

Serial Verb Constructions

A Cross-Linguistic Typology

edited by

ALEXANDRA Y. AIKHENVALD
and

R. M. W. DIXON

Research Centre for Linguistic Typology,
La Trobe University

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Serial Verb Constructions in Mwotlap

Alexandre François

Mwotlap is an Austronesian language of the Oceanic branch, spoken by about 1,800 speakers on Motalava, a small island of the Banks group, north of Vanuatu (François 2001, 2003). Contrary to many languages from the same area—for example, Paamese (Crowley 1987), Ambae (Hyslop 2001), Araki (François 2002)—Mwotlap has almost no traces of serialization between verb phrases (of the type *I'll PUSH you you'll FALL*).¹ The only productive case of verb serialization is of a different pattern, with two or more verbs chained together within a single verb phrase (of the type *I'll PUSH FALL you*). A typical example of this serializing construction can be heard in a famous love song:²

- (1) [lak tēy yoyōñ ēwē] no
 AOR:dance hold be.quiet be.fine me
 'Just dance with me calmly'

Simple though it may be, a sentence like (1) raises a number of issues. What are the relations, both syntactic and semantic, between the four verbs? How do they combine their lexical semantics, their tense–aspect–mood values, their argument structures? How do such constructions compare with other serializing patterns cross-linguistically?

After situating Mwotlap SVCs in their syntactic context (§1), we will describe their structural properties (§2), paying special attention to the sharing of arguments (§3). We will then propose a functional classification of these serial verbs (§4), and end our reflection with a note on multiverb serialization (§5).

¹ To be precise, Mwotlap does possess a type of pauseless parataxis that is reminiscent of the so-called ‘core-layer serialization’, such as *Give me some water I drink it* (François 2003: 188). However, it appears that this construction is limited to a specific TAM context (the second verb must be inflected as aorist) and to a single semantic value (the expression of purpose). Consequently, this structure is probably better described as a case of paratactic subordination involving two distinct clauses, rather than a standard case of verb serialization.

² The spelling conventions adopted for Mwotlap include the following: *e* = [ɛ]; *ē* = [ɪ]; *o* = [ɔ]; *ō* = [ʊ]; *g* = [ɣ]; *b* = [ʷb]; *d* = [ⁿd]; *q* = [kpʷ]; *m̄* = [ŋmʷ]; *n̄* = [ŋ].

1. Clause structure and verb serialization

1.1. A PRELIMINARY NOTE ON WORD CLASSES

The inventory of word classes in Mwotlap makes it possible to distinguish between verbs and adjectives. For example, verbs cannot modify a noun directly, whereas adjectives can: compare *nēt̪mey gom_[ADJ]* ('a sick child') and **nēt̪mey teñ_[vb]* (*'a cry child'). And yet, adjectives and verbs behave exactly the same way outside noun phrases. For example, both categories require TAM markers in order to form a valid predicate phrase, without any copula:

- (2) (a) inti-k me-teñ
child-1sg PER-cry
'My son is crying'
- (b) inti-k mo-gom
child-1sg PER-sick
'My son is sick'

Since the study of serial structures is not concerned with noun phrases, it will be legitimate, for our present purposes, to consider adjectives as forming a subclass of (intransitive, stative) verbs.

1.2. THE STRUCTURE OF THE CLAUSE

The standard order of constituents in Mwotlap is SV for intransitive and AVO for transitive clauses, which is typical of a nominative-accusative system. In the absence of any sort of case-marking, the syntactic function of the core arguments is indicated by their syntactic position. Verbs are either strictly intransitive or strictly transitive, a few being ambivalent (mainly of the S=A type). Mwotlap does not allow for double-object constructions.

Although TAM markers often consist of just a prefix, some of them are discontinuous, combining a prefix and a postclitic, like the Potential *te-...vēh* or the negator *et-...te*. This morphological property makes them a convenient tool to test the boundaries of the verb phrase, as they clearly show which constituents belong inside vs. outside the VP. For instance, in (3) below, the position of *vēh* allows us to distinguish between two distributional word classes, which in English would correspond to the single category of 'adverbs' (*again* and *tomorrow*):

- (3) kōmyō [TE-gen lok se vēH] na-madap talōw le-mtap
2du POT₁-eat back again POT₂ ART-pineapple tomorrow in-morning
'You'll be able to eat pineapple once again tomorrow morning'

Reserving the term 'adverb' for those peripheral complements which always appear outside the VP (e.g. *talōw* 'tomorrow'), we propose the term 'adjunct' (Crowley 1982: 162) to designate those modifiers which belong inside the VP, and

appear immediately after its head (e.g. *lok* ‘back’ and *se* ‘again’); we’ll come back to this notion below.

We now have enough information to state the canonical structure of the sentence in Mwotlap:

{ *subject* [TAM₁ -HEAD *adjuncts* TAM₂]_{VP} *object adverb/oblique* }

Note that the object phrase is always external to the VP, unless we are dealing with an incorporated object (see §2.1).

1.3. THE NATURE OF ADJUNCTS AND THE LIMITS OF SVCS

Rather than a lexical category, the term ‘adjunct’ designates a syntactic position in the clause—that is, any word that appears within a predicate phrase, immediately following its head. Crucially, this position of VP-internal modifier can be lexified by more than one word class. First, Mwotlap possesses a category of ‘pure adjuncts’, which cannot appear anywhere else in the sentence other than that position. These were illustrated in (3), with *lok* and *se*.

But in some cases, the adjunct slot can also be filled by a noun:

- (4) Tigsas kē et-wot *vu* te, kē mo-wot *et*
 Jesus 3sg NEG₁-be.born spirit NEG₂ 3sg PER-be.born person
 ‘Jesus was not born a spirit, he was born a man’

It is also common to find an adjective in the same position:

- (5) Imam ma-hag *qaqa* ēwē l-ēm̄
 Dad PER-sit stupid just in-house
 ‘Dad is just staying idle/idly at home’

And in many cases, the adjunct position is filled by a verb:

- (6) nitog hohole *galgal!*
 PROHIB talk:REDUP lie:REDUP
 ‘Stop lying!’

Following the discussion in §1.1, the description of serial verb constructions will be focused on sentences such as (5) as well as (6).

It is also worth mentioning cases in which the adjunct slot is filled by a word that was formerly a verb, but has now become a pure adjunct:

- (7) nok [tig *day*] bulsal mino
 1sg AOR:stand (*expect*) friend my
 ‘I’m (standing) waiting for my friend’

In a former stage of the language, when *day* could still behave as a verb in its own right, a sentence like (7) would have had to be described as a serial verb construction ('stand wait'), just like (6). But although it has retained certain features typical of verbs—such as a transitive argument structure—the lexeme

day is now restricted to this modifying position, as though it had become a sort of applicative clitic. As it no longer satisfies the definition of a verb—that is, compatibility with the position of head in a verb phrase—it is methodologically necessary to exclude such cases from our synchronic study of serial verbs. We will, however, come back to this issue in the conclusion.

2. Structural properties of Mwotlap SVcs

A serial verb construction can consist of two or more elements; the longest string attested is four verbs. We will start by examining the rules for ‘simple’ serial verbs ($V_1 + V_2$), and will return to multiverb serialization in §5.

The formal properties of Mwotlap SVcs can be stated according to the typological criteria and terminology set out in the first chapter of this book. These are given in Table 1, and will be addressed separately in the following discussion.

2.1. CONTIGUITY

The two verbs forming an SVC must be strictly contiguous, that is, no element can intervene between them, whether this is an object or an oblique phrase. Even ‘pure adjuncts’, which are allowed in the VP, are not normally inserted between two serialized verbs. The only apparent exception to this rule is when the object of V_1 is incorporated. In this case, the object O_1 is suffixed to V_1 , and therefore surfaces between the two verbs, as in:

- (8) nok [suwyeg-*qen* tēy] nu-sus
 1sg AOR:cast-net hold ART-shoes
 ‘I go net-fishing with my shoes on’

This construction—which is very rare anyway—is easily explained if one realizes that the first element in the SVC is not the transitive verb *suwyeg* ‘cast’, but an intransitive, compound verb of the form *suwyeg-qen* /cast-net/ ‘to net-fish’, with an incorporated object. A sentence like (8) is therefore no exception to the rule of strict contiguity between V_1 and V_2 .

TABLE 1. Main structural properties of Mwotlap SVcs

<i>Contiguity V_1/V_2?</i>	Strict contiguity
<i>Wordhood V_1/V_2?</i>	One prosodic word, two phonological words
<i>Symmetry V_1/V_2?</i>	Asymmetrical serial verbs (major + minor)
<i>Tense–aspect–mood, negation</i>	Identical + single-marking
<i>Pluractionality (reduplication)</i>	Non-identical + independent marking
<i>Argument sharing constraints</i>	Fusion rules (2 structures merging into 1)

2.2. ONE OR TWO WORDS?

The two parts of an SVC are so close to each other that it is sometimes tempting to analyse the string $V_1 + V_2$ as an instance of verb compounding. This brings up the issue of wordhood in SVCs: are we dealing with one or two words?

At first sight, several arguments may advocate a one-word analysis. Indeed, V_1 and V_2 are not only strictly contiguous, but they also form a single prosodic unit: for example, *yow veteg* /jump leave/ will have only its final syllable stressed [jɔwβε'tɛγ] and no intonation break, like a single word. Semantically, the whole string $V_1 + V_2$ often ends up being endowed with certain semantic features that can be assigned to neither of its components, as though it now formed a single unit: thus, *yow veteg* /jump leave_{TR}/ means ‘escape from (someone, something)’, without implying any real ‘jumping’ event; *dém veteg* /think leave_{TR}/ is the usual way to translate ‘give up (something), forgive (someone)’. Yet, this is not sufficient evidence to conclude that we are dealing with a single word, as it is common for lexical units to consist of several words.

Another piece of evidence will ultimately prove that SVCs form distinct phonological words. Indeed, the phonotactic rules of Mwotlap make it possible to strictly identify the boundaries of the word. The only syllable pattern allowed in this language (François 2000) has the form CVC (with optional consonants), so that the phonotactic template of any word is #CVC|CVC...|CVC#. Consequently, clusters of two consonants are only allowed across syllable boundaries within a word, and never word-initially. There are two possible outcomes when a lexical root of the form $C_1C_2V^-$ has to be integrated in a sentence:

- if the root is in the position to begin a new syllable (typically after a word boundary), then the sequence # $C_1C_2V^-$ undergoes a vowel epenthesis, whereby a clone of V is inserted between the two consonants: for example /VTEG/ ‘leave’ → *nēk so v̥eteg* ‘you should leave it’;
- conversely, if the same root is preceded by a vowel-final prefix, then the prefix + lexeme string forms a single word. The syllable boundary occurs between C_1 and C_2 , with no need for epenthesis: e.g. /VTEG/ → *nēk te-p̥teg* ‘you will leave it’.

In this pair of examples, the behaviour of the root /VTEG/ with regard to vowel epenthesis makes it clear when we are dealing with a single phonological word (form *te-p̥teg*: hence *te*- ‘Future’ is a prefix) or with two distinct words (form *so v̥eteg*: hence *so* ‘Prospective’ is not a prefix). We can now apply the same phonological test to our serial verbs—provided the first verb ends in a vowel, and the second verb has an underlying CCV- root. If we consider the combination of V_1 /Hō/ ‘paddle, travel in canoe’ with V_2 /VTEG/, the surface form we observe (‘paddle away’) is *hō v̥eteg*, not **hō-p̥teg*: V_1 and V_2 are thus separated by a word boundary, and cannot be said to form a single, compound word. As a conclusion, serial verbs in Mwotlap always remain distinct phonological words, whatever their degree of semantic or prosodic cohesion.

Finally, from the morphological point of view, examples (11a–b) below will show that root reduplication affects independently each element in a serial construction. This is also a strong argument in favour of the conclusion that Mwotlap SVCs fundamentally consist of separate words.

2.3. SHARING VERBAL CATEGORIES

If the serial verbs of Mwotlap were to be compared with other languages, they would probably stand at one end of the typological spectrum, that labelled ‘prototypical serial verbs’ in Chapter 1, and characterized by the highest degree of cohesion between its elements. Indeed, SVCs essentially behave the same as a single lexeme, with regard to almost all the semantic categories that may affect a verb phrase. Thus, all tense–aspect–mood markers are obligatorily shared by V_1 and V_2 , and they are marked only once:

- (9) kēy [to-yoñteg vēglal vēh] na-lñe
 3pl POT₁-hear know POT₂ ART-voice:2sg
 ‘They might recognize your voice’

In (9), the Potential marker *te-vēh* appears once, and is shared by the two verbs; to use the terms of Chapter 1, Mwotlap SVCs are characterized by ‘single marking’ of TAM.

The same observation is true for negative markers, which in this language belong to the TAM paradigm rather than combine with it. Elements of an SVC cannot be negated separately, even if, semantically speaking, only one verb (here V_2 *maymay*) falls under the scope of the negation:

- (10) kōyō may leg, ba [et-leg maymay qete]
 3du COMPL married but NEG₁-married strong NEG₂:COMPL
 ‘They’re already married, but not fully married yet’

There seems to be only one semantic category that is assigned independently to each member of an SVC: this is pluractionality, which is morphologically coded by root reduplication (François 2004b). In the next example, one may contrast different combinations, according to whether V_1 refers to one ‘stoning’ event (*yim*) or to several (*yimyim*); and whether V_2 refers to one death (*mat*) or to several (*matmat*):

- (11) (a) no [mi-yim matmat] ne-men
 1sg PER-stone die:REDUP ART-bird(s)
 ‘I stoned the birds (once) and killed them’
 (b) kem [mi-yimyim mat] ne-men
 1exc:pl PER-stone:REDUP die ART-bird(s)
 ‘We stoned the bird(s) and killed it/them outright’

Finally, another important issue deals with the sharing of argument structures in serial verbs; this will be the topic of §3.

2.4. SYNTACTIC ASYMMETRIES OF V₁/V₂

The properties of Mwotlap SVCs reviewed thus far tend to suggest we are dealing with two verbs V₁ and V₂ placed on the same syntactic level, so that it might be tempting to talk about a non-hierarchized, multiheaded structure. In fact, several arguments show that V₁ and V₂ have a distinct status, and that their combination remains asymmetrical.

First of all, V₁ and V₂ do not have the same inventory. If all verbs are attested in the V₁ slot, it is not true they can all function as V_{±2}: such common verbs as *van* 'go', *vap* 'say', *yōñteg* 'feel', or *dēm* 'think' are attested only as V₁, and never as V₂. In other words, the inventory of verbs that can be serialized, however numerous, appears to constitute a (semi) closed list; the choice of V₂ is clearly not as free as it seems at first.

Among other elements that betray an asymmetry between V₁ and V₂, a handful of verbs show morphological differences according to their position. The verb 'know' has the form *ēglal* when used alone or as a first verb in a series, but becomes *vēglal* in the position of V₂, as in (9). The verb *sok* is reduplicated as *soksok* when used alone or as V₁, but as *sosok* when V₂; similarly, *tēy* 'hold' reduplicates as *tēytēy* if V₁, but *tētēy* if V₂, and so on. These 'SVC specific forms' are seen only in this adjunct position.

The difference between V₁ and V₂ is even more striking if we begin to consider semantics. Quite often, a verb lexeme will keep its proper meaning when it is used as V₁, but will receive a more abstract or figurative interpretation when used as a verb modifier. To take just a couple of examples, *tēy* normally means 'hold in one's hands' when in head position, but has a broader comitative meaning ('be or act *with* someone/something') when it acts as a verb modifier, as in (1) and (8). Similarly, *v(e)teg* as V₁ means 'lay (something) down, take leave of (someone)'; but as V₂, its more abstract meaning 'away from (something/someone)' allows for figurative uses such as 'leave, forget, forgive, surpass' (see §2.2).

All these arguments tend to confirm that the SVCs of Mwotlap, despite apparently forming a balanced string of two verbs V₁+V₂, illustrate in fact what the typological chapter of this book called 'asymmetrical serial verbs', whereby a 'minor verb' from a closed class (adjunct V₂) is being serialized to a 'major verb' from an open class (head V₁).

3. Sharing arguments in Mwotlap SVCs

3.1. BASIC PRINCIPLES

In §2.3, we saw that the SVCs of Mwotlap are characterized by a strong internal cohesion, so that they necessarily share the same value in tense-aspect-mood or in polarity. The issue of argument-sharing is much more complex, and deserves to be examined in detail. It will appear that Mwotlap challenges certain typological statements in this regard.

The principles of our analysis are as follows. While each member of an SVC is lexically endowed with its own underlying argument structure, when serialized they behave exactly like a single verb: in particular, the SVC can have no more than one subject and one object. This raises the question of how the argument structures of the two verbs can conflate so as to form the argument structure of the whole ‘macro-verb’. A systematic study (François 2004a) has shown Mwotlap to follow strict rules in this regard: thus, (13) below will show how the combination of V_1 ‘*x* punch *y*’ and V_2 ‘*y* cry’ regularly results in a transitive macro-verb $V_1 + V_2$ ‘*x* punch-cry *y*’, with the subject of V_2 becoming the object of the serial verb $V_1 + V_2$.

The results of this study can be stated, following a *subject-V-object* convention, with simple formulas of the type: $[x - V_1 - y + y - V_2 = x - [VP] - y]$. These argument-fusion rules can in turn be grouped in a simple chart (Table 2). The two rows state whether V_1 is intransitive ($x - V_1$) or transitive ($x - V_1 - y$); the eight columns not only show the transitivity value of V_2 , but also the identity of arguments involved (x, y, z).³

Due to lack of space, we will not illustrate each of these combinations in detail,⁴ and will only present the major observations with regard to argument sharing rules.

3.2. SUBJECT SHARING PRINCIPLES

As one would expect, it is common for two serialized verbs to share their subject:

- (12) Tita [ta-hag dēyē] nēk l-ēm
 Mum FUT-sit expect 2sg in-house
 ‘Mum will stay at home waiting for you’
 $\rightarrow \{x-V_1 + x-V_2-y = x-[VP]-y\}$

However, subject sharing is not obligatory in Mwotlap. A clear example of this is the case of ‘switch-function serial verbs’, in which V_2 ’s subject coincides with V_1 ’s object:

TABLE 2. The eleven argument-fusion rules for Mwotlap SVCs

	$E-V_2$	$x-V_2$	$y-V_2$	$x-V_{2-y}$	$z-V_2$	$x-V_{2-z}$	$z-V_{2-y}$	$y-V_{2-z}$
$x-V_1$	x-[VP]	x-[VP]	x-[VP]-y	x-[VP]-y				*
$x-V_1-y$	x-[VP]-y	x-[VP]-y	x-[VP]-y	x-[VP]-y	x-[VP]-z	x-[VP]-z	x-[VP]-z	*

³ In these formulas, x designates the subject of V_1 ; y is any second argument distinct from x (either V_1 ’s object, V_2 ’s subject, or V_2 ’s object); finally, z is any third argument distinct from x and y (either V_2 ’s subject or object). The mention of z in a formula is only relevant if it contrasts with both x and y , and therefore, if it follows a transitive V_1 ; hence the hatched areas in the chart. The star means ‘unattested’. As for the first column of the table, see §4.3.

⁴ For those minor patterns which are not exemplified here, see François (2004a).

- (13) Tali [mi-tit] teñteñ] Kevin
 T. PER-punch cry:REDUP K.
 'Tali made Kevin cry by punching him'
 $\rightarrow \{x - V_1 - y + y - V_2 = x - [VP] - y\}$

But Mwotlap shows certain configurations that are typologically even more original than (13). One of these is a variant of what is known as ‘cumulative subject’ (see example (34) in the introductory chapter): if one subject semantically includes the other (in the same way as *we* includes *I*), then the subject of the whole SVC will correspond to the more inclusive of these two subjects. This case is best exemplified by sentences meaning ‘accompany (someone)’, where ‘(x+y)-go + x-take-y’ becomes ‘(x+y) -[accompany]-y’:

- (14) dō [so tatal tēy] no le-tno plēn?
 iinc:du PROSP walk hold 1sg LOC-place plane
 'Will you accompany me to the airport?'
 (lit. Shall *the two of us* walk-and-take me to the airport?)
 $\rightarrow \{(x+y)-V_1 + x-V_2 - y = (x+y)-[VP]-y\}$

Interestingly, this original construction has made its way into the Bislama pidgin spoken on Motalava: the equivalent of (14) would be *yUMITU karem MI i go long eapot?* The people of the neighbouring islands, whose Bislama would be slightly different here (*yu karem MI i go...*), are sometimes amused by this strange dual subject, directly calqued from Mwotlap.

The second configuration we would like to mention here is perhaps even more significant, because it contradicts the claim often made (e.g. Durie 1997: 291) that the elements of an SVC must share at least one argument. In Mwotlap, it is not unusual to serialize two verbs having no participant in common at all. This happens typically when V_1 refers to a single-participant action, and V_2 refers to its effect upon another participant. The output of this combination is a transitive macro-verb—as is made clear by (15) and the corresponding formula:

- (15) ige susu [ma-gayka] matyak] no
 pl small:REDUP PER-shout be.awake 1sg
 'I was woken up by the kids shouting'
 $\rightarrow \{x-V_1 + y-V_2 = x-[VP]-y\}$

Note that in this type of sentence, both verbs are intransitive, as they individually refer to single-participant events: {x – V_1 } the kids were shouting in the back-yard, {y – V_2 } I awoke. Yet the serialization of these two intransitive verbs eventually forms a transitive macro-verb {x – [VP] – y}, as though the action now described were that of an agent ('the kids') upon a patient ('me').

Among other attested combinations, we can mention the following. Note that these examples, whatever the ambiguities of translation, all combine intransitive verbs.

- (16) ne-leñ [mi-yip hal-yak] na-kat
ART-wind PER-blow fly-away ART-cards
'The wind blew the cards away'
- (17) nēk [so en mōkheg] nē-kle!
2sg PROSP lie.down take.rest ART-back:2sg
'You should lie down (so that) your back can rest!'
- (18) nēk [mi-tig mēlēmlēg] na-lo den kemem
2sg PER-stand black ART-sun from 1exc:pl
'Standing as you are, you're hiding the sun from us'
(lit. You're *standing dark* the sun from us)

Incidentally, all the examples (15)–(18) form a subcase of what will later be defined as 'causative serialization' (§4.2; see Table 4). Its difference with mainstream causatives is the intransitive nature of V₁, semantically referring to a single-participant event.

3.3. OBJECT SHARING PRINCIPLES

Similar remarks can be made on the issue of object sharing. Of course, serialized verbs can share their object, as we saw in (9); but it can also happen that each verb possesses its own underlying object. Because Mwotlap does not allow for ditransitive constructions, only one of these two objects can be retained for the whole SVC, and this may result in syntactic conflicts.

The principle is that the last argument introduced by V₂ (*z*) overrules the object of V₁ (*y*); the latter disappears from the argument structure of the SVC, and can only be retrieved from the context. In (19), the object of V₁ *tow* (*n-eh* 'song') is only mentioned in the topic clause:

- (19) nēk so tow n-eh en,
2sg PROSP compose ART-song ANAPH
nēk [tow tataq] na-myōs nōnōm
2sg AOR:compose follow ART-desire your
'(if) you compose a song, you just compose following your fancy'

There is no place for the argument 'song' in the resulting serial structure; the only object retained is the patient of V₂ ('follow your fancy'):

you COMPOSE *song* + you FOLLOW *fancy* = you COMPOSE—FOLLOW *fancy*
that is: {x-V₁-y + x-V₂-z = x-[VP]-z}

An even rarer example of this sort of alchemy is provided by the next sentence:

- (20) ige īney a kēy so lep n-eh en,
(pl) REL SUBORD 3pl PROSP take ART-song ANAPH
nok [se lep] kēy
1sg AOR:sing take 3pl
'Those who want to learn the song, I get them to *learn* it by *singing* it'

The pattern here is as follows:

I SING *song* + they LEARN *song* = I SING—LEARN them
 that is: {x-V₁-y + z-V₂-y = x-[VP]-z}

What is perhaps most striking in all these cases of argument restructuring is their perfect regularity (see Table 2). And, in fact, the tighter the syntactic constraints are, the more efficiently they allow the speaker to forge new combinations, and the hearer to interpret them.

4. A functional classification of Mwotlap SVCs

The previous sections were essentially dedicated to the formal and structural properties of Mwotlap serial verbs; we will now undertake a brief semantic typology of these constructions. Interestingly, this functional classification will turn out to be strongly linked to the formal one, as the three major functional categories of serial verbs we recognize depend on whether the subject of V₂ is the same as V₁ ('concurrent' serialization), whether it is another participant ('causative' serialization), or a whole proposition ('event-argument' serialization).

4.1. CONCURRENT SERIALIZATION

Despite the empirical diversity of serial constructions in Mwotlap, it is possible to identify a first major functional type: this is when V₁ and V₂ refer to two simultaneous facets of a single event, performed by the same subject. This semantic value, which we identify as 'concurrent serialization', encompasses a variety of argument structures, with the only proviso that the subject must be the same for V₁ and for V₂ (*x*). The relevant patterns are listed in Table 3.

An illustration of this functional type would be the following:

- (21) kōyō [ma-tatal] kaka le-mtehal
 3du PER-walk chat LOC-road
 'They were discussing while walking along the road'

See also (6) *hohole galgal* /talk lie/; (9) *yoñteg vēglal* /hear know/; (12) *hag dēyē* /sit expect/; (19) *tow tataq* /compose follow/. Whatever their formal and semantic diversity, all these sentences share one essential property: they show the same participant performing two actions (V₁ and V₂) at once. Quite originally, the

TABLE 3. The five formal subtypes of 'concurrent' serialization

	<i>E-V₂</i>	<i>x-V₂</i>	<i>y-V₂</i>	<i>x-V₂-y</i>	<i>z-V₂</i>	<i>x-V₂-z</i>	<i>z-V₂-y</i>	<i>y-V₂-z</i>
<i>x-V₁</i>	—	x-[VP]	—	x-[VP]-y				*
<i>x-V₁-y</i>	—	x-[VP]-y	—	x-[VP]-y	—	x-[VP]-z	—	*

same-subject serial verbs of Mwotlap always refer to concurrent, complementary facets of a single event, never to successive actions.⁵

Of course, nothing prevents the ‘concurrent’ type from being divided into some secondary functional subtypes, depending on the lexical nature of V₁ and/or of V₂. For example, the combination of any motion verb (V₁) with the adjunct *tēy* ‘hold’ (V₂) translates the notion of ‘carry, bring’:

- (22) Bōybōy [mē-hēw tēy] me na-mtig
 B. PER-descend hold hither ART-coconut
 ‘Boyboy has brought the coconuts down’

More generally, V₁ + *tēy* receives a comitative reading, as in (1) *lak tēy* /dance hold/ ‘dance with (someone)’, or in (8) *suwyeg-qen tēy* /cast-net hold/ ‘go net-fishing with (my shoes on)’. Another kind of comitative—still a case of ‘concurrent’ serialization—can be formed with V₂, *b(i)yin* ‘help, join’:

- (23) dō [so lak *biyin*] kēy?
 iinc:du PROSP dance join 3pl
 ‘Shall we dance with them?’

This broad category of ‘concurrent serial verbs’—V₁ and V₂ being two facets of a single predication, with the same subject—also covers more abstract configurations, such as the comparative. This consists of the combination of a stative V₁ plus a verb we have already discussed (§§2.2 and 2.4), *v(e)teg* ‘put down, leave_{TR}, get away from, surpass’:

- (24) kē [nē-mnay *veteg*] nēk
 3sg STAT-clever leave 2sg
 ‘He’s cleverer than you’ (lit. he’s clever he leaves you behind)

It may seem surprising to group in a single functional category such diverse semantic values as simultaneous action (21), comitative (1, 23), and comparative (24). However, it must be clear that our present objective is not to classify Mwotlap serial verbs according to their translation equivalents in English. Rather, it is to illustrate how a single linguistic device—namely, the mere sequence of two verbs *x – V₁ . . . + x – V₂*—can be powerful enough to consistently encode a wide range of semantic relations, which in other languages would have been formally broken down into many distinct structures (adverbs, prepositions, gerunds or converses, subordinate clauses, etc.).

⁵ The only apparent exception to this statement would be the frequent combination of the verb *van* ‘go’ with a second verb (e.g. *van wēl nu-suk* ‘go buy some sugar’), which indeed has a sequential interpretation. In fact, this sequence of two verbs is not a standard case of SVC: first, because the verb following *van* belongs to the inventory of heads (V₁) rather than of adjuncts (V₂); second, this structure allows the sequence V–V to be separated by a directional, which is strictly forbidden to genuine serial structures.

TABLE 4. The five formal subtypes of ‘causative’ serialization

	<i>E</i> - <i>V</i> ₂	<i>x</i> - <i>V</i> ₂	<i>y</i> - <i>V</i> ₂	<i>x</i> - <i>V</i> ₂ - <i>y</i>	<i>z</i> - <i>V</i> ₂	<i>x</i> - <i>V</i> ₂ - <i>z</i>	<i>z</i> - <i>V</i> ₂ - <i>y</i>	<i>y</i> - <i>V</i> ₂ - <i>z</i>
<i>x</i> - <i>V</i> ₁	—	(<i>x</i> -[VP]- <i>x</i>)	<i>x</i> -[VP]- <i>y</i>	—				*
<i>x</i> - <i>V</i> ₁ - <i>y</i>	—	—	<i>x</i> -[VP]- <i>y</i>	—	<i>x</i> -[VP]- <i>z</i>	—	<i>x</i> -[VP]- <i>z</i>	*

4.2. CAUSATIVE SERIALIZATION

A radically distinct configuration is when *V*₂ refers to the effect of *V*₁ upon a second participant. This serializing pattern is the only way to form causatives in Mwotlap. Here we are not dealing with simultaneous actions any more, but with a cause–effect relationship, which necessarily implies that *V*₁ comes before *V*₂ in time. Once again, this large functional category may encompass several formal structures (Table 4)—the only criterion being that *V*₂’s subject (*y* or *z*) be a participant distinct from *V*₁’s subject (*x*).

The most widespread illustration of causative serialization is the so-called ‘switch-function’ SVC, that is, {*x*-*V*₁-*y* + *y*-*V*₂ = *x*-[VP]-*y*}. It can make use of two dynamic verbs, as we saw in (13) *tit teñteñ* /punch cry/; but most of the time, the second verb *V*₂ is a stative verb or an adjective, as in (11) *yim mat* /stone dead/.

The causative function is not restricted to this standard switch-function pattern. In §3.2, we saw how a cause–effect relationship could be expressed by a sequence of two intransitive verbs, the subject of *V*₂ being absent from the underlying structure of *V*₁; examples such as (16) *yip halyak* /blow fly.away/ may be described as ‘low agency causative serialization’. Finally, a sentence such as (20) *se lep* /sing learn/, despite its structural originality, clearly belongs to the same category of causative serialization.

4.3. EVENT-ARGUMENT SERIALIZATION

The last major functional type that can be identified recalls the role played by English manner adverbs: a stative, intransitive verb *V*₂ constitutes a comment on the first verb *V*₁. The underlying subject of *V*₂ is not an individual participant, but the whole event (abbreviated *E*) corresponding to *V*₁—more precisely, *V*₁ and its arguments. This definition corresponds to two formal subtypes (Table 5).

TABLE 5. The two formal subtypes of ‘event-argument’ serialization

	<i>E</i> - <i>V</i> ₂	<i>x</i> - <i>V</i> ₂	<i>y</i> - <i>V</i> ₂	<i>x</i> - <i>V</i> ₂ - <i>y</i>	<i>z</i> - <i>V</i> ₂	<i>x</i> - <i>V</i> ₂ - <i>z</i>	<i>z</i> - <i>V</i> ₂ - <i>y</i>	<i>y</i> - <i>V</i> ₂ - <i>z</i>
<i>x</i> - <i>V</i> ₁	<i>x</i> -[VP]	—	—	—				*
<i>x</i> - <i>V</i> ₁ - <i>y</i>	<i>x</i> -[VP]- <i>y</i>	—	—	—	—	—	—	*

The first case was illustrated by (1) *lak yoyoñ* /dance quiet/ ‘dance calmly’; (5) *hag qaqa* /sit stupid/ ‘stay idly’; or (10) *leg maymay* /married strong/ ‘be fully married’. The second case involves a transitive V₁:

- (25) na-bago [mi-ñit maymay] na-ñalmal en
 ART-shark PER-bite strong ART-girl ANAPH
 ‘The shark bit viciously (*lit.* bit strong) the girl’
 $\rightarrow \{x\text{-}V_1\text{-}y + e\text{-}V_2 = x\text{-}[VP]\text{-}y\}$

In this sentence, the subject of *mymay* (‘be strong’) is not the shark, let alone its victim; what is meant to be ‘strong’ is event V₁ itself, that is, ‘the shark’s biting the girl’. Formally speaking, one will notice that this sort of serialization always leaves the argument structure of the head intact.

This construction explains why the lexicon of Mwotlap almost lacks manner adverbs (like Eng. *strongly, gently*): this role is played by adjectives in the adjunct position, in the structure we call ‘event-argument serialization’.

5. Multiverb serialization

All the rules we have seen, whether formal or functional, have been illustrated by serial verbs with only two members. The last issue we would like to address concerns multiverb serialization. How can the speaker calculate, say, the argument structure of an SVC with four elements? This problem is easily solved if one remembers that any macro-verb resulting from serialization behaves exactly like a simple verb; it then becomes possible to describe any string of verbs starting from the head (V₁), moving rightwards, and recursively applying the rules defined for any pair of verbs:

$$\{(V_1\text{-}V_2)\text{-}V_3\text{-}V_4\}$$

We will illustrate this principle with two examples.

- (26) key [lañ mat veteg] hōw nō-lōmgep en
 3pl AOR:beat die leave down ART-boy ANAPH
 ‘They got rid of the boy by beating him to death’

The first combination is a CAUSATIVE SVC, *lañ mat* /beat die/ ‘beat to death, kill’:

$$\{they\text{-}beat\text{-}boy + boy\text{-}dead = they\text{-}(kill)\text{-}boy\}$$

This macro-verb is then incorporated into a CONCURRENT SVC, *lañ-mat veteg* / (kill) leave_{TR} / ‘get rid of (someone) by killing him’, which forms a transitive ‘super-macroverb’:

$$\{they\text{-}(kill)\text{-}boy + they\text{-}leave\text{-}boy = they\text{-}(get.rid.of)\text{-}boy\}$$

Finally, we can now fully analyse the complex example in the first page of this chapter:

- (1) [lak tēy yoyōñ ēwē] no
 AOR:dance hold be.quiet be.fine me
 'Just dance with me calmly'

This string of four verbs must be analysed step by step. The intransitive verb V_1 'dance' and the transitive V_2 'hold' together form a case of CONCURRENT SVC; the result is a transitive verb with a comitative reading:

$$\{you\text{-dance} + you\text{-hold}\text{-me} = you\text{-(dance.with)\text{-me}}\}$$

In a second stage, this macro-verb is embedded in two successive EVENT-ARGUMENT SVCs, which leave its argument structure intact:

$$\{you\text{-(dance.with)\text{-me}} + it\text{-is.quiet} = you\text{-(dance.calmly.with)\text{-me}}\}$$

$$\{you\text{-(dance.calmly.with)\text{-me}} + it\text{-is.fine} = you - (just.dance.calmly.with)\text{-me}\}$$

The pronoun *no* in (1) is both the object of V_2 'hold' and the object of the whole serial verb construction, which ultimately behaves as a single verb.

The general tendency, as illustrated in this example, is for event-argument SVCs to occur towards the end of the VP—that is, they form the final steps in the chronology of multiverb serialization. The two other types of SVCs are typically met at the beginning of a serial string, with both orders attested equally: either Causative embedded in Concurrent (26), or the reverse.

6. Conclusion

Verb serialization is perhaps one of the domains of Mwotlap grammar which are the most productive and subject to historical change. Certain unattested combinations may one day come to light, while other sequences will eventually disappear; some verbs acquire novel properties according to their position as a head or an 'adjunct'; some lexemes even progressively change their categorial status and specialize in the function of modifier, either grammaticalizing as a valency-increasing applicative, or simply becoming some sort of adverb, a new building block for phraseological innovation. But paradoxically, although this evolution derives intricately from the formal and functional properties of verb serialization, methodological concerns make it difficult to integrate them into the description of 'serial verbs' strictly speaking (§1.3).

Language typology tends to focus more on 'universal' word classes such as verbs, at the risk of leaving certain language-specific categories undescribed, like the one we called 'adjuncts' in Mwotlap. And yet, studying this rich class of verb modifiers, many of which originally come from verbs in former SVC patterns,

would logically constitute the next step in the description of Mwotlap verb serialization.

References

- BRIL, I. and OZANNE-RIVIERRE, F (eds.) 2004. *Complex predicates in Oceanic languages: Studies in the dynamics of binding and boundness*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- CROWLEY, T. 1982. *The Paamese language of Vanuatu*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- 1987. 'Serial verbs in Paamese', *Studies in Language* 11.35–84.
- DURIE, M. 1997. 'Grammatical structures in verb serialization', pp. 289–354 of *Complex Predicates*, edited by A. Alsina, J. Bresnan, and P. Sells. Stanford: CSLI.
- FRANÇOIS, A. 2000. 'Vowel shifting and cloning in Motlav: historical explanation vs. formal description', pp. 49–68 of *Proceedings of AFLA 7 (The Seventh Meeting of Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association)*, edited by M. Klamer. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit.
- 2001. *Contraintes de structures et liberté dans la construction du discours. Une description du mwotlap, langue océanienne du Vanuatu*. Ph.D. thesis, Université Paris-IV-Sorbonne.
- 2002. *Araki: A disappearing language of Vanuatu*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- 2003. *La sémantique du prédicat en mwotlap (Vanuatu)*. Collection Linguistique de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, 84. Leuven, Paris: Peeters.
- 2004a. 'Chains of freedom: Constraints and creativity in the macro-verb strategies of Mwotlap', in I. Bril and F. Ozanne-Rivierre (2004), pp. 107–43.
- 2004b. 'La réduplication en mwotlap : les paradoxes du fractionnement', pp. 177–94 of *Les langues austronésiennes*, edited by E. Zeitoun. *Faits de langues* n°24. Paris: Ophrys.
- HYSLOP, C. 2001. *The Lolovoli dialect of the North-East Ambae language, Vanuatu*. Pacific Linguistics, 515. Canberra: Australian National University.