similar and in this paper we draw examples from the literature on both when discussing previous work. Data for this paper also comes from the Emille Hindi Corpus (www.emille.lancs.ac.uk - last accessed 14 February, 2021) and is cited accordingly. Unless otherwise specified, examples are constructed by us and checked with Hindi speakers in Uttar Pradesh, India.

[2] We are grateful to Professor Tista Bagchi and Professor Pradeep Kumar Das for encouraging us to pursue the topic of this paper, as well as Reeta Srivastava and Saumya Srivastava for countless hours of discussing data with us. We would also like to thank Joseph Lovestrand and Naresh Sharma for their comments which helped significantly improve the paper. Any mistakes are our own.

[3] Interlinearized examples follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules with the addition of the following abbreviations: CONJ 'conjunctive', EMPH 'emphatic' and INSTR 'instrumental'.

b. laṛkii=ne   laṛke=ko   (pattʰar) **maar diyaa**
    girl.F=ERG   boy.M.OBL.SG=ACC/DAT   stone.M   hit   give.PFV.M.SG
    'The girl hit the boy (with a stone).'

It has been noted in the literature that a "reverse" order is also allowed, as shown in (2) where the verb that makes a light contribution precedes the lexically more dominant verb (Das 2015; Hook 1973; Poornima 2012; Poornima & Koenig 2009). In the "reverse" order the light verb is realised in root form and the main verb carries TAM morphology (V$_{\text{LIGHT}}$V$_{\text{MAIN}}$ ordering).

(2) **"Reverse" construction: V$_{\text{LIGHT}}$V$_{\text{MAIN}}$**
    a. laṛkii=ne   seb   **jaa kʰaayaa**
        girl.F=ERG apple.M go   eat.PFV.M.SG
        'The girl ate the apple (deliberately).'

    b. laṛkii=ne   laṛke=ko   #(pattʰar) **de   maaraa**
        girl.F=ERG   boy.M.OBL.SG=ACC/DAT   stone.M   give   hit.PFV.F.SG
        'The girl hit the boy with a stone (deliberately).'

Constructions such as (2a) and (2b) have been described in previous work as "reverse" or "reordered" variants of standard complex predicates (see, for example, Das 2015; Hook 1973; Poornima 2012). The examples in (2), however, come with an intentional reading which the constructions in (1) lack. Further, while in (1b) *pattʰar* 'stone' can be dropped, omitting it in (2b) where *de* 'give' is realised first would be infelicitous (as indicated with the hash symbol #). These observations call for a more careful investigation of structural and semantic aspects of the unusual V$_{\text{LIGHT}}$V$_{\text{MAIN}}$ sequences.

In this paper we make first steps in this direction, taking the light verbs *de* 'give' and *jaa* 'go' as case studies. We argue that the unusual V$_{\text{LIGHT}}$V$_{\text{MAIN}}$ ordering is pragmatically marked and propose that the inherent semantics of directed-motion *jaa* 'go' and directed-action *de* 'give' provide the base for interpretive effects such as intentionality to arise. In what follows, Section 2 gives an overview of previous work on complex predicates in Hindi and closely related Urdu. Sections 3 and 4 trace the use of *de* 'give' and *jaa* 'go' in the different orders. Finally, Section 5 draws a conclusion.

2. Background and previous work
2.1. Morphosyntactic properties
ACPs[4] in Hindi, and closely related Urdu, have received considerable attention so far (Abbi & Gopalakrishnan 1991; Butt 1995; 2010; Butt & Lahiri 2013; Butt & Ramchand 2005; Hook 1973; 1993; Singh 1998; Poornima 2012; Poornima & Koenig 2009). ACPs are formed with a main verb in bare stem form that contributes lexical meaning, followed by a light verb (or vector verb) which carries TAM morphology and contributes additional information that relates to aspect (telicity) but also other semantic notions such as volitionality, benefaction, suddenness, and forcefulness (see Section 2.2). A single verb construction is illustrated in (3) with the perfective verb *paḍʰii* 'read'. In (4) we observe a complex predicate formed with the verbal stem *paḍʰ* 'read' followed by the light verb

---

[4] Often also referred to as "compound verb" constructions (see Hook 1973; Hook 1993).

de 'give' carrying perfective morphology. While both (3) and (4) describe an event of reading, in (4) the light verb adds a sense of completion and emphasises the outward direction of the action,[5] i.e., the agent read the book out loud (see Section 3.1 for a detailed discussion on the semantics of *de* 'give').

(3) **Single verb construction**
    mãĩ=ne   ye kitaab **paḍʰii**
    1SG=ERG this book.F read.PFV.F.SG
    'I read this book.'

(4) **Standard ACP with light verb *de* 'give'**
    mãĩ=ne   ye kitaab **paḍʰ dii**
    1SG=ERG this book.F read give.PFV.F.SG
    'I read this book (out loud).'

There is general agreement that historically ACPs originate from a Sanskrit structure which involved an adverbial participle ('having X-ed'). The verb-verb sequence was reanalysed as a monoclausal structure with two co-predicating verbs (Butt 1997) in which the last verb is light and makes a weaker contribution. This happened with only a handful of verbs such as *de* 'give', *le* 'take', *ḍaal* 'put', *maar* 'hit', *jaa* 'go', *aa* 'come', *paṛ* 'fall', *baiṭʰ* 'sit', *nikal* 'emerge', *uṭʰ* 'rise'. With evidence from object agreement, anaphora and control tests, Butt (1995) shows that the complex predicate construction, as in (4), has a single subject and no embedding.

Synchronically, however, some verb-verb sequences are potentially ambiguous between a complex predicate reading and an adverbial participle reading, though the different readings can be disambiguated prosodically (Butt 1997). This is shown in (5). The translation in (a) indicates the biclausal reading in which the first verb *toṛ* 'break' is embedded and the clause-final *ḍaalii* 'put' is the perfective matrix verb. In this case the subject of the embedded construction is controlled by the matrix subject. In the complex predicate reading in (b), on the other hand, the two verbs describe a single event: the main verb *toṛ* 'break' provides the event description, followed by the light verb *ḍalii* 'put'. This ambiguity can be removed with the use of the conjunctive participle marker *-kar/-ke* to describe a temporal sequence of events, as shown in (6).

(5)   raam=ne   kachre=m&etilde; botal **toṛ ḍaalii**
    Ram.M=ERG bin=in   bottle.F break put.PFV.SG.F
    (a) 'Having broken the bottle, Ram put it in the bin.'
    (b) 'Ram broke the bottle in the bin.'

(6)   raam=ne   kachre=m&etilde; botal **toṛ-kar   ḍaalii**
    Ram.M=ERG bin=in   bottle.F break-CONJ put.PFV.SG.F
    'Having broken the bottle, Ram put it in the bin.'

In his detailed study on Hindi verb-verb complex predicates, Hook (1973) notes that an unusual "reverse" order is also possible in which the light verb in root form precedes the

---

[5] Ozarkar and Ramchand (2018) note the same for the Marathi light verb 'give': it expresses the outward directedness of an action (i.e., away from the agent).

lexically dominating verb that provides the event description and carries TAM morphology. This is shown in (7).

(7) isii   gam=mẽ   govindacharya=ne   apnaa   sir
     this.EMPH.OBL sadness=in Govindacharya.M=ERG own.M.SG head.M

     diivaar=par **de** **maaraa**
     wall=on   give hit.PFV.M.SG
     'In (/due to) this sadness Govindacharya hit his head on the wall.'
     (Hindi Emille Corpus via Poornima 2012: 92)

Poornima (2012) shows with data from movement, adverbial modification and coordination tests that the "reverse" orderings are also monoclausal structures with a tight verb-verb constituent. The difference, she argues, between ACPs and the "reverse" ordering is in syntactic headedness (see also Poornima & Koenig 2009). The light verb modifies the meaning of the main verb in both orderings but in standard ACPs it is also the syntactic head, whereas in the reverse construction, as in (7), this role is taken by the clause-final main verb. Poornima further shows that both orders are reluctant to negation but only standard ACPs allow passivisation (though there is no explanation for this to date).

The only other study we know of that explores structural properties of the "reverse" ordering is Das (2015). Das relates possibilities for reversal to transitivity. He argues that verbs that match in terms of transitivity can reverse, as in (8) and (9), but an intransitive light verb such as *jaa* 'go' cannot be placed before a transitive main verb as it cannot support an internal argument. However, Poornima (2012) treats (10) as a case of a "reverse" complex predicate in which the intransitive light verb *jaa* 'go' precedes the transitive main verb *bech* 'sell'.

(8) a. mãĩ tʰak-kar   beḍ=pe **leṭ**   **gayaa**
         1SG tired-CONJ   bed=on lie.down go.PFV.M.SG

     b. mãĩ tʰak-kar   beḍ=pe **jaa leṭaa**
         1SG tired-CONJ   bed=on go   lie.down.PFV.M.SG
         'Being very tired, I fell on the bed.' (Das 2015: 172)

(9) a. srijan=ne   gusse=mẽ gilaas **toṛ**   **diyaa**
         Srijan.M=ERG   anger=in   glass.M break give.PFV.M.SG

     b. srijan=ne   gusse=mẽ gilaas **de**   **toṛaa**
         Srijan.M=ERG   anger=in   glass.M give break.PFV.M.SG
         'Srijan broke the glass in anger.' (Das 2015: 169)

(10) raam=ne   apnaa   makaan **jaa bechaa**
      Ram.M=ERG own.M.SG house.M go   sell.PFV.M.SG
      'Ram$_i$ sold his$_i$ house.' (Hook 1975 via Poornima 2012: 117)

In previous work so far, the unusual V_{LIGHT}V_{MAIN} sequences have generally been described as "reverse" or "reordered" variants of standard ACPs. However, switching the order of verbs in (10) does not easily allow a complex predicate reading as per native speaker intuitions. This is shown in (11) where a reading in which the two verbs describe a temporal sequence of events (a biclausal structure) is much preferred. Further, the example in (10) carries a sense of intentionally and resembles the English *go and* pseudo-coordination construction in (12) (see Vos 2004). In English, the verb *go* in the first conjunct does not require an actual physical movement reading but may be used to express surprise (Ross 2016).

(11) raam   apnaa   makaan **bech gayaa**
     Ram.M own.M.SG house.M sell   go.PFV.M.SG
     'Having sold his*ᵢ* house, Ram*ᵢ* left.'

(12) 'He went and sold the house (despite what his relatives told him).'

These observations suggest that V_{LIGHT}V_{MAIN} sequences are perhaps not best thought of as semantically equivalent, reordered variants of standard ACPs; instead, the unusual V_{LIGHT}V_{MAIN} ordering may have developed independently driven by the directional semantics of verbs such as *de* 'give' and *jaa* 'go' to serve pragmatic functions (e.g., to signal that there is something unusual about an event). Before we discuss this in more detail, we provide an overview of previous work on the semantics of light verbs in the next section.

2.2. Semantics of light verbs

Generally, there is consensus that light verbs in standard ACPs lead to completive readings but also contribute some additional information which has been notoriously hard to pinpoint. Different light verbs are said to give rise to different readings to do with completion, volitionality, suddenness, benefaction, forcefulness, regret, affectedness (Abbi & Gopalakrishnan 1991; Butt 2010; Hook 1973; Hook 1991; Hook 1993; Kachru 2006; Masica 1976; Poornima 2012; Singh 1998; Singh 1994). For example, several studies explain that the light verb *de* 'give' indicates "other-benefaction" (Abbi & Gopalakrishnan 1991; Hook 1973; Kachru 2006), i.e., the agent's actions are benefiting others as indicated in (13). Poornima (2012) argues for an analysis in terms of "affectedness" rather than benefaction. She explains that in (14) *de* 'give' indicates affectedness of a non-subject referent (i.e., the ruining of the house is understood to affect others).

(13) ek   kamiiz **sil-vaa**   **do**
     one shirt.F tailor-CAUS give.IMP
     'Get a shirt made (for another).' (Abbi & Gopalakrishnan 1991: 692)

(14) apnii   burii   aadatõ=ke   kaaraṇ   apnaa   gʰar
     own.F   bad.F   habit.F.OBL.PL=GEN.OBL   because   own.M.SG   house.M

   ujaaṛ   diyaa
   ruin   give.PFV.M.SG
   'His/her bad habits ruined his/her house.' (adapted from Poornima 2012: 208)

Butt and Geuder (2001) argue that light verbs are a special class of their own and, unlike auxiliaries, they carry lexical meaning, albeit in a weak, schematic manner. They discuss the use of the light verb *de* 'give' in combination with different main verbs and show that in addition to completive readings (i.e., the event reads as an achievement), the constructions also imply agentivity. This covers unintentional causation, as in (15) and (16), as well as (17) for which the authors argue that the light verb adds a sense of responsibility on the agent for the loss of the wallet.[6]

(15) us=ne   bʰuul=se   gilaas   **toṛ   diyaa**
     3SG.OBL=ERG   forget=INSTR   glass.M   break   give.PFV.M.SG
     'He/she broke a/the glass by accident.'
     (Hook 1974: 63 via Butt & Geuder 2001: 344)

(16) bʰuul=se   mujʰe   apnaa   sahii   naam   **bataa   diyaa**
     forget=INSTR   1SG.ACC/DAT   own.M.SG   true   name.M   tell   give.PFV.M.SG
     'He/she_i inadvertently told me his/her_i real name.'
     (Hook 1974: 273 via Butt & Geuder 2001: 345)

(17) kisii=ne   baṭuaa   **kʰo   diyaa**
     someone.OBL=ERG   wallet.M   lose   give.PFV.M.SG
     'Someone lost a/the wallet.' (Hook 1974: 310 via Butt & Geuder 2001: 345)

Butt and Geuder recognise completion and agentivity as the meanings that are consistent with the use of the light verb *de* 'give'. They argue that other readings such as the presence of a recipient, as in (16), or forcefulness, as in (18) and (19), are dependent on the meaning of the main verb that introduces the event description. In other words, these semantic features reside in the light verb but their "activation" is dependent on the meaning of the main verb. When the feature is compatible with the meaning of the main verb, the light verb adds it or enforces it.

---

[6] Note that it is precisely because of this sense of responsibility that the construction in (17) with the indefinite subject *kisii=ne* 'someone' (i.e., an unknown agent) might be deemed odd when presented out of context. As per native speaker intuitions the structure in (i) with the ergative pronoun *us=ne* is a significant improvement:

(i)   us=ne   pʰir=se   baṭuaa   kʰo   diyaa
        3SG.OBL=ERG   again=INSTR   wallet.M   lose   give.PFV.M.SG
        'He lost the wallet again.'

(18) us=ne   gusse=mẽ   aa-kar   kitab   zamiin=par
     3SG.OBL=ERG   anger.OBL=in come-CONJ book.F   floor=on

paṭak dii
throw   give.PFV.F.SG
'In a fit of rage he/she dashed the book to the floor.' (Butt & Geuder 2001: 344)

(19) us=ne   dushman=ko   paanii=mẽ **ḍubaa diyaa**
     3sg.OBL=ERG enemy.M/F=ACC/DAT water=in   drown give.PFV.M.SG
     'He/she drowned the enemy in water (forcefully).' (Butt & Geuder 2001: 347)

Structurally, Butt and Geuder argue that the light verb *de* 'give' has lost the THEME argument slot. In (20) the direct object *skuuṭar* 'scooter' is the patient of washing; it does not hold a theme relation with 'give'. They also point out that a beneficiary argument is absent; the beneficiary in (20) is realised as an optional adjunct.

(20) tum=ne   (us=ke-liye)   skuuṭar **dʰo   dii**
     2SG=ERG 3SG.OBL=for   scooter.F wash give.PFV.F.SG
     'You washed the scooter (for him/her).' (adapted from Butt & Geuder 2001: 348)

Light verbs, therefore, have an incomplete argument structure and do not introduce an event description. They simply modify the event description projected by the main verb and contribute additional semantic features. Butt and Geuder (2001) speculate that the only possible analysis seems to be one in which the event argument is construed as the theme. Following a neo-Davidsonian representation approach (see Parsons 1990), they propose the representation in (22) for the construction in (21). The event predicate GIVE-TYPE is interpreted in conjunction with the main event description introduced by the main verb *pʰẽk* 'throw'. The thematic roles AGENT and THEME are to be understood here in the sense of Dowty's (1991) proto-roles as verbal entailments.

(21) tum=ne   kuuṛaa   us=ke   sir=par **pʰẽk   diyaa**
     2SG=ERG garbage.M 3SG.OBL=GEN.OBL   head=on throw give.PFV.M.SG
     'You threw the garbage on his/her head.' (Butt & Geuder 2001: 357)

(22) a.   throw(e)(you, the garbage) & GOAL(e, on his/her head) & GIVE-TYPE(e)

     b.   GIVE-TYPE(e) = e involves the force emission/transmission pattern
           AGENT(e)-THEME(e)   (Butt & Geuder 2001: 357)

Butt and Lahiri (2013) further elaborate on this idea by stressing that light verbs are form-identical with main verbs and are diachronically stable (but see Slade (2021) for counter-arguments). They argue for a single underlying lexical entry for both main and light uses that consists of lexical entailments and information to do with world knowledge (e.g., whether an event is (in)volitional, sudden, for the benefit of someone, etc.). Depending on whether the verb enters the syntax as a main verb or a light verb, lexical information either feeds a full event description and argument structure (main verbs) or modifies an existing event description (light verbs). Contrary to claims that light verbs are semantically bleached (Hook 1973; Hook 1993), Butt and Lahiri argue that it is not the

case that "light" meanings are derived from "full" lexical specifications. Rather, it is precisely the general nature of these verbs that allows them to double as light and main verbs.

The interpretation of the so-called "reverse" constructions is discussed to a much lesser extent in the literature. Hook (1973: 56) explains that the example in (23) "implies a suddenness not found in the unreordered sequence."

(23) kitaab zamiin=par **de paṭkii**
     book.F floor=on give slam.PFV.F.SG
     'He/She slammed the book to the floor.' (adapted from Hook 1973: 55)

More recently, Das (2015) argues that the ordering of verbs is driven by pragmatic factors. Similarly to Hook (1973), he explains that the "reverse" order in (24) and (25) reveals "suddenness of performing the actions" (Das 2015: 182). Other readings that Das argues to arise as a result of the unusual order are agent's intentionality and/or anger in performing an action, for which he provides the examples in (26) and (27), respectively. A further use outlined by Das is to express an uncontrolled action as in (28), i.e., to express that "this ought not to have happened" (Das 2015: 186). However, Hook (1973) and Das (2015) do not discuss in more detail the interpretive effects associated with the unusual ordering and these remain not very well understood and in need of further study.

(24) laṛke   taalaab=mẽ **jaa kude**
     boy.M.PL pond=in   go jump.PFV.M.PL
     'The boys jumped into the pond.' (Das 2015: 180)

(25) us=ne   mere   piit^h=par ek mukkaa **de maaraa**
     3SG.OBL=ERG 1SG.POSS.OBL back=on one punch.M give hit.PFV.M.SG
     'He/She (suddenly) punched me on my back.' (Das 2015: 181)

(26) mãĩ b^{h}iiṛ=mẽ kisii tarah **jaa g^{h}usaa**
     1SG crowd=in some way go enter.PFV.M.SG
     'Somehow, I managed to get into the crowd.' (Das 2015: 183)

(27) kavitaa=ne   saarii miṭṭ^{h}aaii kuṛedaan=mẽ **de ḍaalii**
     Kavita.F=ERG all sweet.F dustbin=in give put.PFV.F.SG
     'Kavita threw all the sweets in the dustbin.' (Das 2015: 183)

(28) gend naalii=mẽ **jaa luṛ^{h}kii**
     ball.F drain=in go roll.PFV.F.SG
     'The ball rolled into the drain.' (adapted from Das 2015: 185)

In summary, in previous work both standard ACPs and the "reverse" constructions have been shown to behave like monoclausal structures (but the different orders do show differences such as the inability of the "reverse" construction to passivise). Butt and Geuder (2001) discuss in detail light verbs in standard ACPs and argue that they carry lexical meaning which interacts with the contribution of the main verb. The so-called "reverse" constructions, however, have received significantly less attention. While some

works explain that V_{LIGHT}V_{MAIN} sequences carry a sense of intentionality, anger, lack of control and/or suddenness not observed in standard ACPs (Hook 1973; Das 2015), the source of such interpretive effects has not been explored in more detail.

In this paper we argue that such extra dimensions of meaning are determined contextually but are linked to the inherent directional semantics of *de* 'give' and *jaa* 'go'. The initial placement of *de* 'give' and *jaa* 'go' draws attention to the directed-action and directed-motion aspect of an event, respectively, and leads to marked interpretations. We suggest that, rather than a reordered variant of a standard ACP, the unusual V_{LIGHT}V_{MAIN} constructions may have developed independently to highlight an out-of-the-ordinary action or outcome. To understand if this is indeed the case, a closer investigation of structural and semantic aspects of the so-called "reverse" constructions is needed, as well as their use in context. If we are on the right track, this would further strengthen Butt and Lahiri's (2013) proposal for a single lexical entry that reflects the general nature of verbs that have both main and light uses. In what follows, we provide an overview of the uses of the light verbs *de* 'give' (Section 3) and *jaa* 'go' (Section 4) in the different orders.

3. The light verb *de* 'give'
We first give a brief overview of the uses of *de* 'give' in standard ACPs (Section 3.1) before discussing the "reverse" construction (Section 3.2) and associated interpretive effects (Section 3.3).

3.1. Standard ACPs with *de* 'give': an overview
In its standard clause-final ACP use, *de* 'give' is a very common light verb that surfaces with transitive and unergative verbs to describe events that involve an agent-originating outwardly directed action. This is in essence the argument that Ozarkar and Ramchand (2018) make for the Marathi light verb 'give': it expresses the outward directedness of an action (i.e., away from the agent), and this determines what main verbs it can combine with. Their argument applies well to Hindi too and is also in keeping with Butt and Geuder's (2001; 2003) proposal that the semantics of *de* interacts with the meaning of the main verb to give a sense of completion and agentivity and – when the main verb allows it – forcefulness and/or the presence of a beneficiary/recipient (see Section 2.2).

Expectedly, the light verb *de* readily combines with ditransitive main verbs such as *b^hej* 'send' (29) that describe a transfer of an entity (a theme) away from the agent and towards a recipient.

(29) is   g^haṭnaa=kii   riporṭ   kendra sarkaar=ko
     this.OBL incident=GEN.F report.F central government.F=ACC/DAT

     b^hej dii   gayii   hai
     send give.PFV.F.SG PASS.PFV.F.SG be.PRS.3SG
     'The report of this incident has been sent to the central government.'
     (Emille Hindi Corpus; ehinweb191)

It also surfaces with verbs that do not express a transfer of a physical object but which nevertheless can be understood as involving the transfer or outward emission of a more abstract entity (e.g., information, sound), as in (30) and (31) with the main verbs *bataa* 'tell' and *kah* 'say', respectively. Similarly, the use of the light verb *de* with the main verb *paṛʰ* 'read' in (32) indicates that the agent read the book out loud.

(30) mãĩ=ne   saaraa   kissaa   aapne   bʰaaii=ko
     1SG=ERG whole.M story.M own.M.OBL brother.M=ACC/DAT

     bataa diyaa
     tell   give.PFV.M.SG
     'I told my brother the whole story.'

(31) us=ne   saaf taur=par **kah diyaa**   kii ye sab
     3SG.OBL=ERG clear way=on say give.PFV.M.SG that this all

     bakvaas   hai
     nonsense be.PRS.3SG
     'He said clearly that this is all nonsense.' (Emille Hindi Corpus; ehinweb1ea)

(32) mãĩ =ne   kitaab **paṛʰ dii**
     1SG=ERG book.F read give.PFV.F.SG
     'I read the book (out loud).'

The light verb *de* 'give' combines with a wide range of transitive main verbs that describe the emission/exertion of force originating from the agent towards some other entity. This is observed in (33)-(35). In (33) and (34) the argument affected by the agent's actions carries the accusative/dative *=ko* marker.[7] In (35) it is the unmarked object *log* 'people' that is on the receiving end of the agent's actions.

(33) maalikõ=ne   ek raat us=ko   naukrii aur
     owner.OBL.PL=ERG one night 3SG.OBL=ACC/DAT job   and

     gʰar=se   baahar **nikaal   diyaa**   tʰaa
     house=from outside remove/take.out give.PFV.M.SG be.PST.M.SG
     'One night the owners threw her out of the job and house.'
     (adapted from Emille Hindi Corpus; ehinweb141)

(34) tum=ne mujʰe   dʰaratii=ka   sab=se sukʰii ĩsaan
     2SG=ERG 1SG.ACC/DAT earth=GEN.M all=from happy person.M

     banaa diyaa
     make   give.PFV.M.SG
     'You made me the happiest person on earth.'
     (EMILLE Hindi Corpus; ehinweb006)

---

[7] The *=ko* marker surfaces obligatorily on indirect objects and direct objects high in animacy and specificity (Butt 1993; Bhatt & Anagnostopoulou 1996).

(35) puliskarmiyõ=ne   vahãã=se   hazaarõ=kii   sãkʰyaa=mẽ
     policeman.OBL.PL=ERG there=from thousand.PL=GEN.F number.F=in

     log   **bʰaag-aa diye**   tʰe
     people.M run-CAUS give.PFV.M.PL be.PST.M.PL
     'Policemen drove away thousands of people from there.'
     (adapted from Emille Hindi Corpus; ehinweb170)

However, the use of the light verb 'give' does not require the realisation of a beneficiary argument (also noted by Butt and Geuder 2001, 2003). For example, (36)-(37) could be uttered in a context in which the door was opened and the sweets were made for someone's benefit but this is by no means a requirement. The light verb 'give' does not enforce that there is a beneficiary participant; rather, it lends easily to such readings due to its directional semantics.

(36) us=ne   darvaazaa **kʰol diyaa**
     3SG.OBL=ERG door.M   open give.PFV.M.SG
     'He opened the door.'

(37) raadʰaa=ne   mitʰaaii **banaa dii**
     Radha.F=ERG sweet.F make   give.PFV.F.SG
     'Radha made sweets.'

Following this line of thought, the use of *de* 'give' with unergatives such as *ro* 'cry' in (38) and *kʰã̃ãs* 'cough' in (39) is expected as these describe outward emission events. Note that the subjects in (38)-(39) do not carry the ergative marker. Contrary to descriptive generalisations, we have found that the ergative marker =*ne* is not obligatory with the light verb *de* 'give' when combined with unergative main verbs.[8] If =*ne* is used, however, it implies that the agent has control over the action, e.g., coughing on purpose as indicated in (40).We take this to mean that purposeful and/or control over the action readings have to do with the use of the ergative marker and not with the light verb *de* 'give'.

(38) laṛkii **ro dii**
     girl.F cry give.PFV.F.SG
     'The girl cried.'

(39) laṛkii **kʰã̃ãs dii**
     girl.F cough give.PFV.F.SG
     'The girl coughed.'

(40) laṛkii=ne   **kʰã̃ãs diyaa**
     girl.F=ERG cough give.PFV.M.SG
     'The girl coughed (on purpose).'

---

[8] See Butt (2017) for a detailed discussion on split-ergativity in Hindi/Urdu.

As Ozarkar and Ramchand (2018) note for Marathi, the light verb *de* 'give' in Hindi does not co-occur with main verbs that express an agent-oriented action. This is illustrated with the contrast between (41) and (42). In (41) the light verb *de* 'give' can be realised with the main verb *kʰilaa* 'feed' but it is ungrammatical with *kʰaa* 'eat' in (42). The same extends to other verbs that express an inwards action: the light verb *de* 'give' cannot be used with *siikʰ* 'learn', *pii* 'drink', *nahaa* 'bathe', *samajʰ* 'understand' but can be used with the causative *sikʰaa* 'teach', *pilaa* 'water/give water', *nehlaa* 'bathe (someone)', *samjʰaa* 'explain'.

(41) mãĩ=ne   bachche=ko   anaanaas   **kʰilaa diyaa**
    1SG=ERG child.M.OBL.SG=ACC/DAT pineapple.M feed   give.PFV.M.SG
    'I fed the child pineapple.'

(42) *mãĩ=ne   seb   **kʰaa diyaa**
    1SG=ERG apple.M eat   give.PFV.M.SG
    'I ate the apple.'

To conclude, the light verb *de* 'give' in standard V_{MAIN}V_{LIGHT} ACPs combines with main verbs that describe agentive events to reinforce the outwards directionality of the agent's action. The light verb *de* does not encode directly volitional/intentional readings and it does not affect argument structure; it simply adds a layer of meaning to the event predication projected by the main verb by contributing its directional semantics. In what follows, we turn to exploring the rarer V_{LIGHT}V_{MAIN} sequences in which the verbal stem *de* 'give' is realised before a lexically more dominant verb (*de* + V sequences).

3.2. "Reverse" ordering: *de* + V sequences
Butt (1995) argues for monoeventiveness and monoclausality to be defining features of complex predication. For a *de* + V sequence to be established as a (type of) complex predicate, the two verbs in the sequence need to express a single event within a monoclausal structure. Agreement is a reliable test for monoclausality as in Hindi perfective transitive verbs show agreement with an unmarked object[9] (for other tests see Poornima & Koenig 2009; Poornima 2012). For example, in (43) agreement morphology on the finite verb *maarii* 'hit' indicates that *kitaab* 'book' is a matrix object and there is no embedding. The verbal root *de* 'give' does not describe an event of 'giving'. In contrast, (44) is a biclausal structure in which the feminine *gend* 'ball' is part of the participial adverbial *gend de-kar* 'having given the ball' (see Section 2.1) and the perfective matrix verb *maaraa* 'hit' shows default masculine agreement.

---

[9] In the perfective, transitive subjects carry the ergative marker and the verb agrees with an unmarked object, as shown in (ii). If the object is marked, the perfective verb defaults to third person, singular, masculine agreement, as in (iii). For more details, see Butt (2017).

    (ii)   miiraa=ne   taaraa=ko   chʰarii   maarii
            Mira.F=ERG   Tara.F=ACC/DAT stick.F   hit.PFV.F.SG
            'Mira hit Tara with a stick.'

    (iii)   miiraa=ne   taaraa=ko   maaraa
            Mira.F=ERG   Tara.F=ACC/DAT hit.PFV.M.SG
            'Mira hit Tara.'

(43) miiraa=ne   raam=ko   kitaab **de** **maarii**
　　　Mira.F=ERG Ram.M=ACC/DAT book.F give hit.PFV.F.SG
　　　'Mira hit Ram with a book.'

(44) laṛkii=ne   laṛke=ko   gend **de-kar**   **maaraa**
　　　girl.F=ERG boy.M.SG.OBL=ACC/DAT ball.F give-CONJ hit.PFV.M.SG
　　　'Having given the ball to the boy, the girl hit him.'

There are, however, constructions in which *de* 'give' makes (what looks like) a light contribution without following the expected agreement pattern for monoclausal structures. For example, in (45) and (46) the perfective verbs show masculine agreement indicating that the feminine *chʰaṛii* 'stick' and *kitaab* 'book' are not matrix arguments.

(45) miiraa=ne   raam=ko   **chʰaṛii de** bʰagaayaa
　　　Mira.F=ERG Ram.M=ACC/DAT stick.F   give chase.PFV.M.SG
　　　'Mira chased Ram away using a stick.'

(46) miiraa=ne   raam=ko   **kitaab de** maaraa
　　　Mira.F=ERG Ram.M=ACC/DAT book.F give hit.PFV.M.SG
　　　'Mira hit Ram using a book.'

We speculate that in these cases *de* 'give' forms an adverbial participle that provides information on how the action described by the finite verb is accomplished. Similarly, in (47) the perfective verb *rokii* 'stop' agrees with the object of stopping *lift* 'lift', while *haatʰ de* is a "means" participle that provides information on how the agent stopped the lift.

(47) miraa=ne   lift **haatʰ de** rokii
　　　Mira.F=ERG lift.F hand.M give stop.PFV.F.SG
　　　'Mira stopped the lift using (her) hand.'

Scrambling tests provide further evidence that we need to differentiate between the "means" participle use of *de* 'give' and "reverse" complex predication. In (48) the finite verb agrees with the object *chʰaṛii* 'stick' which can move freely in the clause, as illustrated in (48a-b). The ungrammatical examples in (48c-d) show that the verb root *de* cannot be fronted away from the lexical verb *maarii* 'hit'.

(48) **"Reverse" complex predicate: *de* + V**
　　a.　miiraa=ne raam=ko   *chʰaṛii* **de** **maarii**
　　　　Mira=ERG Ram=ACC/DAT stick.F give hit.PFV.F.SG
　　　　'Mira hit Ram with a stick.'

　　b.　miiraa=ne   *chʰaṛii* raam=ko **de**   **maarii**
　　c.　*miiraa=ne   *chʰaṛii* **de** raam=ko   **maarii**
　　d.　*miiraa=ne   **de** raam=ko *chʰaṛii*   **maarii**

When *de* forms a "means" participle, however, the situation is different. In (49) the finite verb does not show agreement with *chʰaṛii* 'stick'. The adverbial participle *chʰaṛii de*

moves as a unit, as shown in (49a-b), and it cannot be separated as indicated with the ungrammaticality of (49c-d).

(49) **"Means" participle: N +** *de*
    a.   miiraa=ne raam=ko   **chʰaṛii** **de**   maaraa
           Mira=ERG Ram=ACC/DAT stick.F give hit.PFV.M.SG
           'Mira hit Ram using a stick.'

    b.   miiraa=ne   **chʰaṛii**   **de**   raam=ko   maaraa
    c.   *miiraa=ne   **chʰaṛii**   raam=ko   **de**   maaraa
    d.   *miiraa=ne   **de**   raam=ko   **chʰaṛii**   maaraa

We speculate that in (45-47) and (49a-b) we might be observing early stages of the development of *de* 'give' towards an instrumental postposition, though this is not listed as a common grammaticalization path of 'give' in the World Lexicon of Grammaticalization (Heine & Kuteva 2002). However, as these constructions are not the subject of this paper we leave them to one side for future research and concentrate on the structures that do show a monoclausal agreement pattern.

A further question that remains for future work is whether there are argument structure restrictions associated with the unusual *de* + V ordering. For example, in the standardly ordered ACP construction in (50a-b) the realisation of *kitaab* 'book' is not obligatory. When *de* 'give', however, precedes the lexical verb in the "reverse" construction, dropping *kitaab* is infelicitous, as shown in (51a-b).

(50) **Standard ACP: V_{MAIN}V_{LIGHT}**
    a.   miiraa=ne   raam=ko   kitaab **maar dii**
           Mira.F=ERG Ram.M=ACC/DAT book.F hit   give.PFV.F.SG
           'Mira hit Ram with a book.'

    b.   miiraa=ne   raam=ko   **maar diyaa**
           Mira.F=ERG Ram.M=ACC/DAT hit   give.PFV.M.SG
           'Mira hit Ram.'

(51) **"Reverse" construction: V_{LIGHT}V_{MAIN}**
    a.   miiraa=ne   raam=ko   kitaab **de maarii**
           Mira.F=ERG Ram.M=ACC/DAT book.F give hit.PFV.F.SG
           'Mira hit Ram with a book (deliberately).'

    b.   #miiraa=ne raam=ko   **de maaraa**
           Mira.F=ERG Ram.M=ACC/DAT give hit.PFV.M.SG
           'Mira hit Ram.'

In "reverse" constructions with *de* 'give' we have identified so far, there is consistently an unmarked argument, as we saw in (51a) (the exception is unergative verbs; see Section 3.3). While we point to this observation, we are aware that a much larger study of possible verb-verb combinations is needed to confirm if this holds empirically. If this is indeed the case, then that would mean that the *de* + V order requires an internal (theme) argument

slot. This contrasts with the standard ACP construction in which the clause-final light verb 'give' takes the event argument as its theme (see Section 2.2 on Butt & Geuder's (2001) proposal). We leave the question open as more work is needed to identify what selectional restrictions drive possible *de* + V combinations. We proceed to discuss interpretive effects associated with the unusual ordering.

3.3. Interpretive effects
The placement of the verb root *de* 'give' before the lexically dominant verb comes with very clear interpretive effects such as intentionality, forcefulness and suddeness which are not observed in the standard ACP ordering. Examples are given below with the transitive verbs *kʰilaa* 'feed' (52), *paṭak* 'slam' (53), *pʰẽk* 'throw' (54), *giraa* 'make fall, knock down' (55), *gʰuseṛ* 'push into' (56) and the unergative *chʰĩĩk* 'sneeze' (57).

(52) mãã=ne   bachche=ko   rotii   **de**   **kʰilaayii**
      mother.F=ERG   child.M.OBL.SG=ACC/DAT   bread.F   give   feed.PFV.F.SG
      'The mother (forcefully) fed the child bread.'

(53) laṛke=ne   kitaab   zamiin=par   **de**   **paṭkii**
      boy.M.OBL.SG=ERG   book.F   floor=on   give   slam.PFV.F.SG
      'The boy slammed the book to the floor.'

(54) us=ne   apnii   maalaa   jʰiil=mẽ   **de**   **pʰẽkii**
      3SG.OBL=ERG   own.F   necklace.F   lake=in   give   throw.PFV.F.SG
      'He/She*ᵢ* threw his/her*ᵢ* necklace into the lake.' (adapted from Hook 1974: 34)

(55) raam=ne   apnii   kitaab   jʰiil=mẽ   **de**   **giraaii**
      Ram.M=ERG   own.F   book.F   lake=in   give   make.fall.PFV.F.SG
      'Ram*ᵢ* dropped (intentionally) his*ᵢ* book in the lake.'

(56) us=ne   takiyaa=mẽ   chaaku   **de**   **gʰuseṛaa**
      3SG.OBL=ERG   pillow.F =in   knife.M   give   push.into.PFV.M.SG
      'He/She pushed the knife into the pillow.'

(57) laṛkii   (raam=par)   **de**   **chʰĩĩkii**
      girl.F   Ram=on   give   sneeze.PFV.F.SG
      'The girl sneezed (on Ram) (intentionally).'

For all constructions in (52-57) a standardly ordered (V$_{MAIN}$V$_{LIGHT}$) counterpart in which the main verb precedes the light verb can be constructed. However, the standard ACPs will make a more neutral assertion and will lack the intensive readings associated with the *de* + V order. For example, when the standard ACP in (58a) is used there is no indication whether the agent hit the patient with the book on purpose or by accident. The "reverse" order in (58b), however, reads as an intentional and more forceful act (examples are repeated from (50a) and (51a)).

(58) a. **Standard ACP: VMAINVLIGHT**
miiraa=ne   raam=ko   kitaab **maar dii**
Mira.F=ERG Ram.M=ACC/DAT book.F hit   give.PFV.F.SG
'Mira hit Ram with a book.'

   b. **"Reverse" construction: VLIGHTVMAIN**
miiraa=ne   raam=ko   kitaab **de maarii**
Mira.F=ERG Ram.M=ACC/DAT book.F give hit.PFV.F.SG
'Mira hit Ram with a book (deliberately).'

In other cases, the "reverse" order serves to emphasise the agent's unusual actions. For example, in (59) Santa's delivering of the presents before Christmas is unusual and worthy of emphasis and the order in (60) directs the hearer's attention towards Mira's out-of-the-ordinary actions.

(59) sãĩṭaa=ne   krismas=se   pehle saare tohfe
Santa.M=ERG Christmas=INSTR before all.PL present.M.PL

   de   pahũchaaye
give   deliver.PFV.M.PL
'Santa delivered all presents before Christmas.'

(60) miiraa=ne   daavat=ka   saaraa-kaa-saaraa kʰaanaa akele hii
Mira.F=ERG party=GEN.M all-GEN.M-all   food.M   alone EMPH

   de   baanaayaa
give   make.PFV.M.SG
'Mira made the entire food for the party alone (to prove something/out of anger).'

The interpretive effects that arise with *de* + V sequences are diverse and tricky to trace but all seem to revolve around the expression of an action that is significant in some way, e.g., it is forceful, deliberate, sudden or unexpected/unusual. While we leave the technicalities for future work, we believe that these readings are linked to the inherent directed-action nature of *de* 'give' in interaction with lexical information from the main verb and the (extra-linguistic) context. The effect of the placement of *de* 'give' before the verb that dominates the event description is one of emphasis on the "outwardly directed-action" aspect of the event, highlighting and drawing attention to the action performed by the agent. This, of course, begs for unusual circumstances and the "reverse" constructions are expectedly pragmatically marked, with what is significant/unusual about the described action being determined contextually. In the next section we turn to the light verb *jaa* 'go'.

4. The light verb *jaa* 'go'
We first give a brief overview of the uses of *jaa* 'go' as a clause-final light verb in standard ACP constructions (Section 4.1) before discussing the "reverse" *jaa* + V sequences (Section 4.2) and their interpretation (Section 4.3).

4.1. Standard ACPs with *jaa* 'go': overview
In its full lexical meaning the directed-motion verb *jaa* 'go' expresses an entity's physical movement/transfer from one location to another, as shown in (61).

(61) laṛkaa skul **gayaa**
     boy.M school go.PFV.M.SG
     'The boy went to school.'

As a light verb, 'go' surfaces mostly with unaccusative verbs that describe a change of state or location/position, as well as with transitive main verbs to highlight having reached an event's endpoint.[10] In its light verb use, 'go' retains the directional motion aspect of its meaning, albeit in a metaphorical sense. For example, in (62) and (63) the light verb 'go' expresses temporal motion from one state to another. 'Go' highlights the subject's transition to the state described by the main verbs *so* 'sleep' and *ṭuuṭ* 'break' from one temporal reference point to another.

(62) bachche **so** **gaye**
     child.M.PL sleep go.PFV.M.PL
     'The children fell asleep.'

(63) guldastaa **ṭuuṭ** **gayaa**
     vase.M break go.PFV.M.SG
     'The vase broke.'

Similarly, (64) shows that the light verb 'go' does not encode a movement/transfer towards a physical location as there is no clash between the meaning of the main verb *aa* 'come' and the light verb *jaa* 'go'. While the main verb *aa* 'come' encodes space-bound movement, the light verb 'go' further emphasises reaching the endpoint of the movement event. With other motion verbs, however, 'go' adds a sense of direction; in (65) it indicates movement "away" from the deictic centre.

(64) pulis **aa** **gayii**
     police.F come go.PFV.F.SG
     'The police have come.'

(65) kabuutar **uṛ** **gayaa**
     pigeon.M fly go.PFV.M.SG
     'The pigeon flew away.'

With transitive verbs, as in (66)-(68), 'go' again reinforces that the event is completed in full and exhaustively. For example, (68) implies that the tigers devoured all three cows in full (the event of eating has reached its natural endpoint; see also Singh 1994; 1998).

(66) vo saarii kitaab (ek baar=mẽ) **paṛʰ gayaa**
     3SG whole.F book.F one time=in read go.PFV.M.SG
     'He/she read the whole book (in one go).'

---

[10] See Butt and Ramchand (2005) who argue that light verbs lead to an achievement or accomplishment reading.

(67) mãĩ sab kuchʰ **sikʰ** **gayaa**
1SG everything learn go.PFV.SG.M
'I learned everything.'

(68) is   varsh bʰii chʰe-janvarii=ko   ye   baagʰ tiin
this.OBL year   also six-January=ACC/DAT these tiger.M three

gaayõ=ko   maar-kar   **kʰaa gaye**
cow.F.OBL=ACC/DAT hit/kill-CONJ eat   go.PFV.M.PL
'This year also on the sixth of January these tigers killed and ate three cows.'
(*lit.* 'having killed three cows, ate (them) up') (Emille Hindi Corpus; ehinweb147)

In summary, in its standard ACP use the light verb *jaa* 'go' retains its directional semantics and combines with both unaccusative and transitive main verbs to express temporal motion towards an event's natural endpoint, leading to readings of exhaustiveness and completion. With other motion-related verbs, however, 'go' forms a type of directional construction adding an "away" reading to a motion event. Next, we turn to discuss the more unusual ordering in which *jaa* 'go' precedes the lexically dominant verb.

4.2. "Reverse" ordering: *jaa* + V sequences
As already discussed in section 2.1, *jaa* + V sequences are in general described in previous work as "reverse", semantically equivalent variants of standard ACPs (Hook 1973; Poornima 2012; Das 2015). However, the "reversal" is by no means a productive process which casts doubts on whether *jaa* + V constructions should be thought of as "reverse" variants of standard ACPs or are a completely different beast.

First, not any standard V$_{MAIN}$V$_{LIGHT}$ complex predicate can "reverse" and not any V$_{LIGHT}$V$_{MAIN}$ sequence we have identified can "reverse back" to a standard ACP. For example, (69a) shows a *jaa* + V sequence with the animate subject *Ramesh.* Having the standard ACP order, as in (69b), where the main verb *kho* 'lose' precedes the light verb 'go', yields an unaccusative structure with the inanimate *baṭuaa* 'wallet' as the subject. The examples in (70) show that the "reverse" construction in (70a) does not have a readily available standard counterpart; the order in (70b) describes a temporal sequence of actions.

(69) a. ramesh   apnaa   baṭuaa **jaa kʰoyaa**
Ramesh.M own.M.SG wallet.M go   lose.PFV.M.SG
'Ramesh$_i$ lost his$_i$ wallet.'

b. ramesh=kaa   baṭuaa   **kʰo gayaa**
Ramesh=GEN.M wallet.M lose go.PFV.M.SG
'Ramesh's wallet got lost.'

(70) a. haat^hii   gusse=mẽ diivaar **jaa toṛaa**
        elephant.M anger=in   wall.M go   break.PFV.M.SG
        'The elephant broke the wall in his anger.'

    b. haat^hii   gusse=mẽ diivaar **toṛ   gayaa**
        elephant.M anger=in   wall.M break go.PFV.M.SG
        'Having broken the wall in his anger, the elephant left.'

Second, there is (at least in some cases) a certain degree of grey area as to whether *jaa* + V sequences are interpreted as describing a single event or a temporal sequence of actions. For example, Hook (1973) describes (71) as a case of a "reverse" complex predicate (though he uses the term "compound verb"). However, this example could also be understood to describe a temporal sequence in which the arrow went for a while and then it fell.

(71) mãĩ=ne   apne   d^hanush=se tiir   chalaayaa
     1SG=ERG own.OBL bow=INSTR arrow.M make.move.PFV.M.SG

     tab   vo ek   miil duur **jaa giraa**
     then 3SG one mile far   go   fall.PFV.M.SG
     'When I shot the arrow from my bow it carried for a mile.' (Hook 1973: 24)

The initial placement of *jaa* 'go' often comes with a strong sense of directional motion, especially with other motion-related verbs and locative expressions. In (72)-(74), the verb root *jaa* 'go' seems to express motion in space towards the explicit locations.

(72) gend gaḍḍ^he=mẽ **jaa girii**
     ball.F ditch=in   go   fall.PFV.F.SG
     'The ball fell into the ditch.' (adapted from Das 2015: 184)

(73) gend naalii=mẽ **jaa luṛ^hkii**
     ball.F drain=in   go   roll.PFV.F.SG
     'The ball rolled into the drain.' (adapted from Das 2015: 185)

(74) chaakuu raam=ke   peṭ=mẽ   **jaa g^husaa**
     knife.M Ram.M=GEN.M.OBL stomach=in go   enter.PFV.M.SG
     'The knife entered Ram's stomach.'

The ungrammaticality of (75b), compared to the standard ACP in (75a), also suggests that the early placement of *jaa* 'go' carries a sense of outbound spatial movement which clashes with the meaning of *aa* 'come'.

(75) a.   pulis   **aa**   **gayii**
                police.F come go.PFV.F.SG
                'The police have come.'

        b.   *pulis   **jaa aayii**
                police.F go   come.PFV.F.SG
                'The police have come.'

With other verbs, however, it is much clearer that *jaa* 'go' may not necessarily describe physical movement. This is the case in (69a) and (76-77) where 'go' does not describe motion in space; instead, the unusual ordering of the verb root *jaa* 'go' before the lexical verb leads to a more marked interpretation (to be discussed in Section 4.3).

(76) raam=ne   gusse=mẽ merii   gʰaɽii   **jaa toɽii**
      Ram.M=ERG anger=in POSS.1SG.F watch.F.SG go break.PFV.F.SG
      'Ram broke my watch in anger.'

(77) laɽkii=ne   seb   **jaa kʰaayaa**
      girl.F=ERG apple.M go   eat.PFV.M.SG
      'The girl ate the apple.'

This short overview has shown that *jaa* 'go' in *jaa* + V sequences may express motion in space but, as we saw in (69a) and (76-77), need not do so. As we will see in the next section, we argue that both uses are linked to the inherent semantics of *jaa* 'go': in the first case it expresses motion in the physical sense and, in the second, in a metaphorical sense to serve pragmatic functions.

4.3. Interpretive effects
Ross (2016) shows that cross-linguistically morphemes and verbs such as 'go' that indicate a direction away from a deictic centre are often involved in a grammaticalization pattern to express mirativity[11] (see DeLancey 1997; DeLancey 2012). As already hinted in Section 2, this seems to be the case with Hindi *jaa* + V sequences, resembling the English *go and* construction said to express surprise (Vos 2004; Ross 2016). The initial placement of *jaa* 'go' in (78a), for example, leads to a marked interpretation; the example could be uttered to describe an event of falling that is perceived to be in some way surprising or unexpected (e.g., *Ram* was not careful enough and fell despite being warned). Such extra dimensions of meaning are not present with the standard ACP in (78b) where the light verb 'go' indicates the complete transition to the state described by the main verb *gir* 'fall'.

(78) a.   raam   gaḍḍʰe=mẽ **jaa giraa**
          Ram.M ditch=in   go fall.PFV.SG.M
          'Ram fell in a ditch.'

---

[11] The term mirativity is broadly used to describe utterances that a speaker uses to express their surprise at some unexpected state, event, or activity (see DeLancey 1997; DeLancey 2012).

b. raam   gaḍḍʰe=mẽ **gir gayaa**
Ram.M ditch=in   fall go.PFV.SG.M
'Ram fell in a ditch.'

Jaa + V sequences may also be used to express an action done with determination, as in (79) (an 'occupied' reading as opposed to 'sat on' the chair), or an action done in control as in (80) ('throwing oneself' as opposed to 'falling' accidentally). *Jaa* + V sequences may also be used to express disapproval: (81) could be uttered in a context in which the mother should not have read the letter (e.g., it was not meant for her) but she went ahead and read it anyway.

(79) raaj   kursi=pe **jaa baiṭʰaa**
Raj.M chair=on go sit.PFV.M.SG
'Raj occupied the chair.'

(80) naukar   malik=ke   kadamõ=mẽ **jaa giraa**
servant.M master.M=GEN.OBL feet=in   go fall.PFV.M.SG
'The servant threw himself at the feet of the master.' (Das 2015: 11)

(81) maa=ne   apnii beṭii=kii   chiṭṭʰii **jaa paḍʰii**
mother.F=ERG own.F daughter.F=GEN.F letter.F go read.PFV.F.SG
'The mother*i* read her*i* daughter's letter.'

The readings we have described (disapproval, surprise, deliberateness/determination, control) are diverse and context-dependent but, we believe, are linked to the semantics of directed-motion *jaa* 'go'. The verb root *jaa* 'go' in *jaa* + V sequences expresses the subject's motion towards the completion of an action (as described by the lexical verb), albeit in a metaphorical sense when no physical movement reading is present. Ross (2016) makes an intriguing argument which is relevant here: constructions such as the English *go and* involve the extension of 'go' to express deviation from an expected outcome (motion away from expectation). Along similar lines, Hindi *jaa* + V sequences could be understood as drawing attention and highlighting the subject's motion towards an outcome that is perceived to be in some way unusual or significant (as per the speaker's expectations and world knowledge).

6. Conclusion

In this paper we explored the use of directed-motion *jaa* 'go' and directed-action *de* 'give' in standardly ordered complex predicates and in the so-called "reverse" constructions. We suggested that describing *jaa* + V and *de* + V sequences as "reverse" variants of standard complex predicates might be misleading as there are significant interpretive differences between the two orderings. Given the widely observed grammaticalization of 'go' on a cross-linguistic basis to express mirative readings, it seems plausible that at least the *jaa* + V construction in Hindi has developed independently driven by the directional semantics of *jaa* 'go'.

Our central argument has been that the placement of *de* 'give' and *jaa* 'go' before the lexically more dominant verb leads to interpretive effects which can be traced back to their directional semantics. We have argued that the early placement of *de* 'give' draws

attention to the agent's actions; informally, *de* + V sequences express an agent-initiated action that is unusual or significant in some way. The early placement of *jaa* 'go' highlights the subject's (metaphorical) motion towards an unusual or in some way significant outcome. In this paper, however, we have only started scratching the surface when it comes to semantic aspects of *de* + V and *jaa* + V constructions. We hope, nonetheless, to have shown that these constructions are worth exploring as they can shed further light on verbal stem meaning and processes of complex predicate and event construal. Much more work also remains to be done on the argument and constituent structure of these constructions, as well as their use in context.

References

Abbi, Anvita & Devi Gopalakrishnan. 1991. Semantics of explicator compound verbs in South Asian languages. *Language Sciences* 13(2). 161–180.

Bhatt, Rajesh & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1996. Object shift and specificity: Evidence from ko-phrases in Hindi. In Lise M. Dobrin, Kora Singer & Lisa McNair (eds.), *Proceedings of CLS 32*, 11–22. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Butt, Miriam. 1993. Object specificity and agreement in Hindi/Urdu. In Katharine Beals, Gina Cooke, David Kathman, Sotaro Kita, Karl-Erik McCullough & David Testen (eds.), *Papers from the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, vol. 1, 89–103. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Butt, Miriam. 1995. *The structure of complex predicates in Urdu*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Butt, Miriam. 1997. Interfaces as locus of historical change. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG97 Conference*. University of California, San Diego: CSLI Publications.

Butt, Miriam. 2010. The light verb jungle: Still hacking away. In Brett Baker, Mark Harvey & Mengistu Amberber (eds.), *Complex predicates: Cross-linguistic perspectives on event structure*, 48–78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Butt, Miriam. 2017. Hindi/Urdu and related Languages. In Jessica Coon, Diane Massam & Lisa Demena Travis (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ergativity*, 807–831. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Butt, Miriam & Wilhelm Geuder. 2001. On the (semi)lexical status of light verbs. In Corver Norbert & Riemsdijk Henk van (eds.), *Semi-lexical categories: On the content of function words and the function of content words*, 323–370. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Butt, Miriam & Wilhelm Geuder. 2003. Light verbs in Urdu and grammaticalization. In Eckardt Regine, Heusinger Klaus von & Schwarze Christoph (eds.), *Words in time*, 295–350. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Butt, Miriam & Aditi Lahiri. 2013. Diachronic pertinacity of light verbs. *Lingua* 135. 7–29.

Butt, Miriam & Gillian Ramchand. 2005. Complex aspectual structure in Hindi/Urdu. In Nomi Ertischik-Shir & Tova Rapoport (eds.), *The syntax of aspect*, 117–153. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Das, Pradeep Kumar. 2015. Can compound verb be reversed in Hindi? An inquiry of its form and function. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Linguistics* 8. 37–60.

DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1. 33–52.

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

Dowty, David. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67(3). 547–619.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hook, Peter Edwin. 1973. *The compound verb in Hindi*. University of Pennsylvania PhD dissertation.

Hook, Peter Edwin. 1991. The emergence of perfective aspect in Indo-Aryan languages. In Elizabeth Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. II, 59–89. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hook, Peter Edwin. 1993. Aspectogenesis and the compound verb in Indo-Aryan. In Mahindra K. Verma (ed.), *Complex predicates in South Asian languages*, 97–114. New Delhi: Manohar.

Kachru, Yamuna. 2006. *Hindi*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Masica, Colin P. 1976. *Defining a linguistic area: South Asia*. University of Chicago Press.

Ozarkar, Renuka & Gillian Ramchand. 2018. Structure matching and structure building in Marathi complex predicates. *Journal of South Asian Linguistics* 8(1).

Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the semantics of English: A study in subatomic semantics*. MIT Press.

Poornima, Shakthi. 2012. *Hindi complex predicates at the syntax-semantics interface*. University at Buffalo, State University of New York PhD dissertation. https://arts-sciences.buffalo.edu/content/dam/arts-sciences/linguistics/AlumniDissertations/Poornima%20dissertation.pdf (11 April, 2021).

Poornima, Shakthi & Jean-Pierre Koenig. 2009. Hindi aspectual complex predicates. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, 276–296. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2009/poornima-koenig.pdf (11 April, 2021).

Ross, Daniel. 2016. Going to surprise: The grammaticalization of itive as mirative. In *Cognitive Linguistics in Wroclaw Web Conference*.

Singh, Mona. 1994. *Perfectivity, definiteness, and specificity: A classification of verbal predicates in Hindi*. University of Texas at Austin PhD dissertation.

Singh, Mona. 1998. On the semantics of the perfective aspect. *Natural Language Semantics* 6(2). 171–199.

Slade, Benjamin. 2021. Development of verb-verb complexes in Indo-Aryan. In *Verb-verb complexes in Asian languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vos, Mark de. 2004. Pseudo coordination is not subordination. In Leonie Cornips & Jenny Doetjes (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, vol. 21, 181–192. John Benjamins Publishing Company.