

### **Multiple-marking SVCs: Multiple exponence vs. reduced adverbial clauses**

**Introduction.** The multiple realization of Tense, Mood, and Aspect (TMA) in multiple-marking serial verb constructions (SVCs) presents a challenge for the monoclausal analysis of such constructions, as inflectional morphology is commonly associated with clausal structures. Recently, Rolle (2020) shows that multiple TMA-marking in Degema (Benue-Congo) 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 Wu et al. 2020 on Austronesian; 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 Degema (Benue-Congo), verbs are marked by a set of preverbal subject and post-verbal TMA marker. In SVCs, the position of the object determines the distribution of such markers (Rolle & Kari 2016): If the object occurs in between the two verbs, each verb is marked by its own set of subject and TMA markers (multiple-marking SVCs) (1b). However, if the object is fronted, or omitted, the SVC is marked only once (single-marking SVCs) (1a). As both sets of markers must share their values, Rolle (2020) analyzes multiple TMA-marking in Degema SVCs as an instance of multiple exponence of a single TMA value which follows from morpho-phonological requirements (2).

**Reduced adverbial clauses.** Similarly, Daakaka (Oceanic) exhibits both single and multiple-marking SVCs (Hopperdietzel 2020, von Prince 2015). In contrast to Degema, the distribution of single or multiple TMA-marking is not sensitive to the position of the object nor must the two TMA-markers share their values (though must be semantically compatible) (3). 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 (5). As a result, multiple-marking SVCs do not represent a cross-linguistically uniform phenomenon (cf. Bickerton 1989).

**Mono-clausal prosody.** As structurally reduced adjuncts, multiple-marking SVCs in Daakaka somewhat resemble clause-chaining constructions other languages like Matukar Panau (Oceanic) (Mansfield & Barth 2021; cf. Weisser 2015, Longacre 1986). In such constructions, individual clauses are linked by dependent forms of TMA-markers instead of overt conjunctions (6). However, both types of construction differ 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). As a result, single- and multiple-marking SVCs form a continuum that can be established on the basis of their morphosyntactic and prosodic integration, as summarized in Table 1.

**Outlook.** In our talk, we offer a formal analysis of multi-verb constructions in Daakaka and beyond 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 2011, 2009; Weisser 2015).

## Examples.

- █ DEGEMA  
 a. *ovó nú mi=dúw tá=an?* SINGLE-MARKING SVC  
 who that 1SG=follow go=FACT  
 ‘Who did I go with?’ (Rolle 2020: 214)
- b. *mi=dúw=n óvo mǐ=tá=an?* MULTIPLE-MARKING SVC  
 1SG=follow=FACT who 1SG=go=FACT  
 ‘I went with who?’ (Rolle 2020: 215)
- █ [<sub>CP</sub>C [<sub>IP</sub> I<INFL> [<sub>V1P</sub> V1-INFL [<sub>V2P</sub> V2-INFL]]] MULTIPLE EXPONENCE
- █ 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 REALbe.small  
 ‘Bong cut the tree small.’
- █ *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)
- █ [<sub>CP</sub>C [<sub>IP</sub> I<sub>1</sub> [<sub>V1P</sub> V<sub>1</sub>] [<sub>I2P</sub> I<sub>2</sub> [<sub>V2P</sub> V<sub>2</sub>]]]] REDUCED ADVERBIAL CLAUSE
- █ 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.HAB beach=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)

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

**(Selected) References.** Bickerton, D. 1989. Seselwa Serialization and its significance. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 4(2), 155-183. • Givón, T. 1991. Some substantive issues concerning verb serialization. In C. Lefebvre (ed.), *Serial verbs*, 137-184. Amsterdam: Benjamins. • Harris, A.C. 2017. *Multiple exponence*. Oxford: OUP. • Krifka, M. 2016. Embedding illocutionary acts. In T. Roeper & M. Spaes (eds.), *Recursion*, 59-88. Cham: Springer. • Mansfield, J. & D. Barth. 2021. Clause chaining and the utterance phrase: Syntax–prosody mapping in Matukar Panau. *Open Linguistics* 7(1), 423-447. Miyagawa, S. 2017. *Agreement beyond phi*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Rolle, N. 2020. In support of an OT-DM model. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 38(1), 201-259. • von Prince, K. 2015. *A grammar of Daakaka*. Berlin: de Gruyter. • Selkirk, E. 2011. The syntax-phonology interface. In J. Goldsmith, J. Riggle & A. Yu (eds.), *The handbook of phonological theory*, 485-532. Oxford: Blackwell. • Weisser, P. 2015. *Derived coordination*. Berlin: De Gruyter.