

(2) a. Bir top kaptär-lär asman-da **uch-up#yür-ätt-i**
 one flock pigeon-PL sky-LOC **fly-CNV#LVV-PST.HAB-3s**
 ‘A flock of pigeons are flying around.’ (uig20040324_YK.28)

b. Leken qimet **bol-up # qal-ur-lar**
 but expensive **be-CNV # LVV-AOR.3p**
 ‘But they are expensive.’ (uig1905_kg207-i.21)

3.1.2. Lack of Intervening Material

In LV constructions, intervening material is not allowed between the V_1 and V_2 .

(3) a. U mäyma:l-lar-gha bir kün ash **qoy-up #bär-är-lär**
 PN.DEM guest-PL-DAT one day food **put-cnv #LVV-AOR-3p**
 ‘These guests are entertained all day long’ (uig18920728_tf8.106)

b.* U mäyma:l-lar-gha bir kün ash qoy-up **hazir** bär-är-lär
 PN.DEM guest-PL-DAT one day food put-cnv **now** LVV-AOR-3p
 Intended: ‘These guests are **now** entertained all day long’

3.1.3. Selectional Properties and Case Assignment

LVs do not select NP complements.

(4) a. Müshük yüz-üm-ni **tatili-d-i**
 cat face-POSS1-ACC **scratch-PST.DIR-3s**
 ‘The cat scratched my face.’

b. Män kitab-ni üstäl-gä **qoy-d-um**
 PN1s book-ACC table-DAT **put-PST.DIR-1s**
 ‘I put the book on the table.’

In the light verb use in (4c), only one NP-complement is selected:

c. Yesh-i chong kaptär tumshuq-i bilän päy-lir-i-ni **tatila-p #qoy-d-i**
 age-poss3 big pigeon beak-poss3 with feather-PL-poss3-ACC **scratch-cnv #LVV-PST.DIR-3s**
 ‘The old pigeon scratched its feathers with its beak.’ (uig20040324_YK.60)

In all of our data, the main verb determines selectional properties, while the LV provides aspectual or actional information regarding the event.

3.1.4. Negation

Morphological negation of light verbs is possible: $V_1-(I)p\#V_2-MA-$ as in (5a),
 cf. main verb negation: $V_1-mAy\#V_2$ as in (5b):

(5) a. Äsili **teri-p # baq**-ma-ghan ye: | xam ye:
 before grow-cnv # LVV-NEG-PRTC.PST land | raw land
 ‘The land that is not (yet) cultivated is called raw land.’ (uig19560909_tf2.55)

b. Sen bu yil bughday **teri-may # baq!**
 PN2s this year wheat **grow-cnv.neg #LVV.IMP**
 ‘This year, how about you try *not* growing wheat (for a change)!’ (native speaker elicitation)

Appears to contradict that light verbs should not be able to be negated (Butt 2003), but when light verbs take negative morphology, the scope of negation extends to the whole predicate. Thus, syntactically, Uyghur light verb predicates cannot be negated.

3.2 Prosodic Evaluation: Pauses

Pauses (marked as a pipe | in the examples) are permitted in sequential constructions in Uyghur, but are prohibited between the V_1 and V_2 in an LV construction.

(6) a. Shundaq bixätär qäpiz-im tur-up | roh izdä-p nä-gä bar-i-män?
 in.this.way safe cage-POSS1 stay-cnv | soul find-cnv where-DAT go-PRS-1s
 ‘I am so safe in my cage, where would I go to find out about the soul?’
 (uig20040324_YK.106)

b. Män ganggira-p # qal-d-im
 PN1s freeze-cnv # LVV-PST.DIR-1s
 ‘I (unexpectedly) froze.’ (uig20040324_YK.82)

Our native-speaker investigator reports that (6b) would be ungrammatical with a pause between *gangirap* and *qaldim*.

- The sequential construction in (6a) freely allows for a pause to follow the main V.
- The grammatical sentence in (6b) does not allow a pause in this position

3.3 Semantic Evaluation: Bleaching

The approximately 25 full lexical verbs in Uyghur are semantically bleached when used as LVs. Mostly but not exclusively cross-linguistically typical semantics; some unusual features:

Table 1. Uyghur full V vs. LV semantics

Verb stem	Lexical Verb meaning	examples of LV meanings
<i>baq-</i>	watch, see	try, attempt
<i>tur-</i>	stand	durative
<i>bär-</i>	give	to the benefit of (benefactive)
<i>bol-</i>	become	completed
<i>chiq-</i>	emerge, ascend	resulting in
<i>qoj-</i>	put	completely finished; do quickly

Uyghur verbs share a number of typological properties with light verbs identified in other languages: monoclausality, selectional properties, prosody, negation, and cross-linguistically typical semantic bleaching.

4. Typological irregularities

4.1 Diachronic Stability

Cross-linguistically, light verbs tendentially maintain their morphology, syntax, and semantics over time (Butt 2003, 2010). Sanskrit and Hindi/Urdu provide clear examples of this continuity; do not undergo diachronic change or grammaticalization; the verb 'go' *ga:* appears in the Sanskrit example in (7a), and also in the Modern Urdu example in (7b):

Sanskrit:

- (7) a. tato makṣikoḍḍīya gā-ta
 then fly.fly.GER go-PRTC.PST
 'then the fly flew away' (Pancatsntra 122, from Tikkanen 1987:176)

Modern Urdu:

- b. kabutre oṛ ga-ye
 pigeon.M.PL.NOM fly go-PERF.M.PL
 'The pigeons flew away.' (Butt 2010)

Uyghur provides counterevidence to the claim: morphological erosion and grammaticalization from $V_1-(I)p\#al-$ in (8a) to the modern fused form $V_1-(I)wal-$ as in (8b):

Premodern Uyghur:

- (8) a. Araq-ni öz-ler-i qil-ma-y-du | Xita:y-din set-ib #al-a-du
 liquor-ACC self-PL-POSS3 do-NEG-PRS-3S | China-ABL buy-CNV#LVV-PRS-3S
 'They do not make liquor themselves, they buy it (for their own benefit) from the Chinese'
 (uig18911011_qm17.20)

Modern Uyghur:

- b. U kitab-im-ni el-iwal-d-i (< *al-(I)p al-* 'take (for own benefit)')
 PN3S book-POSS1-ACC buy-CNV.LVV-PST.DIR-3S
 'He took my book (for his own benefit)'

Uyghur LV forms are (contra Butt 2010) *not* diachronically stable, since they do undergo grammaticalization and semantic change. Several Uyghur complex LV predicates have been similarly grammaticalized as affixes.

Table 2. Grammaticized Uyghur LVs

source form	Grammaticized form	Example <i>al-</i> 'take'	Gloss
<i>-(I)p yat-</i> 'lie'	<i>-(I)wat</i>	<i>el-iwat-i-män</i>	'I am taking'
<i>-(I)p al-</i> 'take'	<i>-(I)wal</i>	<i>el-iwal-i-män</i>	'I take for my benefit'
<i>-(I)p bär-</i> 'give'	<i>-(I)wär</i>	<i>el-iwär-i-män</i>	'I continue to take'
<i>-(I)p ät-</i> 'do'	<i>-(I)wät</i>	<i>el-iwät-i-män</i>	'I finish taking'

4.2 Perfectivity

The only other apparent characteristic of Uyghur LVs that does not fit in with the LV literature is the issue of perfectivity. LVs are cross-linguistically associated with perfectivity (Ramchand and Butt 2002, Karimi Doostan 1997, Bowers 2004). The Urdu examples in (9a-b) are both perfective LV constructions (Butt 2010).

Urdu:

- (9) a. nadya=ne xat=ko lik mar-a Perfective
 Nadya.F.SG=ERG letter.M.SG=ACC write hit-PERF.M.SG
 'Nadya dashed off the letter (forcefully).'

- b. nadya=ne xat lik di-ta Perfective
 Nadya.F.SG=ERG letter.M.SG.NOM write give-PERF.M.SG
 'Nadya wrote the letter (for somebody else).' (Butt 2003: 9)

Indeed, many of the verbal LV examples in our Uyghur corpus are perfective, as in (10):

- (10) U bu kitab-ni **kör-üp#bol-ghan** i-d-i
PN3S this book-ACC **see-CNV#LVV-PRTC.PST** X-PST.DIR-3S
'S/he has already read this book.'

However, Uyghur also allows LVs in imperfective clauses as well, both in early modern Uyghur as in (11a), and modern Uyghur as in (11b).

- (11) a. Bu toy-ni shu yosun-da **qil-ip#bär-är-lär**
this wedding-ACC manner-LOC **do-CNV#LVV-AOR-3P**
'The wedding is held in this way' (uig18920728_tf8.110)
- b. Seni äskü adäm-lär tut-up **yä-p # ket-i-du**
PN2S.ACC bad person-PL grab-CNV **eat-CNV# LVV-PRS-3S**
'A bad person may grab and eat you' (uig20040324_YK.135)

Imperfective LV clauses have not commonly been attested crosslinguistically.

4. Implications for the Typology of LVs

We have established that LVs in Uyghur pattern similarly to LVs cross-linguistically in the following ways:

- Monoclausality – single predicate core
- No intervening material between V_i and LV
- No pauses between V_i and LV
- Scope of negation cannot be restricted to LVs (but they may bear morphological negation)
- LVs may not select NP-Complements
- LVs may not assign case
- LVs are semantically bleached compared to their main verb forms

Apparent cross-linguistic anomalies:

- Grammaticization of LVs, hence diachronically unstable
- Presence of imperfective LVs.

References

- Bowern, Claire. 2004. (Some Notes on) Light Verbs and Complex Predicates in Turkic. In Heejeong Ko and Maryanne Walter, eds. *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 46.
- Butt Miriam. 1995. *The structure of complex predicates in Urdu*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Butt Miriam. 2003. The Light Verb Jungle. In G. Aygen, C. Bowern, and C. Quinn (eds.) *Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics* 9: 1-49. Online: <http://edvarda.hf.ntnu.no/ling/tross/Butt.pdf>.
- Butt Miriam. 2010. The Light Verb Jungle: Still hacking away. In Amberber, Mengistu, Brett Baker, and Mark Harvey. *Complex Predicates: Cross-linguistic perspectives on event structure*. Cambridge, 48-78.
- Butt Miriam and Wilhelm Geuder. 2001. On the (semi)lexical status of light verbs. In Norbert Corver and Henk van Riemsdijk, eds. *Semi-lexical categories: the function of content words and the content of function words*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 323–369.
- Dwyer, Arienne. 2010. The Development of Complex Predication in Turkic: Uyghur Light Verbs. Presentation at ILCAA, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, November.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1909 [1954]. *A modern English grammar on historical principles. VI. morphology*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Karimi Doostan, Gholamhossein. 1997. *Light Verb Constructions in Persian*. Ph.D. dissertation, Essex University.
- Mohanani, Tara. 1994. *Argument structure in Hindi*. Chicago: U of Chicago Press.
- Ramchand, Gillian and Miriam Butt. 2002. *Complex aspectual structure in Hindi/Urdu*. Ms., UMIST and Oxford.

Comments welcome to the Uyghur Light Verbs team:

Arienne Dwyer anthlinguist@ku.edu
Gülнар Eziz g925a296@ku.edu
Travis Major tjmajor@ku.edu

Thanks to C.M. Sperberg-McQueen and Jamie Albers for their contributions to the project.