Towards a typology of multiple-marking SVCs

Introduction. The multiple realization of Tense, Mood, Aspect, and Agreement (TMAA) in multiple-marking serial verb constructions (SVCs) presents a challenge for a monoclausal analysis of such constructions, as inflectional morphology is commonly associated with clausal structures. Recently, Wu et al. (2023) show that multiple-marking in Amarasi (Central-Malayo-Polynesian) does not reflect underlying syntactic complexity such as a bi-clausal structure but is instead an instance of multiple exponence of a single TMA category on each verb in a monoclausal one (also Rolle 2020 on Degema, Niger-Congo; cf. Harris 2017, Anderson 2006).

Proposal. Based on existing corpus and novel fieldwork data, we revisit the status of multiple-marking SVCs from the perspective of the Oceanic language Daakaka in this talk. By examining their morphosyntactic and prosodic properties, we demonstrate that multiple-marking SVCs in this language are best analyzed as structurally reduced adverbial clauses, distinct from both monoclausal SVCs and "true" bi-clausal covert coordination. Cross-linguistically, we argue that multiple-marking SVCs are therefore not a uniform phenomenon (cf. Bickerton 1982), which has further implications for the typology of multi-verb constructions.

Multiple exponence. In Amarasi, verbs are marked for subject agreement by prefix that inflects for person and number. TMA is realized by a preverbal particle. In SVCs, all verbs follow a single TMA marker, show full subject agreement concord (1a) and monoclausal negation (1b) (Tan 2024). Note that the distribution of agreement markers is independent of the position of the object, which can either appear in between or after the two verbs, depending on the type of SVC. Based on the morphosyntactic properties of SVCs, Tan (2022) provides an analysis, according to which the two verbs are combined within the extended verbal domain, either via complementation or adjunction (cf. Hopperdietzel 2022). For example, prepositional SVCs adjoin as VP-sized modifiers to an extended VP, lacking an inflectional domain. As agreement prefixes must share their values across all verbs in SVCs, Tan (2022) analyzes multiple-marking SVCs as the multiple exponence of a single agreement feature on each verb (2) (also Wu et al. 2023; cf. Rolle 2020 on Degema).

Reduced adverbial clauses. Daakaka (Oceanic) exhibits both single and multiple-marking SVCs (3) (Hopperdietzel 2020, von Prince 2015). However, while the distribution of single- and multiple-marking is not sensitive to the position of the object, the two preverbal TMA-markers do not need to share their values (though they must be semantically compatible). This is illustrated in (4) where the initial verb is marked for realis while the non-initial verb is marked for irrealis mood, indicating that the result state denoted by the non-initial verb has not been reached yet. Despite the distinct TMA-marking, the non-initial verb does not exhibit full clausal properties as higher structural material, such as subject agreement as well as the assertion marker *ka* in the context of irrealis mood, are infelicitous (cf. Miyagawa 2017, Krifka 2016). Therefore, we argue that multiple-marking SVCs in Daakaka involve the adjunction of a structurally-reduced adverbial clause, of the size of an IP (5). Comparing Daakaka and Amarasi, multiple-marking SVCs therefore do not represent a cross-linguistically uniform phenomenon across Austronesian languages (cf. Bickerton 1989 on Creole languages).

Clause-chaining constructions. As structurally reduced adjuncts, multiple-marking SVCs in Daakaka somewhat resemble clause-chaining constructions (CSCs) in other languages like Matukar Panau (Oceanic) (Mansfield & Barth 2021; cf. Longacre 1986). In such constructions, individual clauses are linked by dependent forms of TMA-markers instead of overt conjunctions (6). Adopting Weisser's (2015) analysis, clause chaining constructions are an instance of derived coordination in which IP-sized adjuncts move from their base-generated position within the VP to a coordinated position right below C. As the IP-adjuncts are in the scope of the matrix I_1 head prior to movement, the dependent marking on non-final verbs follows from feature sharing.

Prosodic integration. Despite both constructions include IP-sized adjuncts, CSCs differ both from Daakaka-type multiple-marking SVCs in their prosodic integration: While Mansfield & Barth (2021) show that each dependent clause in a clause-chaining construction is mapped onto its own clause-level intonational phrase, our pilot study of the prosody of multiple-marking SVCs in Daakaka suggests that both verbs are realized within a monoclausal intonational phrase; a defining property of SVCs cross-linguistically (Givon 1991). In particular, we show that pitch rises related to the right edge of clause-level intonational phrases do not occur in between two verbs of multiple-marking SVCs. Thereby, Daakaka multiple-marking SVCs resemble multiple-marking SVCs in Amarasi, for which Tan (2024, 2022) notes that all verbs are realized within a single intonational domain. As a result, different types of multi-verb constructions form a continuum that can be established based on their morpho-syntactic and prosodic integration, as summarized in Table 1.

Outlook. In our talk, we offer a formal analysis of multi-verb constructions in Daakaka at the morphosyntax/prosody interface that builds on the interaction of the underlying morphosyntactic structural complexity associated with the respective verbs as well as their relative syntactic position within the clause (cf. Selkirk 2009). In particular, we propose that IP-adjuncts in Daakaka are prosodically integrated into the matrix clause due to the absence of a local C head, whereas IP-adjuncts in Matukar Panau end up in a derived position, local to C, triggering a biclausal spell-out (cf. Selkirk 2011 on biclausal prosody of IP-coordination in Japanese).

Examples.

(1) AMARASI

a. *Asu* **of** ***n-pius*** ***na-ʔmaet*** *ʔbibkase* MULTIPLE-MARKING SVCS
dog will 3-bite 3-kill.MET sheep
'Dogs will bite and kill sheep.' (Tan 2024: 82)

b. *Au* ***ka=ʔu-teef*** ***ʔ-ok*** *sin=**fa**.*
1SG.NOM NEG=1SG-meet.MET 1SG-COM.MET 3PL=NEG
'I didn't meet with them.' (Tan 2024: 82)

(2) [CP C [IP **I**<INFL> [V1P [V1P V1-INFL] [V2P V2-INFL]]] MULTIPLE EXPONENCE

(3) DAAKAKA

a. *Bong* ***ma*** *ta* *mwelili-ane* *lee* *ente.* SINGLE-MARKING SVC
Bong REAL cut.INTR be.small-TR tree DEM
'Bong made the tree small by cutting it.

b. *Bong* ***ma*** *te* *(lee* *ente)* ***ma*** *mwelili.* MULTIPLE-MARKING SVC
Bong REAL cut.TR tree DEM REAL be.small
'Bong cut the tree small.'

(4) ***Mwe*** *pyaos* *vyan* *#(ka)* ***we*** *tum~tum-ane* *ar* *an* *[…].* MULTIPLE-MARKING SVC
REAL row go ASR POT RED~be.right-TR place ART
'He rowed straight to the place […].' (von Prince 2015: 318)

(5) [CP C [I1P **I1** [V1P [V1P V1] [I2P **I2** [V2P V2]]]] REDUCED ADVERBIAL CLAUSE

(6) MATUKAR PANAU
i *samer* *pilau-**ma*** *i* *y-a-**ma*** *lul=te* *i* *tor-**ago**.*
3SG sago.leaf put.on-D.HAB 3SG 3SG-go-D.HABbeach=LOC 3SG walk-I.REAL.IPFV
'She puts on her sago leaf, she goes down to the beach, and walks around.'
(Mansfield & Barth 2021: 423)

(7) [CP C [I2P**[**I1P **I1** [V2P **V1]** [I2P [I2 [V2P [V2P V2] <[I1P **I1** [V1P **V1**]>]]]] CLAUSE CHAINING

Table 1: TMA-marking and prosodic properties of various multi-verb constructions

	single-marking SVCs	**multiple-marking SVCs (mult. exp.)**	**multiple-marking SVCs (reduced clause)**	**clause-chaining construction**	**covert coordination**
multiple TMA values	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
distinct TMA values	no	no	yes	yes	yes
independent TMA values	no	no	no	no	yes
bi-clausal prosody	no	no	no	yes	yes

(Sel.) References. Bickerton. 1989. Seselwa Serialization & its significance. *Journal of Pidgin & Creole Languages* 4(2), 155-183. • Harris. 2017. *Multiple exponence*. OUP. • Hopperdietzel. 2022. Talmy's typology in serializing languages. *Glossa* 7, 1-45. • Krifka. 2016. Embedding illocutionary acts. In Roeper & Spaes (eds.), *Recursion*, 59-88. Springer. • Mansfield & Barth. 2021. Clause chaining & the utterance phrase Panau. *Open Linguistics* 7(1), 423-447. • Miyagawa, S. 2017. *Agreement beyond phi*. MIT Press. • von Prince, K. 2015. *A grammar of Daakaka*. de Gruyter. • Selkirk, E. 2011. The syntax-phonology interface. In Goldsmith et al. (eds.), *The handbook of phonological theory*, 485-532. Blackwell. • Tan, T. 2024. Voice and Valency in Amarasi. Harvard University dissertation. • Tan, T. 2022. Three ways to serialise verbs in Amarasi. Talk, Workshop on Field Work (…) in Indonesia. • Weisser, P. 2015. *Derived coordination*. De Gruyter. • Wu et al. 2023. Syntactic vs. morphological verbal concord in Austronesian languages. *Proc TripleAFLA*, 104-118.