京都大学言語学研究 (*Kyoto University Linguistic Research*) **39** (2020), 93–136

Serial verbs and monoclausality: A case study on Jinghpaw

Keita Kurabe

Abstract: Serial verbs are a prominent feature of many Southeast Asian languages. One of the central questions associated with serial verbs pertains to their clausehood: Are they monoclausal constructions with a single predicate character, or multiclausal constructions like coordinate and subordinate sentences? The aim of this paper is to address this question based on data from Jinghpaw, a Tibeto-Burman language spoken in and around northern Myanmar, with a special focus on sequential serial verbs. This paper shows that they are monoclausal constructions by comparing them with a chain of clauses in terms of intonation, contiguity, number of component verbs, sharing of grammatical and semantic categories, volitionality matching, argument sharing, yes-answers to questions, bridging constructions, and causation. This paper shows that many of these properties work together to characterize serial verbs as monoclausal despite their superficial similarities to other multiclausal constructions.

Key words: serial verbs, clausehood, monoclausality, Jinghpaw, Tibeto-Burman

1 Introduction

A series of multiple verbs that "act together as a single predicate, without any overt marker of coordination, subordination, or syntactic dependency of any other sort" is known under the rubric of serial verb constructions (SVCs), or serial verbs for short (Aikhenvald 2006: 1). Serial verbs, especially prevalent in the genetically and typologically diverse languages of East and Southeast Asia, Oceania, West Africa, and Creoles, have received significant attention from researchers in linguistics. Raising many empirical questions, they have been extensively studied from various perspectives such as wordhood, transitivity, valency, tense-aspect-mood, eventhood, iconicity, grammaticalization, and dif-

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 157th Meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan held at Kyoto University, Japan, November 17–18, 2018. I would like to express my gratitude to the two anonymous reviewers of this paper for their helpful comments and suggestions. Any remaining errors are my own. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP17H04523 and JP20K13024.

fusibility (Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006, Aikhenvald 2018a, 2018b, and the references therein). One of the central questions surrounding serial verbs concerns their clausehood: Are they monoclausal constructions with a single predicate character, or multiclausal constructions like coordinate and subordinate sentences (Foley and Olson 1985, Durie 1997, Aikhenvald 2006, 2018b, Cleary-Kemp 2015: 116–26, among others)?

This paper aims to address the clausehood of serial verb constructions in Jinghpaw, a Tibeto-Burman language spoken in northern Myanmar and adjacent areas of China and India. As is typical in other languages of mainland Southeast Asia, serial verbs are one of the prominent features of Jinghpaw grammar in terms of their high frequency and functional load. Serial verbs in Jinghpaw are of great relevance to studies in clausehood and verb serialization since, as monoclausal constructions, they exhibit a number of differentiating properties that distinguish them from their multiclausally rephrased equivalents. However, there have been very few prior studies that systematically investigated serial verbs in this language, let alone their clausehood. Given this context, this paper explores serial verbs in Jinghpaw with a special focus on their monoclausality, drawing on first-hand data gathered through original fieldwork in northern Myanmar. As such, the present paper is laid out as follows. Section 2, as a point of departure, provides a brief account of serial verbs in Jinghpaw in terms of their components, contiguity, wordhood, productivity, transitivity, subtypes, and paraphrasing. Following this, Section 3 addresses the clausehood of serial verbs by comparing them with their paraphrased multiclausal counterparts in terms of intonation (§3.1), contiguity (§3.2), number of verbs involved (§3.3), sharing of aspect, polarity, temporal setting, and adverbials (§3.4), volitionality matching (§3.5), argument sharing (§3.6), yes-answers to questions (§3.7), bridging constructions (§3.8), and causation (§3.9). All of these properties differentiate serial verbs from multiclausal constructions. Indeed, many of them work in conjunction to characterize serial verbs as monoclausal constructions. The final section (§4) summarizes the main findings of the paper. In the remainder of this section, we will offer an account of the data used in this paper, followed by a brief profile of Jinghpaw and its speakers, and an overview of prior studies of serial verbs in this language.

All data presented in this paper, except those taken based on elicitation, were drawn from a corpus of more than 1,980 transcribed, naturalistic narrative texts. These data were collected by the author and speech community members in northern Myanmar based on a community-based collaborative language documentation project, conducted especially between 2016 and 2020 (see Kurabe and Lu Awng to appear). As of 2020, we had gath-

ered audio recordings of more than 2,700 stories, many of them traditional folktales. At present, we have transcribed 1,984 stories, on which this paper is largely based. Audio recordings for 2,754 stories with transcriptions have been archived with PARADISEC, and are currently available there (Kurabe 2013, 2017). Each example in this paper is given an ID based on its label in the collection (e.g., KK1-0001).

Jinghpaw speakers traditionally inhabit upland areas across the political boundaries of the modern nation states of Myanmar, China, and India. Most speakers of the language today live in northern Myanmar. Their language belongs to the Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpaw branch within Tibeto-Burman and has a special relationship with the Luish languages, spoken by a small population dwelling in discontinuous pockets situated across Myanmar, Bangladesh, and India. Jinghpaw speakers, as is typical of highlanders in mainland Southeast Asia, live in a socioculturally dynamic and multilingual environment in contrast to lowlanders such as the Burmese, who live in more or less homogenous societies with less linguistic diversity (see Enfield and Comrie 2015 for an overview). Of particular relevance is the fact that Jinghpaw serves as a lingua franca among the Kachin people, who are linguistically diverse people speaking several mutually unintelligible Tibeto-Burman languages. Despite their internal linguistic diversity, the Kachin people form more or less a sociocultural complex with a number of shared cultural traits such as the Kachin marriage alliance system (see Kurabe, in press).

In terms of typology, Jinghpaw is a syllable-tone language with four contrastive tones maximally realized in smooth (sonorant-final) syllables and two in checked (stop-final) syllables. Its morphology is predominantly analytic and agglutinative. Morphological processes in the language include compounding, reduplication, affixation, and conversion. Its major word classes are nouns, verbs, adverbs, particles, and interjections. Verbs, based on their valency, can be categorized as intransitive, monotransitive, ditransitive, or ambitransitive. Jinghpaw, as is the case with the vast majority of Tibeto-Burman languages, is a verb-final language in which a verb or a string of verbs is placed at the end of a given clause. In terms of its locus type, the language has dependent marking both at the clausal and NP level. The alignment of case marking exhibits a nominative-accusative pattern with differential object marking, where the S and A arguments occur without any overt case marker in contrast to the P argument, which is marked by accusative case when there is a possibility that it may be misconstrued with the A argument. As with the other languages of mainland Southeast Asia, Jinghpaw makes heavy use of serial verbs as a means to encode consecutivity, simultaneity, purpose, and so forth (see §2.2).

Despite their great relevance to grammar, prior studies of serial verbs in Jinghpaw are rather scarce. Hanson's 1896 grammar, one of the earliest studies of the language, did not touch on issues related to serial verbs although his publications on and in the language are full of them. The same holds even for recent linguistics-oriented studies, such as that of Liu (ed.) (1984), whose accounts are brief with only a few examples (pp.79–81), and Dai and Xu (1992), who provide no mention of the construction. Dai (1998), repeated in Dai (2012: 348–57), on the other hand, addresses issues of the classification, paraphrasing, and grammaticalization of serial verbs (see relevant sections below). Matisoff (1974) and Kurabe (2010) also provide some discussion of serial verbs with a special focus on their diachronic development, pointing out the general tendency whereby preceding verbs tend to be de-verbalized into adverbs in contrast to following verbs, which tend to be grammaticalized into auxiliaries (see also §2.2).

2 Serial verbs in Jinghpaw

As is typical in other neighboring mainland Southeast Asian languages, serial verbs are a prominent feature of Jinghpaw grammar in terms of a high frequency of occurrence and functional load. As a point of departure, this section sets out to provide a brief descriptive account of serial verbs in the language in terms of their general properties (§2.1), subtypes (§2.2), and paraphrasing (§2.3). This paper follows the definition of serial verbs established by Aikhenvald (2006) given in §1. (See Haspelmath 2016 for another perspective on the definition of serial verbs.)

2.1 Components, contiguity, wordhood, and transitivity

Serial verbs are constructions that involve more than one verb. Each component verb, by definition, should be able to occur on its own as a main predicate of a clause (Cleary-Kemp 2015: 102–5, Haspelmath 2016: 302–4). To illustrate , consider first the following example of a typical serial verb construction in Jinghpaw, wherein two component verbs 'catch' and 'eat' are serialized with no mark of syntactic dependency. Throughout this paper, serial verb components are indicated in bold. The first verb in serialization is labelled V_1 and the subsequent verb V_2.

(1) ɕánthe=gò dùmsu=ni=phé?=mùŋ **rìm** **ɕá**=?ay.
3pl=TOP cattle=PL=ACC=also catch eat=DECL
'They (wolves) also caught and ate cattle.' (KK1-0770)

Each component verb in the serialization can stand alone as a sole verb in a clause. Its main verbhood is illustrated by examples such as (2) and (3) below. A comparison of the three examples (1–3) demonstrates that verbs undergo no semantic or morphophonological change when used in serialization.

(2) ʔnyaw=gò yú=mùŋ rìm=ʔay.
cat=TOP rat=also catch=DECL
'The cat also caught the rat.' (KK1-0221)

(3) gəlaŋ=gò ʔù=phéʔ ɕá=ʔay.
hawk=TOP fowl=ACC eat=DECL
'The hawk ate the fowl. (KK1-1449)

In terms of the contiguity parameter, serial verbs in Jinghpaw, as is typical in other neighboring verb-final languages, are strictly contiguous: No syntactic elements may be interposed between the component verbs, as illustrated by (1) above and (4) below. Due to this requirement, all arguments of subsequent verbs (e.g., 'dragon' below) must be realized before the whole string of verbs (see §3.2 for more details).

(4) day bərèn=phéʔ yòŋ **sa yu**=ʔay=dàʔ.
that dragon=ACC all go see=DECL=HS
'Everyone went and saw that dragon.' (KK1-0810)

Typological studies show that verbs that make up a serial verb may constitute one or more words. Both multi- and single-word serial verbs prevail in the world's languages (Aikhenvald 2006: 37–9, 2018b: 93–9, and references therein). The wordhood of serialized components in Jinghpaw is not easily determinable due to the lack of morphophonological processes specific to all types of compounds. Serial verbs, however, seem to be formed by a syntactic rather than morphological process, given that verb serialization is fully productive and transparent in meaning. Their high productivity and compositionality also suggest that serial verbs are not exhaustively stored in the mental lexicon. The semantic predictability of serial verbs is illustrated by (1) and (4). Additional examples are illustrated by (5), which contains two separate serial verbs indicated in bold (i.e., 'go tear' and 'sit eat').

(5) bàynam ləŋây=phéʔ **sa ʔəɕèp**=ná **duŋ ɕá**=màt=ʔay=dàʔ.
goat one=ACC go tear=SEQ sit eat=COMPL=DECL=HS
'(The tiger) came and tore one goat apart and sat down and ate it.' (KK1-1596)

Serial verbs consisting of two verbs, as illustrated above and elsewhere, are the most common type of serial verb constructions in Jinghpaw. Verb serialization can also consist of more than just two independent verbs. Consider (6), for example, which involves three component verbs. The sequence of verbs, as in other cases, occurs without any overt marker for encoding syntactic dependency (for the number of component verbs, see §3.3 below).

(6) ɕán=gò kəwá-ɕəloŋ=kó? **sa duŋ jəthà**=ʔay.
2du=TOP bamboo-bush=LOC go sit chat=DECL
'The two of them went to the bamboo bushes, sat down, and chatted there.' (KK1-1319)

There are no restrictions in terms of the transitivity of component verbs, as illustrated by the following combinations of transitives and intransitives in serialization. The whole serial verb is intransitive when it only consists of intransitives, while the construction is transitive when it contains at least one transitive (see §3.6 for a related discussion with respect to argument sharing).

(7) Vi-Vi
[nday gəlaŋ **si khràt**=ʔay] ɕərà=kó? məti gəbà ləŋây tu=wà...
this hawk die fall=NMLZ place=LOC mushroom big one grow=VEN
'A large mushroom grew at the place where this hawk died and fell...' (KK1-0157)

(8) Vt-Vt
[maŋ-ɕá-gəlaŋ=phé? **gàp sàt**=dàt=ʔay] ɕəlóy...
body-eat-hawk=ACC shoot kill=away=NMLZ when
'When (he) shot and killed that corpse-eating hawk...' (KK1-0698)

(9) Vi-Vt
gənù=gò gəɕà=phé? **sa ʔəphúm**=ná khràp=ʔay=dà?.
mother=TOP child=ACC go embrace=SEQ cry=DECL=HS
'The mother went to her son and held him and cried.' (KK1-1632)

(10) Vt-Vi
ɕi=gò thó gəgà=dè? **woy phroŋ**=màt=ʔay=dà?.
3sg=TOP that other=ALL lead escape=COMPL=DECL=HS
'She led (the children) and ran away in the other direction.' (KK1-0120)

2.2 Types of serial verbs

Serial verbs in Jinghpaw have internal varieties. In this paper, we limit the scope of our discussion to sequential serial verbs, which are symmetrical and describe successively occurring events. We adopt this limitation because (a) they are the most common type of serial verbs in the language, and (b) subtypes of serial verbs do not always behave in the same way (see below). In this section and §2.3, however, we provide a brief account of all serial verb types in the language in order to situate the sequential type within the overall context of the grammar of serial verbs.

Serial verbs can be divided into two broad types in terms of the parameter of symmetricality (Aikhenvald 2006: 21–37, 2018b: 55–91). The symmetrical serial verb combines two or more verbs from unrestricted semantic types, while the asymmetrical serial verb includes a verb chosen from a closed semantic class, which specifies categories such as aspect, mood, and phasal meanings. Symmetrical serial verbs in Jinghpaw, as we have already seen, typically depict a succession of interconnected events, which we will refer to as *sequential* serial verbs. The order of serialized verbs is always iconic, following the temporal order of events, where the event denoted by V_1 occurs prior to that described by V_2. Many examples can be rendered into English with the conjunction "and", although serial verbs and rephrased multiclausal constructions are not identical to each other (see §3). An additional example is given below, where the two subevents of flying and sitting are understood as having happened successively.

(11) ŋa-rèm-ʔù=gò day phərá ǹtsa=kóʔ **pyen duŋ**=ná...
cow-tend-bird=TOP that pagoda above=LOC fly sit=SEQ
'The black-collared starling flew and perched on the pagoda and...' (KK1-1657)

Component verbs in sequential serial verbs sometimes assume semantic relationships such as *means* (12) and *cause-effect* (13). To illustrate, consider (12), where V_1 can be interpreted as the means of V_2:

(12) nday gənaw=ni=phéʔ **gəbyèʔ sàt**=ʔay.
this brother=PL=ACC trample kill=DECL
'(The bull) killed these (frog) brothers by trampling them.' (KK1-1044)

and (13), where V_2 depicts the effect of V_1. Note that these terms are intended merely as convenient labels based on semantic relationships coded by serialization. There are no clear-cut boundaries between these semantic subtypes. Examples such as (11)–(13) are

collectively referred to as *sequential* serial verbs in this paper.

(13) naŋ ləmaná **khrù si**=ŋà=yàŋ...
2sg if burn die=CONT=when
'If you were burnt to death...' (KK1-0667)

Symmetrical serial verbs can also describe simultaneously occurring subevents, related by verb serialization. The temporal iconicity of component order does not always hold. Recurrent semantic relationships holding between component verbs include *concomitance* and *manner*. These examples are collectively referred to as *simultaneous* serial verbs. Concomitant serialization describes events where the subevent depicted by V_1 is concurrent with that described by V_2. This is illustrated by the following directional serial verb, where V_2 contributes information about the direction in which V_1 is performed.

(14) [ŋay báy ʔwâ=phéʔ **gun sa** rà=na] rê.
1sg again father=ACC carry go need=NMLZ COP
'I will have to go (into the mountain) carrying my father again.' (KK1-0132)

In manner serialization, V_1 describes the manner in which the action described by V_2 is performed. V_1 is often rendered into English with manner adverbs. Examples include:

(15) day khokhám-wáŋ kətà=dèʔ **ləgyím ʨàŋ**=ná...
that king-enclosure inside=ALL conceal enter=SEQ
'He sneaked into the Royal Palace secretly and...' (KK1-0794)

Asymmetrical serial verbs are also attested in Jinghpaw. One recurrent type is a serial verb that acquires a purpose reading. In these *purposive* serial verbs, V_1 describes the purpose of V_2. The component order, as such, does not follow the temporal iconicity: The event described by V_1 is subsequent to that depicted by V_2. Purposive serial verbs are asymmetrical in that V_2 is drawn from a restricted set of intransitive motion verbs, especially the motion verb *sa* 'go, come'. Examples include:[1]

(16) məkhòn-gəʨà=ni ləphó **thàʔ sa**=ʔay=dàʔ.
girl-child=PL banana.leaf pick go=DECL=HS
'The girls went to pick up banana leaves.' (KK1-1121)

[1] It is sometimes ambiguous whether the readings of serial verbs ought to be categorized as purposive or sequential. Example (16) can also be interpreted as a sequential serial verb (i.e., 'The girls picked up banana leaves and went.')

Serialized verbs may also have the predicate-argument relationship, where V_1 is an argument of V_2.[2] This type of serial verb is asymmetrical in that the verbs that can occur as V_2 are chosen from a subset of complement-taking verbs. Both an intransitive (17) and transitive (18) may occur as V_2.

(17) tawkók=gò... lam **khom ləʔnyàn**=ná=ɕèʔ...
turtle=TOP road walk be.slow=SEQ=then
'The turtle was slow to walk and...' (KK1-0571)

(18) naŋ=ná bùŋlì=phéʔ **gəlo gərum**=ʔay.
2sg=GEN work=ACC do help=DECL
'(He) helped (you) do your job.' (KK1-0124)

The following (19) and (20) summarize verbs attested in our data that can occur as V_2 in this type of serialization.

(19) Intransitives
lòy 'be easy', *yàk* 'be difficult', *ləʔnyàn* 'be slow', *ləwan* 'be fast', *lóʔ* 'be many', *gəja* 'be good', *may* 'be good', *kam* 'be willing', *jin* 'be tired', *gúy* 'be brave', *wam* 'be brave', *phaŋ-khràt* 'be late', *thùm* 'be ended', *ləgòn* 'be lazy', *máʔ* 'be exhausted', *ɕút* 'err', *pyo* 'be happy', *giŋ* 'be worth', *thúk* 'fit'

(20) Transitives
dúm 'feel', *gəlo* 'do', *gərum* 'help', *jəkhrìŋ* 'stop', *ràʔ* 'like', *ɕəróŋ* 'like', *ɕəkùt* 'persist', *nìŋkhàp* 'oppose', *ce* 'know', *ɕərín* 'teach', *dàŋ* 'win', *ɕàŋ-lóm* 'participate', *phaŋ* 'begin', *ŋút* 'finish', *ɕəkréʔ* 'bring to a close', *khrìt* 'fear', *rà* 'need', *lù* 'get', *mó* 'intend'

Serialization types, as demonstrated by Solnit (2006: 155–6) for Eastern Kayah Li, can be combined into a larger structure. Jinghpaw illustrates both right- and left-nesting. For example, consider *jóm rìm sàt* (lit. join.force-catch-kill) 'catch and kill together', which illustrates a simultaneous serial verb whose second member 'catch kill' is a sequential type (i.e., [V [V V]$_{\text{SEQ}}$]$_{\text{SIM}}$), and *tam ɕá sa* (lit. seek-eat-go) 'go to find and eat', which is a purposive serial verb whose first member 'seek eat' is a sequential type

[2] This type of serialization is counted as a serial verb construction in the framework set out by Aikhenvald (2006, 2018b). By contrast, Haspelmath (2016), who adopts a narrow definition of serial verbs, does not treat any example exhibiting predicate-argument relation as a type of serial verb constructions.

(i.e., [[V V]$_{\text{SEQ}}$ V]$_{\text{PURP}}$). A more complex example *jóm tsun ɕəkùt rà* (lit. join.force-say-work.hard-need) 'need to do our best to advocate together' can be decomposed, similarly, as consisting of a simultaneous type 'say together' embedded inside two serial verbs with the predicate-argument relationship (i.e., [[[V V] V] V]). Additional examples include:

(21) Combination of serial verbs

a.	[wà [ʔəbyen phòʔ]]	(lit. return-hit-open)	'return and hit s.t. open'
b.	[sa [mənà khom]]	(lit. go-be.crazy-walk)	'go and walk crazily'
c.	[sa [phay gərum]]	(lit. go-carry-help)	'go and help carrying'
d.	[makoy [ɕədu ɕá]]	(lit. hide-cook-eat)	'make and eat s.t. hidden'
e.	[[gəwá sàt] ɕá]	(lit. bite-kill-eat)	'bite s.t. to death and eat'
f.	[[gəbày ɕəpyen] baŋ]	(lit. throw-release-put)	'throw away s.t. into'
g.	[[sa mənàm] may]	(lit. go-visit-be.good)	'be good to go and visit'
h.	[[ɕədu ɕərín] sa]	(lit. cook-learn-go)	'go to learn to cook'
i.	[[sa [rìm ɕá]] khyén]	(lit. go-catch-eat-prepare)	'prepare to go and catch and eat'

A final point associated with asymmetrical serial verbs is decategorization. In many serializing languages, asymmetrical serial verbs can convey a wide range of grammatical meanings, including aspectual, comparative, and superlative meanings. They can also be used as valency-increasing or -decreasing mechanisms (Aikhenvald 2006: 22–8, 2018b). Diachronically speaking, this also holds for Jinghpaw serial verbs (Matisoff 1974, Kurabe 2010). For example, many aspect markers have their diachronic sources in serial verbs (22a–d, below). Comparative and superlative markers also have their sources in verbs in serialization (22e–f). Valency-increasing and -decreasing markers also go back to grammaticalized verbs in serialization (22g–j). These examples, however, are not counted as serial verbs in this paper because they have already shifted to de-verbal adverbs or auxiliaries, thus losing the properties of genuine verbs such as negatability (see Kurabe 2010).

(22) Decategorization of serial verbs

a.	'lie down'	>	'CONT'	f.	'be fulfilled'	>	'SUPER'
b.	'be lost'	>	'COMPL'	g.	'dispatch'	>	'CAUS'
c.	'put'	>	'RES'	h.	'give'	>	'BENEFACTIVE APPL'
d.	'see'	>	'EXP'	i.	'accompany'	>	'COMITATIVE APPL'
e.	'exceed'	>	'more'	j.	'meet'	>	'PASS'

2.3 Paraphrasing serial verbs

In serializing languages, it is often the case that serial verbs can be paraphrased by means of multiclausal constructions (Matisoff 1969: 72–4, Foley and Olson 1985: 18–22, Sawada 1988: 79–81, 2017: 192–3, 174–6, Enfield 2008: 105–6). The same, as shown by Dai (2012: 356), holds for serial verbs in Jinghpaw. The sequential serial verb can be paraphrased multiclausally by means of the sequential subordinator *=ná* ∼ *ǹná* 'and', which forms a sequential subordinate clause. Compare, for example, the serial verb (23a) with its biclausal equivalent (23b).

(23) a. məcà̱ day=ni=gò day nàmpan=phé? **sa mənam**=?ay.
person that=PL=TOP that flower=ACC go smell=DECL
'Those people went and smelled the flower.' (KK1-0474)

b. məcà̱ day=ni=gò day nàmpan=phé? sa=ná mənam=?ay.
person that=PL=TOP that flower=ACC go=SEQ smell=DECL
'The people went and smelled the flower.' (Elicited)

The paraphrasing strategy is applicable irrespective of the number of component verbs. Compare:

(24) a. ?ù=phé? mù=jaŋ **gàp sàt cá̱** =?ay.
bird=ACC see=when shoot kill eat=DECL
'When (they) found birds, (they) shot and killed and ate (them.)' (KK1-0939)

b. ?ù=phé? mù=jaŋ gàp=ná sàt=ná cá̱=?ay.
bird=ACC see=when shoot=SEQ kill=SEQ eat=DECL
'When (they) found birds, (they) shot and killed and ate (them.)' (Elicited)

The simultaneous serialization can be paraphrased by means of simultaneous subordinators such as *=lèt* 'while'. Relevant examples follow:

(25) a. ləgát-phún gəbà-ló? ǹtsa=dè? **pyen lùŋ**=ǹná...
banyan-tree big-EMPH above=ALL fly ascend=SEQ
'(The white bird) flew up to the top of a large banyan tree and...' (KK1-0497)

b. ləgát-phún gəbà-ló? ǹtsa=dè? pyen=lèt lùŋ=ǹná...
banyan-tree big-EMPH above=ALL fly=SIM ascend=SEQ
'(The white bird) flew up to the top of a large banyan tree and...' (Elicited)

The purposive serial verb can be paraphrased biclausally by means of the purposive postposition *mətu* 'for' preceded by a nominalized clause.

(26) a. la-ɕà day=gò ngu **məri** **sa**=ʔay.
male-person that=TOP rice buy go=DECL
'The man went to buy some rice.' (KK1-1359)

b. la-ɕà day=gò [ngu məri=na] mətu sa=ʔay.
male-person that=TOP rice buy=NMLZ for go=DECL
'The man went to buy some rice.' (Elicited)

The serial verb with the predicate-argument relationship can be paraphrased by means of a nominalizer, which also functions as a complementizer in the language.

(27) a. sumbráʔ-wa myì khàʔ **ráp** **yák**=to-ŋà=ɕèʔ...
caterpillar-man before river cross be.difficult=CONT-CONT=then
'It was difficult for the caterpillar to cross the river before and...' (KK1-0892)

b. sumbráʔ-wa myì [khàʔ ráp=ʔay] yák=to-ŋà=ɕèʔ...
caterpillar-man before river cross=NMLZ be.difficult=CONT-CONT=then
'It was difficult for the caterpillar to cross the river before and...' (Elicited)

Serial verbs, as illustrated above, can usually be rephrased as multiclausal constructions. The reverse, however, does not always hold true. Consider, for example, a biclausal construction depicting a sequence of interlinked events:

(28) ɕán=gò... bá=ná duŋ=to-ŋà=ʔay.
3du=TOP be.tired=SEQ sit=CONT-CONT=DECL
'The two of them were exhausted and sat down.' (KK1-1359)

which cannot be readily converted to a sequential serial verb, as in:

(29) *ɕán=gò... **bá** **duŋ**=to-ŋà=ʔay.
3du=TOP be.tired sit=CONT-CONT=DECL

This irreversibility is also illustrated by another sequential biclausal construction below:

(30) day=kóʔ=ná gá-gùy grày gəthèt=ná si=màt=wà=ʔay.
that=LOC=ABL land-dog very be.hot=SEQ die=COMPL=VEN=DECL
'(They threw boiling water into the mouth of the fox. The water) was very hot and from that the fox died.' (KK1-1441)

which again cannot be rephrased by means of a sequential serial verb, although both constructions intend to describe successive events.

(31) *day=kó?=ná gá-gùy grày **gəthèt** **si**=màt=wà=?ay.
that=LOC=ABL land-dog very be.hot die=COMPL=VEN=DECL

We now turn to properties distinguishing serial verbs and multiclausal constructions, which are connected to the issue of the clausehood of serial verbs. As noted above, throughout the rest of this paper we will focus on sequential serial verbs, whose semantics cover successive events. Other types do not fall under the umbrella of serial verbs treated in this paper. In what follows, the term "serial verbs," unless otherwise noted, is reserved exclusively for the sequential type, which can be paraphrased by means of the sequential subordinator.

3 Clausehood of serial verbs

This section addresses the clausehood of serial verbs by comparing them with their paraphrased multiclausal counterparts. We explore intonation (§3.1), contiguity (§3.2), number of verbs involved (§3.3), sharing of grammatical and semantic categories (§3.4), volitionality matching (§3.5), argument sharing (§3.6), yes-answers to questions (§3.7), bridging constructions (§3.8), and causation (§3.9). All of these parameters differentiate serial verbs from multiclausal constructions despite their superficial similarities. Rather, many of them work together to characterize serial verbs as monoclausal constructions like those clauses headed by a single predicate verb.

3.1 Pause intervention

It is often reported that serial verbs behave differently from multiclausal constructions in terms of prosody (Givón 1991, Aikhenvald 2006: 7–8, 2018b: 27–8, Cleary-Kemp 2015: 118–9, Haspelmath 2016: 308). The same holds for Jinghpaw, as noted by Dai (2012: 349), wherein a pause is not allowed to intervene between serial verb components, as is also often the case in other serializing languages. This is illustrated by the following serial verb:

(32) naŋ=phé? ńtâ-məɸà=ni... ciŋthép ràw **rìm** **sàt**=na=lô.
2sg=ACC house-people=PL bird.trap together catch kill=IRR=SFP
'Your family is going to catch and kill you with the bird trap.' (KK1-0210)

which sounds unnatural when a pause (indicated by '/') is interposed between the component verbs, as in (33). If an intonation break occurs in the middle of a string of verbs as a result of a speech error, the whole string is more likely to be repeated in the restatement. Thus, it is more common to repeat the sequence 'catch kill' rather than just start from 'kill' in (33). The same holds for serial verbs comprising more than two verbs.

(33) ʔnaŋ=phéʔ ńtâ-məc̣à=ni... ciŋthép ràw **rìm** / **sàt**=na=lô.
2sg=ACC house-people=PL bird.trap together catch kill=IRR=SFP
'Your family is going to catch and kill you with the bird trap.' (Elicited)

This prosodic property, by contrast, is not applicable to multiclausal constructions, where an intonation break is often used to mark clause boundaries. Compare, for example, the serial verb construction (32) with the complex sentence (34), which does not sound unnatural with an intonation break. Although both examples contain the same verbs 'catch' and 'kill', the intonation contour may differentiate between them.

(34) day c̣ànŋa=phéʔ **wà** **rìm**=ná / **sàt** **c̣á**=káw=ʔay=dàʔ.
that red.deer=ACC come catch=SEQ kill eat=away=DECL=HS
'(They) came and caught the red deer and killed it and ate it.' (KK1-2081)

3.2 Contiguity

Serial verbs are often parameterized in terms of contiguity: Some serializing languages allow a constituent to intervene between component verbs while others do not (Aikhenvald 2006: 37–9, 2018b: 92–9, Cleary-Kemp 2015: 140–3). In the languages of mainland Southeast Asia, the former is typically found in verb-medial languages in contrast to the latter, which is typical of verb-final languages (Kato 1993: 178, Solnit 2006: 158–9). In terms of the contiguity parameter, as noted earlier, serial verbs in Jinghpaw are strictly contiguous: No syntactic elements are interposed between the component verbs. This is illustrated in the following examples, where component verbs are serialized contiguously irrespective of how many verbs constitute serialization.

(35) ʔənû c̣i=phéʔ **sa** **ʔəc̣ùn**=dàt=jaŋ grày khràp=ʔay.
mother 3sg=ACC go shake=away=when very cry=DECL
'When the mother came and shook him, (he) cried very much.' (KK1-0523)

(36) day bùm ǹtsa=kó?=ɕè? mú? **sa ʔəcéʔ gàʔ**=dàt=ʔay.
that mountain above=LOC=CONTR thunder go strike crack=away=DECL
'The lightning came over the mountain and struck it and cracked it.' (KK1-0213)

(37) galaŋ day=gò yú day=phé?... **sa gaŋ məgràʔ ʔəkhyèʔ**=màt=wà=jaŋ...
hawk that=TOP rat that=ACC go pull grab snatch=COMPL=VEN=when
'When the hawk came and yanked the rat, grabbed it, and carried it away...' (KK1-1553)

The contiguity constraint requires all the arguments of the subsequent verbs to precede the whole serial complex. This is illustrated by (35), where the object of V_2 (i.e., '3sg') precedes V_1. Consider also the noun-verb collocational expression *khàʔ ɕìn* (lit. water-wash), which conveys the sense of 'bathe, take a bath, shower' as a whole. When this collocation is chosen as V_2 in a serial verb sequence, as given below, the noun-verb combination is separated by V_1 due to the contiguity requirement.

(38) day khokhám-jan=gò khàʔ **sa ɕín**=s-ay=dàʔ.
that king-wife=TOP water go wash=CSM-DECL=HS
'The queen went and bathed.' (KK1-0701)

This situation can be contrasted with corresponding multiclausal constructions, which allow syntactic elements to be interposed between verbs freely. For example, compare (38) with its rephrased biclausal counterpart below.

(39) day khokhám-jan=gò sa=ná khàʔ ɕín=s-ay=dàʔ.
that king-wife=TOP go=SEQ water wash=CSM-DECL=HS
'The queen went and bathed.' (Elicited)

The contiguity requirement also blocks other verbal modifiers such as locative adjuncts, adverbs, and auxiliaries from intervening between the components of serial verbs. In contrast to NPs and adverbs, all types of auxiliaries (e.g., *=ɕəŋún* 'CAUS') follow verbs in Jinghpaw. All of them are thus realized after a string of verbs, as in:

(40) ŋay=phéʔ ciŋkha **sa phòʔ**=ɕəŋún=ʔay.
1sg=ACC door go open=CAUS=DECL
'(The rabbit) made me come and open the door.' (KK1-1441)

Note additionally that morphological elements such as the causative and negative prefixes can intervene between component verbs. Relevant examples such as (41) does

not contradict the contiguous nature of serial verbs in that affixes are not syntactic constituents.[3] Syntactic elements such as nouns, adverbs, auxiliaries, and particles, by contrast, are never allowed to intervene verbs in serialization.

(41) náʔ gəʤà=phéʔ **sa ń-ʤə-dám**=káw=yàŋ=gò...
2sg.GEN child=ACC go NEG-CAUS-go.astray=away=when=TOP
'If you don't lead astray your daughter...' (KK1-0671)

Also note that, as the following example illustrates, a string of verbs may be intervened by versatile verbs (e.g., *lù* 'get; can'), which have the ability to precede and follow main verbs when they express abstract meanings. Again, the example does not contradict the contiguous nature of serialized verbs given that, although they may assume abstract meanings like auxiliaries, their status as a genuine verb can be demonstrated by several verbal properties they possess, such as negatability (see Kurabe 2010). The very fact that they can occur within a serial verb sequence points to their status as a genuine verb.

(42) naŋ day khàŋkhyì-wa=ná ǹgùp-mún ləŋây-mi **sa lù bó**=jaŋ...
2sg that lion-man=GEN mouth-hair one-one go get uproot=when
'If you can go and pull out one of the lion's moustaches...' (KK1-1577)

A final remark associated with contiguity is the status of the sequence of synonymous or nearly synonymous verbs such as *tsóʔràʔ* 'love' (lit. love-like), which are aesthetic expressions typical of Southeast Asian languages. Dai (2012: 349–50), in his classification, treats them as a type of serial verbs in Jinghpaw. Although they are sometimes counted as a subtype of serial verbs in other languages as well (Jarkey 2015, Aikhenvald 2006: 30, 2018b: 79–80), this view does not hold for Jinghpaw, where they behave differently from serial verbs in terms of contiguity: A sequence of synonymous verbs allows syntactic elements to be interposed between component verbs. For example, the sequence of nearly synonymous verbs *khum tsúp* 'lit. be complete-be fulfilled' can be decomposed into the following quadrimorphemic elaborate expression with the adverb *graw* 'more' intervening between its components (see Kurabe 2011 for more examples).

(43) graw khum graw tsúp=ʔay.
more be.complete more be.fulfilled=DECL
'It is more complete and more fulfilled.' (Kurabe 2011: 54)

[3] While the negation of serial verbs is usually achieved by adding the negative prefix to V_1, the prefix may uncommonly be prefixed to V_2, as in (41), presumably due to Burmese influence.

3.3 Number of verbs

The most common serial verbs in Jinghpaw are those consisting of two verbs, as noted by Dai (2012: 348) and illustrated by examples above and elsewhere. Verb serialization, as noted earlier, can also consist of more than just two verbs. Serial verbs with three components are also fairly common in the language. Examples:

(44) day ŋá gəbà=phé? **wà ʂədu ʂá=**káw-dàt=?ay=dà?.
that fish big=ACC return boil eat=away-away=DECL=HS
'(The man) went home and boiled that big fish and ate it.' (KK1-1313)

(45) ʂànŋa=phé? ʂi=gò kəlàŋtá? **thìm gəwá sàt=**káw=?ay=dà?.
red.deer=ACC 3sg=TOP suddenly dart bite kill=away=DECL=HS
'He (tiger) suddenly leapt at the red deer and bit it to death.' (KK1-1084)

(46) sùmdu gəbà ləŋây-mi=thè? ciŋkha **?ədùp phroŋ pru=**màt=wà=ná...
hammer big one-one=COM door hit escape go.out=COMPL=VEN=SEQ
'(He) banged on the door with a big hammer and ran out and...' (KK1-1101)

Although they are less common, Jinghpaw does also allow lengthy verb strings involving more than three component verbs. Observe this in the following examples from our narrative texts, which involve four and five independent verbs, respectively.

(47) ʂəro=gò... múk tú=phé? **sa gàt gəwá sàt=**káw=?ay=dà?.
tiger=TOP Muk Tu=ACC go run bite kill=away=DECL=HS
'The tiger came running to Muk Tu and bit him to death.' (KK1-0806)

(48) mà=ni=phé? ʂàt **wà woy ʂədu ʂá lá=**ná...
child=PL=ACC food return lead cook eat take=SEQ
'(The mother) went home and made the kids dinner and ate it and...' (KK1-0054)

Serial verbs, however, are unlikely to involve a much larger number of component verbs, say, more than ten verbs. This is presumably due to many requirements imposed on serial verbs such as sharing of grammatical and semantic categories, volitionality matching, and argument sharing (see relevant sections below). By contrast, multiclausal constructions logically have no upper limit on how many clauses they consist of.

3.4 Shared aspect, polarity, temporal setting, and adverbials

In serializing languages, each verb in a series shares a single value regarding grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, modality, polarity, illocutionary force, and so on. These categories, like monoclausal constructions, should be specified just once per serial verb (Foley and Olson 1985: 23, Aikhenvald 2006: 8–10, Haspelmath 2016: 307–8). Serial verbs in Jinghpaw also share categories such as aspect, modality, polarity, and many others, characterizing them as monoclausal constructions. In this section, we will focus on shared aspect, polarity, temporal setting, and adverbials (see also §3.5 for a relevant discussion of volitionality matching, §3.6 for argument sharing, and §3.7 for the scope of questions). Jinghpaw is an aspect-prominent language with no grammatical tense, as is typical of other neighboring languages in mainland Southeast Asia. All varieties of aspect-marking auxiliaries occur after a sequence of verbs. Each aspect is marked just once per serial verb. As an illustration, consider the following examples, which are marked by the completive aspect marker *=màt* and continuous-resultative aspect marker *=to*, respectively. These aspect markers have the whole serial verb within their scope.

(49) [ɕi thu=ʔay] ǹkhun=kóʔ báy **khràt si**=màt=ʔay=dàʔ.
3sg dig=NMLZ hole=LOC again fall die=COMPL=DECL=HS
'(He) had fallen into the hole he dug and died.' (KK1-1650)

(50) ʔù=ni=gò khàʔ ləŋây=kóʔ ŋá **tam ɕá**=to=ʔay=dàʔ.
bird=PL=TOP river one=LOC fish seek eat=CONT=DECL=HS
'The birds were looking for fish in the river and eating them.' (KK1-1442)

By contrast, the aspect sharing does not always hold for multiclausal constructions. Compare examples in (49) and (50) with (51) below, where each verb takes an independent aspect value, one in completive and another in continuous-resultative, although it contains the same verbs as (49).

(51) sənyèn=gò si=màt=ná gá=dèʔ khràt=to=ʔay=dàʔ.
lizard=TOP die=COMPL=SEQ earth=ALL fall=CONT=DECL=HS
'The tree lizard had died and fell to the ground.' (KK1-1121)

Negation also takes scope over the whole serial verb. This is illustrated in the following examples, where the scope of negation includes both V_1 and V_2, no matter where the negative prefix occurs (see §3.2 for the position of the negative prefix).

(52) pha=ná **ń-sát** **ɕá**=ʔay=ʔmâ.
what=ABL NEG-kill eat=DECL=Q
'Why don't you kill and eat me?' (KK1-1826)

(53) náʔ gəɕà=phéʔ **sa** **ń-ɕə-dám**=káw=yàŋ=gò...
2sg.GEN child=ACC go NEG-CAUS-go.astray=away=when=TOP
'If you don't lead astray your daughter...' (KK1-0671)

On the other hand, in multiclausal constructions each clause can independently be within scope of negation. This is illustrated in the following examples, where the negative prefix has scope only over the first and then the second clause, respectively.

(54) day gəlaŋ gəbà=mùŋ ɕàt ń-lû ɕá=ná si=màt=ʔay=dàʔ.
that hawk big=also food NEG-can eat=SEQ die=COMPL=DECL=HS
'The large hawk also could not eat food and died.' (KK1-0937)

(55) nyéʔ dùmsu ləŋây màt=ná ń-dû=ʔay.
1sg.GEN cow one be.lost=SEQ NEG-arrive=DECL
'One of my cows was gone and didn't come back.' (KK1-0781)

Jinghpaw, as noted above, does not have grammatical tense, but temporal reference is possible by means of temporal nominals, adverbials, and clauses. Only one temporal reference is possible for each serial verb. Individual verb components cannot have independent temporal contrast. The following (56), for example, can only be interpreted when the two events (i.e., going and hunting) take place at the same time. The serial verb cannot describe situations wherein going happens at one time and hunting happens at another, different time. The same holds true for (57) with another temporal nominal (for relevant discussion, see Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002: 402, Bohnemeyer et al. 2007: 497, and Cleary-Kemp 2015: 122–5).

(56) dàyní nàm=dèʔ **sa** **jàwgòŋ**=na.
today forest=ALL go hunt=IRR
'Today I will go into the forest and hunt.' (KK1-0264)

(57) ʔməní [yíʔ gədè khru=ʔay] **sa** **yu**=s-ay=ʔi.
yesterday field how.much burn=NMLZ go see=CSM-DECL=Q
'Did you go and see how many fields burned yesterday?' (KK1-0708)

Each clause of a multiclausal construction, by contrast, may describe multiple events happening at different times. As an illustration, compare (56) with the following example, where the first event is situated at one time while the second event is situated at another time.

(58) dàyní nàm=dèʔ sa=ná phótní jàwgòŋ=na.
today forest=ALL go=SEQ tomorrow hunt=IRR
'I will go into the forest today and hunt tomorrow.' (Elicited)

Related to temporal setting is the sharing of adverbials. Each component verb of a serial verb cannot be separately modified by an adverbial. This may be observed in the following example, where the time adverb *báy* 'again' has scope over both V_1 and V_2.

(59) [gəphù=phéʔ báy **sa khòy**=na] mətu...
brother=ACC again go lend=NMLZ for
'To go and lend the elder brother (some rice) again...' (KK1-1421)

By contrast, the sharing of adverbials is not obligatory for multiclausal constructions, where an adverbial may modify each verb separately. This is illustrated by the following example, where the adverbials 'silently' and 'secretly' modify the first verb 'go' in contrast to the time adverb 'again', which modifies the second verb 'return'. Consider:

(60) ŋay ʔá-kətsi=ɕà ləgú sa=ná báy wà=na=ʔyô.
1sg ADV-be.silent=ADV secretly go=SEQ again return=IRR=SFP
'I'm going to sneak off and come back again.' (KK1-0263)

Due to this requirement, adverbials that can modify serial verbs must be semantically compatible with all component verbs. This is illustrated by the following elicited examples, where the manner adverbial *ləʔnyàn* 'slowly', which is compatible with V_1 (61a) but not V_2 (61b), is not allowed to modify the whole serial verb (61c). This requirement, as demonstrated by (61d), does not hold true for multiclausal constructions, where adverbials can modify each verb separately.

(61) a. ɕi ńtâ=kóʔ ləʔnyàn sa=ʔay.
3sg house=LOC slowly go=DECL
'He went slowly to the house.' (Elicited)
b. *ɕi ńtâ=kóʔ ləʔnyàn ʔyúp=ʔay.
3sg house=LOC slowly sleep=DECL

c. *ɕi ńtâ=kó? lə?nyàn **sa** **?yúp**=?ay.
3sg house=LOC slowly go sleep=DECL

d. ɕi ńtâ=kó? lə?nyàn sa=ná ?yúp=?ay.
3sg house=LOC slowly go=SEQ sleep=DECL
'He went slowly to the house and slept (there).' (Elicited)

3.5 Volitionality matching

Cross-linguistic studies show that some serializing languages have restrictions on transitivity matching, where component verbs with different transitivity values cannot form serial verbs depending on their semantics, composition, and so on (Aikhenvald 2018b: 114–7). As seen in §2.1, serial verbs in Jinghpaw do not require matching with regards to the transitivity value. What is relevant to Jinghpaw serial verbs is volitionality matching. Volitionality and related categories, although not well acknowledged in typological literature, are known to play some role in formation of V-V compounds in Japanese and serial verbs in Pwo Karen (Kageyama 1993, Kato 1998). The relevance of volitionality to Jinghpaw grammar can be illustrated by volitionality-sensitive phenomena such as moods: Only volitional verbs (e.g., 'walk' and 'push') can head imperative and hortative sentences in contrast to optative sentences, which must have non-volitional verbs as their predicates (e.g., 'flow' and 'be fat'). Another area where volitionality plays a role is in serial verbs. Volitionality matching requires the volitionality value of verbs within a single serial verb to be the same. Observe this in the examples below, where the volitionality value of all verbs in serialization is identical throughout, irrespective of their transitivity.

(62) Vol-Vol
ɕi=gò day=thè? **ròt** **khom**=màt=wà...
3sg=TOP that=COM depart walk=COMPL=VEN
'He departed with it and walked...' (KK1-1147)

(63) Vol-Vol
ɕi ?əkyú **ɕàŋ** **phyí**=?ay=dà?.
3sg favor enter beg=DECL=HS
'He went into (the place) and asked for a favor.' (KK1-1650)

(64) NonVol-NonVol

phún-rù məkaw=khu=ná **lùy khràt**=wà=ʔay.

tree-root beside=PER=ABL flow fall=VEN=DECL

'(The water) came running down along the roots of the tree.' (KK1-0353)

(65) NonVol-NonVol

nàm-pan=mùŋ grày **pù tsòm**...

forest-flower=also very bloom be.beautiful

'The flowers also bloomed very beautifully...' (KK1-0690)

Volitionary matching also holds for serial verbs consisting of more than two component verbs. Observe this in the following examples, where three verbs with the same volitionality value are combined in one serial verb.

(66) Vol-Vol-Vol

ləʔnyaw=phéʔ báy **gəyèt sàt ɕá** mó=to...

cat=ACC again hit kill eat intend=CONT

'(The dog) was intending to beat the cat to death and eat it...' (KK1-1403)

(67) NonVol-NonVol-NonVol

gənù=gò **gəjòŋ məlàp məcíʔ**=to=yàŋ...

mother=TOP be.surprised be.fainted be.sick=CONT=when

'The mother was so surprised that she fainted and became ill and...' (KK1-0523)

By contrast, volitionality matching is not required for multiclausal constructions, which may involve verbs with different volitionality values. The following elicited pairs of serial verbs and multiclausal counterparts demonstrate this point. Compare:

(68) NonVol-Vol

a. ɕi ɕəro khrìt=ná phroŋ=ʔay.

3sg tiger fear=SEQ escape=DECL

'He was afraid of the tiger and fled.' (Elicited)

b. *ɕi ɕəro **khrìt phroŋ**=ʔay.

3sg tiger fear escape=DECL

(69) Vol-NonVol

a. ɕi grày gəgàt=ná məcíʔ=màt=ʔay.

3sg very run=SEQ be.sick=COMPL=DECL

'He ran a lot and got sick.' (Elicited)

b. *ɕi gràỳ **gəgàt məcíʔ**=màt=ʔay.
3sg very run be.sick=COMPL=DECL

(70) Vol-NonVol

a. nday modo ɕəmu=ná thèn=màt=ʔay.
this car move=SEQ be.broken=COMPL=DECL
'This car moved and broke down.' (Elicited)

b. *nday modo **ɕəmu thèn**=màt=ʔay.
this car move be.broken=COMPL=DECL

The volitionality matching brings us back to the irreversibility issue we observed in §2.3 where we saw why the biclausal construction (28) cannot be paraphrased by means of a serial verb (29): The two component verbs (i.e., non-volitional *bá* 'be tired' and volitional *duŋ* 'sit down') do not match in their volitionality.

3.6 Argument sharing

A serial verb may enable a more complex argument structure than that of its component verb. In Jinghpaw, it is generally the case that, when two verbs (V_1 and V_2) are serialized, the argument structure of the whole serial complex is a combination of the argument structure of V_1 and V_2. As an illustration, consider the serial verb given below with three arguments (both core and oblique):

(71) ɕi=gò mənaŋ=phéʔ modo=thèʔ **sa ʔədùp**=ʔay.
3sg=TOP friend=ACC car=COM go hit=DECL
'He went by car and hit his friend.' (Elicited)

where the semantic role Vehicle 'car' is licensed by V_1 'go', while the Patient 'friend' is hosted by V_2 'hit'. As can be seen in the example above, the Theme of V_1 (i.e., '3sg') and the Agent of V_2 (i.e., '3sg') are shared between the two component verbs. The fact that the Vehicle is licensed by V_1, not by V_2, can be demonstrated via the following comparison.

(72) a. ɕi=gò modo=thèʔ sa=ʔay.
3sg=TOP car=COM go=DECL
'He went by car.' (Elicited)

b. *ɕi=gò modo=thèʔ ʔədùp=ʔay.
3sg=TOP car=COM hit=DECL

In the same vein, the following pair demonstrates that the Patient 'friend' is licensed by V_2.

(73) a. ɕi=gò mənaŋ=phé? ʔədùp=ʔay.
3sg=TOP friend=ACC hit=DECL
'He hit his friend.' (Elicited)
b. *ɕi=gò mənaŋ=phé? sa=ʔay.
3sg=TOP friend=ACC go=DECL

One important constraint imposed on serial verbs is the constraint against role-doubling (Durie 1997: 340–1), by which a serial complex is blocked from containing duplicate roles (i.e., two agents, two goals, two instruments, and so forth). This requirement, as noted by Durie (1997), is a property of the argument structure of a clause headed by a single verb as well. Their possession of this property constitutes an argument in favor of the monoclausal analysis of serial verbs. By contrast, the constraint does not hold for a multiclausal construction, where duplicate roles are allowed to occur within it. Observe this in the elicited examples given below, where the semantic role Source marked by *=kó?=ná* 'from' is not blocked from doubly occurring in a biclausal construction (74a), in contrast to the serial verb (74b).

(74) a. ɕi ńtâ=kó?=ná sa=ná phún=kó?=ná ɕəro gàp=ʔay.
3sg house=LOC=ABL go=SEQ tree=LOC=ABL tiger shoot=DECL
'He went from the house and shot the tiger from the tree.' (Elicited)
b. *ɕi ńtâ=kó?=ná phún=kó?=ná ɕəro **sa gàp**=ʔay.
3sg house=LOC=ABL tree=LOC=ABL tiger go shoot=DECL

The same situation holds for the examples given below, where the semantic role Instrument is involved. Note that the serial verb 'cut clear' is possible elsewhere.

(75) a. ɕi yí?=phé? ǹthu=thè? khyèn=ná dìŋyé=thè? jəsàn=ʔay.
3sg field=ACC sword=COM cut=SEQ broom=COM clear=DECL
'He cut the field with a sword and cleaned it with a broom.' (Elicited)
b. *ɕi yí?=phé? ǹthu=thè? dìŋyé=thè? **khyèn jəsàn**=ʔay.
3sg field=ACC sword=COM broom=COM cut clear=DECL

Note additionally that the constraint does not rule out a serial verb with multiple NPs that are marked by the same case marker but carry different semantic roles. To illustrate, consider the following elicited example, where the comitative *=thè?* marks one NP as a

Companion (i.e., 'friend') and another as an Instrument (i.e., 'stick').

(76) ŋay mənaŋ=thè? ràw dùk=thè? ɕi=phé? **sa gəyèt**=?ay.
1sg friend=COM together stick=COM 3sg=ACC go hit=DECL
'I went and hit him with a stick with a friend.' (Elicited)

Now let us turn to argument sharing that involves subjects and objects. Unlike obliques, the number of core arguments is strictly specified per clause. Component verbs in a serial verb sequence, thus, usually cannot each introduce their full set of core arguments. Due to this situation, verb serialization often involves a conflation of semantic roles (see Sawada 1988: 84–93 for subject and object sharing in Burmese). This is illustrated by (71) above, where the Theme of V_1 (i.e., '3sg') and the Agent of V_2 (i.e., '3sg') are combined into a subject that belongs to the whole construction. Subject sharing, which requires A and/or S to be shared between serialized verbs, is an obligatory feature of Jinghpaw serial verbs. This constraint thus requires serial verbs to have at least one shared argument, which is a typical feature of serial verbs in the world's language (Aikhanvald 2006: 12, 2018b: 40–1). More examples illustrating subject sharing are given below. As can be seen, in (77), the subjects of V_1 'go' and V_2 'call' are coreferential irrespective of their semantic roles.

(77) ŋá=ni=gò ɕi=phé? **sa ɕəgá**=?ay.
fish=PL=TOP 3sg=ACC go call=DECL
'The fishes came and called him.' (KK1-0601)

Example (77) does not allow an interpretation whereby the constituent verbs have separate subjects, say, 'The fishes came and birds called him'. This is illustrated by the ungrammaticality of (78), where two distinct subjects of V_1 and V_2 occur simultaneously.

(78) *ŋá=ni=gò ?ù=ni=gò ɕi=phé? **sa ɕəgá**=?ay.
fish=PL=TOP bird=PL=TOP 3sg=ACC go call=DECL
Intended: 'The fishes came and birds called him.'

In the same vein, the following serial verb is also precluded from occurring although the combination 'fall-die' is accepted when coreference of the subject holds.

(79) *ɕi=gò ǹlùŋ **khràt si**=?ay.
3sg=TOP stone fall die=DECL
Intended: 'The stone fell and he died.'

Different subjects must be expressed by means of corresponding biclausal paraphrases, as demonstrated below, which allow non-coreferential subject interpretation.

(80) ŋá=ni=gò sa=ná ʔù=ni=gò ɕi=phéʔ ɕəgá=ʔay.
fish=PL=TOP go=SEQ bird=PL=TOP 3sg=ACC call=DECL
'The fishes came and birds called him.' (Elicited)

(81) ɕi=gò ǹlùŋ khràt=ná si=ʔay.
3sg=TOP stone fall=SEQ die=DECL
'The stone fell and he died.' (Elicited)

The same-subject requirement does not allow Jinghpaw to have the *switch-function* type of serialization, such as 'I shot a lion die' for 'I shot a lion dead', where "the object of the first verb is identical to the subject of the second verb" (Aikhenvald 2006: 29). As an illustration, consider the ungrammaticality of the following shoot-die serial verb:[4]

(82) *ŋay khàŋkhyì gəbà=nàn **gàp** **si**=s-ay=lô.
1sg lion big=EMPH shoot die=CSM-DECL=SFP
Intended: 'I shot a big lion to death.'

whose intended meaning should be expressed by a serial verb with shared subjects, such as:

(83) ŋay khàŋkhyì gəbà=nàn... **gàp** **sàt**=s-ay=lô.
1sg lion big=EMPH shoot kill=CSM-DECL=SFP
'I shot and kill a big lion.' (KK1-1596)

or by a corresponding biclausal construction, as is given below.[5]

(84) ŋay khàŋkhyì gəbà=nàn gàp=ná si=s-ay=lô.
1sg lion big=EMPH shoot=SEQ die=CSM-DECL=SFP
'I shot a big lion and (the lion) died.' (Elicited)

An apparent counterexample to subject sharing is illustrated by (85), where the argument 'those (black-myrobalan)' appears at first sight to be the object of V_1 'eat' and

[4] Example (82) is not used with the coreferential subject interpretation (i.e., 'I shot a big lion and I died' due to the semantic constraint: These two subevents are unlikely to occur successively and cannot be viewed as a single event.

[5] Jinghpaw is a pivotless language, where pivot constraints on NP ellipsis and clause linkage are absent from interclausal syntax.

simultaneously the subject of V_2 'be tasty'.

(85) [bùm khán=ʔè tu=ʔay] grày ɕá mu=ʔay.
mountain beside=LOC grow=NMLZ very eat be.tasty=DECL
'Those (black-myrobalan) that grow in the mountains are very tasty.' (KK1-0576)

A closer look, however, reveals that this is not the case. The implied subject of V_1 is not allowed to be realized in this construction. Also, the argument 'those (black-myrobalan)' cannot be marked with accusative case here, suggesting that it is not an object. The argument cannot also be interpreted as the subject of V_1 because of semantic oddity. Although semantically compositional, I treat the verb sequence 'eat be.tasty' as a lexicalized expression, listed in the lexicon as a whole, considering that it is not formed by a syntactic rule like other serial verbs. Its idiomatic status is further suggested by the fact that only a limited set of verbs is allowed as V_1 in this expression (i.e., 'eat' and 'drink', but not other ingestive verbs such as 'taste', 'suck', 'swallow', and 'lick').

Along the same lines as subject-sharing, serial verbs also preclude separate objects from occurring within them. It should be noted first that this does not mean that object sharing is obligatory. In serial verbs consisting of a transitive and an intransitive, for example, objects are not shared between component verbs because an intransitive does not add an object. Object sharing is applied when more than one transitive verb is involved. As an illustration, consider the following serial verb, where the two monotransitive verbs 'throw' and 'put' share a common object 'mud'.

(86) ɕùʔ=gò day khàŋkhyì=ʔàʔ ŋ̀gùp=thàʔ khumpúp **gəbày baŋ**=ya=ʔay=dàʔ.
frog=TOP that lion=GEN mouth=LOC mud throw put=BEN=DECL=HS
'The frog threw mud into the lion's mouth.' (KK1-0347)

The constraint against duplicate objects prohibits serialized verbs from having their own objects separately. To illustrate this, consider the ungrammatical example (87c), which is a combination of (87a) and (87b).[6]

(87) a. ŋay jùm baŋ=ʔay.
1sg salt put=DECL
'I put salt (in my food).' (Elicited)

[6] The verb *baŋ* 'put' is monotransitive, not ditransitive, in Jinghpaw. Thus, examples such as *ŋay ɕàt (=phéʔ) jùm baŋ=ʔay* are ungrammatical in the language.

b. ŋay ɕàt ɕá=ʔay.
1sg food eat=DECL
'I ate my food.' (Elicited)

c. *ŋay ɕàt (=phéʔ) jùm **baŋ ɕá**=ʔay.
1sg food =ACC salt put eat=DECL
Intended: 'I put salt (in my food) and ate it.'

The intended meaning of (87c) can be expressed by a biclausal construction, such as:

(88) ŋay ɕàt (=phéʔ) jùm baŋ=ná ɕá=ʔay.
1sg food =ACC salt put=SEQ eat=DECL
'I put salt in my food and ate it.' (Elicited)

or by demoting the object of V_2 to an oblique, as in:

(89) ŋay ɕàt=kóʔ jùm **baŋ ɕá**=ʔay.
1sg food=LOC salt put eat=DECL
'I put salt in my food and ate it.' (Elicited)

The same-object requirement does not allow Jinghpaw to have *instrumental* serial verbs (e.g., 'take sword cut tree' for 'cut the tree with a sword'), a cross-linguistically common type of serial verbs (Aikhenvald 2006: 13, 26, 2018b: 2, 64–5). The following (90c), which is a combination of (90a–b), is blocked due to the same-object requirement.

(90) a. ɕi ǹthu lá=ʔay.
3sg sword take=DECL
'He took a sword.' (Elicited)

b. ɕi phún gəthàm=ʔay.
3sg tree cut=DECL
'He cut the tree.' (Elicited)

c. *ɕi phún (=phéʔ) ǹthu **lá gəthàm**=ʔay.
3sg tree =ACC knife take cut=DECL
Intended: 'He took a sword and cut the tree..'

Again, the intended meaning should be expressed by means of a chain of clauses, e.g.,

(91) ɕi phún (=phéʔ) ǹthu lá=ná gəthàm=ʔay.
3sg tree =ACC sword take=SEQ cut=DECL
'He took a sword and cut the tree.' (Elicited)

A seeming counterexample to the same-object requirement comes from the example given below, which appears, at first glance, to have two separate objects (i.e., 'children' and 'harp'). A closer look, however, reveals that the argument 'harp' is not an object but an oblique, since it cannot be case-marked by the accusative case but can be marked by the comitative case, if any. The example thus does not provide evidence in favor of the interpretation that two verbs in a series have separate objects.

(92) ɕi=gò mà=ni=phé? tíŋsê **dùm ɕəpyo**=?ay.
3sg=TOP child=PL=ACC harp play entertain=DECL
'He entertained the children by playing the harp.' (Elicited)

Object sharing also holds when two ditransitive verbs are involved. Observe the following example, wherein the direct object 'chili pepper' and the indirect object 'mother' are shared between the ditransitive V_1 and V_2.

(93) ɕán ?naw=ni=gò... gənù=phé?... məjàp **ɕəgún jò?**=?ay=dà?.
3du brother=PL=TOP mother=ACC chili.pepper send give=DECL=HS
'The two brothers sent their mother some chili peppers and gave them to her.' (KK1-0516)

When a serial verb consists of one monotransitive and one ditransitive verb, both direct and indirect objects may be shared. Consider, for example, the following serial verb, where the direct object (i.e., 'leech') of both monotransitive V_1 and ditransitive V_2 are shared:

(94) gənam=gò gəmoy=phé? wòt-byìŋ **ɕədu jò?**=ǹná...
daughter-in-law=TOP mother-in-law=ACC leech-leech boil give=SEQ
'The daughter-in-law boiled the leeches and gave them to the mother in-law and...' (KK1-1634)

and the example below, where the direct object (i.e., 'spirit') of the monotransitive V_1 and the indirect object (i.e., 'spirit') of the ditransitive V_2 are shared.

(95) [ǹdaŋ si=?ay]=ni=?é? ɕoŋ **ɕəgá sán**...
choke die=NMLZ=PL=ACC first call ask
'(The shaman) called (the spirit of) those who died in childbirth and asked them about (it) first and...' (KK1-0688)

Again, ditransitive objects may not be shared in the case of a sequence of clauses:

(96) thù=ǹná [sa=ʔay] məc̣à=ni=phéʔ gàm jòʔ=ʔay.
pound=SEQ go=NMLZ person=PL=ACC good.luck give=DECL
'(They) pounded (ginger, dry meat, and chili pepper) and gave good luck to the people who came.' (KK1-0410)

All in all, the data discussed in the present section show that the argument structure of a serial verb as a monoclausal construction is more tightly bound than that of a multiclausal construction. The same-subject requirement explains why, as we have seen in §2.3 above, the biclausal construction (30) cannot be rephrased by means of a serial verb (31): A serial verb cannot simultaneously contain different subjects (i.e., 'boiling water' and 'fox').

3.7 Yes-answers to questions

Enfield (2008:106–9) proposes the yes-answer test for demonstrating the main verbhood of multi-verb constructions in Lao. The test also holds implications for serial verbs in Jinghpaw. First, observe in the following example that polar questions in Jinghpaw are formed by a sentence-final particle *=ʔi*, as in:

(97) "naŋ ńtâ=gò lù=ʔay=ʔi," ŋú=yàŋ...
2sg house=TOP get=DECL=Q say=when
'When (she) said "Do you have a home?"...' (KK1-0887)

which, as in Lao, may be answered by an affirmative interjection such as *ʔùm* 'yes' or by repeating some parts of the question, especially the main verb. The latter strategy is illustrated by the following example, which immediately follows (97).

(98) "lù=ʔay," ŋú=yàŋ=c̣èʔ...
get=DECL say=when=then
'(he) said "(I) have," and then...' (KK1-0887)

In answering questions involving a serial verb such as the following example by means of the latter strategy,

(99) naŋ seŋ=kóʔ **sa c̣á**=ʔay=ʔi.
2sg shop=LOC go eat=DECL=Q
'Did you go to the restaurant and eat there?' (Elicited)

the preferred answer is to repeat the whole serial verb sequence, as illustrated by (100) below (see Sawada 2017 for relevant discussions in Lhaovo, a Tibeto-Burman language of northern Myanmar).

(100) a. (ʔùm) **sa ɕá**=ʔay.
yes go eat=DECL
'(Yes) I went and ate (there).' (Elicited)

b. ?(ʔùm) **sa**=ʔay.
yes go=DECL
'(Yes) I went (there).' (Elicited)

c. ?(ʔùm) **ɕá**=ʔay.
yes eat=DECL
'(Yes) I ate (there).' (Elicited)

The same holds for serial verbs with different transitivity or semantic configurations, as exemplified by the following examples. The preferred yes-answer to these questions is to repeat the whole verb sequence (i.e., 'catch eat' and 'rob escape' below). Repeating only V_1 or V_2 is judged unnatural.

(101) naŋ ɕàn **rìm ɕá**=ʔay=ʔi.
2sg deer catch eat=DECL=Q
'Did you catch the deer and eat it?' (Elicited)

(102) ɕi gùmphrò **gəɕún phroŋ**=ʔay=ʔi.
3sg money rob escape=DECL=Q
'Did he take the money and run away?' (Elicited)

The examples suggest that serial verbs are doubly headed, where both V_1 and V_2 have main verb status. They also show that the scope of the polar question is over both V_1 and V_2 even though the question particle occurs once per serial verb. All in all, verb components in serial verbs act as a whole like a single predicate in terms of repetition in the yes-answers to polar questions.

A sequence of clauses, in contrast, can be answered only by the verb in the main clause. Main clause repetition is more likely, especially when the clause contains constituents other than the verb. Compare, for example, (99) above with its multiclausal counterpart given below:

(103) naŋ seŋ=kóʔ sa=ná ɕá=ʔay=ʔi.
2sg shop=LOC go=SEQ eat=DECL=Q
'Did you go to the restaurant and eat there?' (Elicited)

which can be answered by (104a) or (104c), suggesting that the polar question marker can take scope over the whole sentence or only the main clause.

(104) a. (ʔùm) sa=ná ɕá=ʔay.
yes go=SEQ eat=DECL
'(Yes) I went and ate (there).' (Elicited)
b. ?(ʔùm) sa=ʔay.
yes go=DECL
'(Yes) I went (there).' (Elicited)
c. (ʔùm) ɕá=ʔay.
yes eat=DECL
'(Yes) I ate (there).' (Elicited)

3.8 Bridging constructions

Another phenomenon involving repetition is illustrated by the bridging construction (de Vries 2005, Dixon 2009, Guérin and Aiton 2019), which serves a discourse strategy to link clause chains by recapitulating (part of) the last clause of a chain (reference clause) at the beginning of the next chain (bridging clause). This discourse strategy is pervasive in Jinghpaw narrative and procedural texts, inter alia in oral texts. First consider the successively occurring sentences in the following examples, where every final predicate in the reference clause is repeated at the first clause of the next chain to link these clauses. Relevant parts are indicated by an underline.

(105) ɕìŋgyim-məɕà=ni=gò phroŋ=ʔay=dàʔ. phroŋ=ná=ɕèʔ...
human-person=PL=TOP escape=DECL=HS escape=SEQ=then
'The humans ran away. (They) ran away and...' (KK1-1578)

(106) lùŋ-khrùt ń-ŋâ=ʔay=dàʔ. ń-ŋâ=ná=ɕèʔ...
stone-wash NEG-be=DECL=HS NEG-be=SEQ=then
'There was no whet-stones. There was no (whet-stones) and...' (KK1-1414)

(107) nàmlàp=thè? dân=ná məgàp=dá=?ay=dà?. məgàp=dá=ná=ɕè?
leaf=COM thus=ABL cover=RES=DECL=HS cover=RES=SEQ=then
ɕi wà=màt=s-ay=dà?. wà=màt=ná=ɕè?...
3sg return=COMPL=CSM-DECL=HS return=COMPL=SEQ=then
'(He) covered (the dead boar) with leaves like that. (He) covered (it) and he went home. (He) went home and...' (KK1-0914)

The whole predicate, as seen, is usually replicated except for the mood marker (e.g., *=?ay* 'DECL'), which is not compatible with subordinators (e.g., *=ná* 'SEQ'), which marks the bridging clause as non-final. The strategy, in line with other chaining languages (see references above), is exploited to express the temporal sequentiality of events, and contributes to referential coherence and easy processing. Omissions of NPs and adverbs are often observed in bridging constructions in Jinghpaw, as shown in (107), where lexical items such as 'with leaves', 'like this', and '3sg' are not included in the bridging clauses.

Aikhenvald (2018b: 22–3) shows that in Tariana, an Arawak language of Northwest Amazonia, serial verbs act as a whole in bridging constructions. This can also be demonstrated by Jinghpaw, where the discourse strategy is more likely to repeat the whole serial verb sequence rather than a part of it, like monoverbal clauses such as (105)–(107). This is observable in the following examples cited from our naturalistic oral narrative texts, where the whole verb sequences in the reference clause are repeated in the bridging clause that refers back to the immediately preceding clause.

(108) ?ù day=phé? báy **?əbyen sàt**=káw=?ay=dà?. **?əbyen sàt**=káw=ná...
fowl that=ACC again hit kill=away=DECL=HS hit kill=away=SEQ
'(He) beat the fowl to death again. (He) beat (it) to death and...' (KK1-0672)

(109) moymaŋ **sa lùp**=káw=?ay=dà?. **sa lùp**=káw=ŋút=ná...
corpse go bury=away=DECL=HS go bury=away=finish=SEQ
'(They) went and buried the body. (They) finished going and burying the body and...' (KK1-0045)

(110) day=mùŋ **gà? ?əyáy**=màt=?ay=dà. **gà? ?əyáy**=màt=ná...
that=also crack be.scattered=COMPL=DECL=HS crack be.scattered=COMPL=SEQ
'That (stone), too, broke and fell apart. (It) broke and fell apart and...' (KK1-0914)

(111) ɕi=gò phún-pòt ləŋây=kó? **thòt duŋ**, **thòt duŋ**=ná=ʔî...
3sg=TOP tree-root one=LOC move sit move sit=SEQ=SFP
'He moved to the trunk of the tree and sat down, (he) moved and sat down and, you know?...' (KK1-1632)

The observation also holds true for bridging constructions involving other processes such as lexical additions. This is illustrated in the following examples, where the reference clauses are repeated with elaboration in the building clauses. Added elements are double-underlined in the translation. Consider:

(112) báy **sa jò?**=ʔay=ʔî. day=khu **sa jò?**=ná...
again go give=DECL=SFP that=like go give=SEQ
'(They) went and gave (it to them) again, you know? Like that, (they) went and gave (it to them) and....' (KK1-0121)

(113) thó **phay phroŋ**=màt=ʔay=ʔî. ŋá=phé? **phay phroŋ**=màt=yàŋ...
there carry escape=COMPL=DECL=SFP fish=ACC carry escape=COMPL=when
'(He) fled that way, carrying (the fish), you know? When (he) fled, carrying the fish...' (KK1-0275)

(114) nday la=khu=ná num day=phé? **sa phyí**=ʔay=ʔî. [gùmphrò
this man=PER=ABL woman that=ACC go ask.for=DECL=SFP money
ló?-ló?=thè? **sa phyí**=ʔay] ɕəlóy...
be.many-RED=COM go ask.for=NMZL when
'This man went and asked for the woman's hand, you know? When (the man) went and asked for (her hand) with a lot of money...' (KK1-0950)

(115) sənyèn=gò day=khu=ɕà [ń-gəja=ʔay]=ɕà **sa tsun**=ʔay=ʔî.
lizard=TOP that=PER=only NEG-be.good=NMLZ=only go say=DECL=SFP
ɕìŋgyim-məɕà=ni=phé? [ń-gəja=ʔay]=ɕà **sa tsun**...
human-person=PL=ACC NEG-be.good=NMLZ=only go say
'The lizard came and told all sorts of bad things like this, you know? (It) came and told the humans all sorts of bad things and...' (KK1-0602)

The repetition of the whole construction in bridging constructions also holds for serial verbs consisting of more than two components. Consider, for example, the following bridging constructions:[7]

[7] The last example involves a concomitant verb as V_1.

(116) day khà?-ɕì=kó? **wà duŋ khràp**=to=?ay=dà?. **wà duŋ khràp**=to...
that river-small=LOC return sit cry=CONT=DECL=HS return sit cry=CONT
'(The girl) went back to that creek and sat down and was crying. (She) went back and sat down and was crying and...' (KK1-0571)

(117) sumri=phé? **sa gəwá dì?**=káw-dàt=?ay=dà?.
rope=ACC go bite cut=away-away=DECL=HS
[**sa gəwá dì?**=káw-dàt=?ay] ɕəlóy...
go bite cut=away-away=NMLZ when
'(The squirrel) came and chewed the rope and cut it off. When (it) came and chewed the rope and cut it off...' (KK1-0754)

(118) day məɕà=phé? **sa ?əcé? gəlàw**=káw=?ay=dà?.
that person=ACC go peck turn.over=away=DECL=HS
sa ?əcé? gəlàw=káw=ɕè?...
go peck turn.over=away=then
'(The snake) came and bit the person and made (him) fall down. (It) came and bit (him) and made (him) fall down, and then...' (KK1-1430)

(119) la ləŋây-mi=phé?... **jóm gaŋ jé ɕá**=káw=?ay=dà?.
man one-one=ACC join.force pull tear eat=away=DECL=HS
jóm gaŋ jé ɕá=káw=ná=ɕè?...
join.force pull tear eat=away=SEQ=then
'(The tigers) tore off one man and ate (him) together. (They) tore off and ate (him) together, and then...' (KK1-0968)

Related is the repetition of the whole construction in the reformulation of an utterance such as paraphrases, which is sometimes done by means of alternative constructions, as in (121), which involves pseudo-clefting in the reference clause and non-clefting in the bridging clause.

(120) **gàp sàt**=káw=jaŋ=gò, [ɕánthe=?à? nìŋbo ré=ŋà=?ay]
shoot kill=away=when=TOP 3pl=GEN leader COP=CONT=NMLZ
səthé-wa=phé? **gàp sàt**=káw=jaŋ...
rich-man=ACC shoot kill=away=when
'When (they) shot and killed (him), When (they) shot and killed their leader, the rich man...' (KK1-1649)

(121) [ɕi=phéʔ **sa** **tàw** **lá**=ʔay] nát=ni ɕədùʔ=ʔay=dàʔ. nát **sa** **tàw** **lá**=ʔay ɕədùʔ=ná=ɕèʔ...
3sg=ACC go welcome take=NMLZ spirit=PL think=DECL=HS spirit go welcome take=DECL think=SEQ=then
'(The orphan) thought it was spirits that came for him. (He) thought spirits came for (him) and...' (KK1-1457)

The repetition of verb sequences as a whole in bridging constructions can be contrasted with multiclausal constructions, where, as illustrated below, subordinate clauses are usually not recapitulated in bridging clauses, especially when the main clause contains constituents other than predicates. Examples include:

(122) toŋ=kóʔ báy baŋ=ná báy là=to=ʔay=dàʔ. báy là=to=ná...
tube=LOC again put=SEQ again wait=CONT=DECL=HS again wait=CONT=SEQ
'(He) put (the fish) in a bamboo tube and waited again. (He) waited again and...' (KK1-0902)

(123) ɕi=gò ləgo=thèʔ khom=ná pru=màt=wà=s-ay=dàʔ.
3sg=TOP foot=COM walk=SEQ come.out=COMPL=VEN=CSM-DECL=HS
pru=màt=wà=yàŋ=gò...
come.out=COMPL=VEN=when=NMLZ
'He walked on his feet and came out. When (he) came out....' (KK1-1657)

The following examples show that only serial verbs (in the main clause) are repeated in the bridging clauses even though the reference clauses involve both serial verbs and sequential subordinate clauses.

(124) ɕi=phéʔ=mùŋ pòt=ná báy **ʔəmyàʔ** **ɕá**=káw=ʔay=dàʔ.
3sg=ACC=also get.angry=SEQ again tear eat=away=DECL=HS
ʔəmyàʔ **ɕá**=káw=ná=ɕèʔ...
tear eat=away=SEQ=then
'(The spirit) got angry and tore him apart and ate him, too. (It) tore and ate (him) and...' (KK1-1686)

(125) bàynam ləŋây=phéʔ **sa** **ʔəɕèp**=ná **dun** **ɕá**=màt=ʔay=dàʔ. nàm=dèʔ
goat one=ACC go tear=SEQ lead eat=COMPL=DECL=HS forest=ALL
dun **ɕá**=màt=ná...
lead eat=COMPL=SEQ

'(The tiger) came and tore a goat apart and took it away and ate it. (It) took (it) away to the woods and ate (it) and...' (KK1-1596)

3.9 Causation

Studies of serial verbs have often shown that when a causative relation is assumed between V_1 and V_2 in serialization, it is that of direct causation (Lord 1974: 196–7, 1975: 28–30, Kato 1993: 183–4, Cleary-Kemp 2015: 125–6, 188–9). Lord (1974: 196–7) shows that the V_2 in serial verbs in Yoruba "is always in some sense a further development, result or goal" of V_1. A sequence of clauses, in contrast, does not always entail such a relationship. This observation can also be demonstrated by serial verbs in Jinghpaw. To illustrate, consider the following example, where the killing event described by V_2 is always understood as being directly caused by the pinching event depicted by V_1. This can be demonstrated by the fact that the sentence cannot be continued with expressions such as 'by poison', which contradicts the point that the death of the raven was a direct consequence of its having been pinched.

(126) cəkhân=gò ʂi=ná lətáʔ=thèʔ... ʔù-kha=phéʔ... **mətép sàt**=káw=ʔay.
crab=TOP 3sg=GEN hand=COM bird-crow=ACC pinch kill=away=DECL
'The crab pinched the raven with its claws and killed it.' (KK1-0109)

This is not always true for a chain of clauses, as demonstrated below. Although the raven's death is usually understood as a result of the crab's pinching, when an adequate context is given, this is not necessarily the case. Thus, it is not impossible to continue the sentence with an expression such as 'by poison'.

(127) cəkhân=gò ʂi=ná lətáʔ=thèʔ... ʔù-kha=phéʔ... mətép=ná sàt=káw=ʔay.
crab=TOP 3sg=GEN hand=COM bird-crow=ACC pinch=SEQ kill=away=DECL
'The crab pinched the raven with its claws and killed it.' (Elicited)

Along the same lines, in the serial verb given below, the death of the brother depicted by V_2 and his falling into the waterfall described by V_1 requires a reading of direct causation: The death can only be understood as a direct and immediate consequence of the fall. The serial verb cannot be used in a situation where his death is caused by other events, say, being bitten by a water snake 20 minutes after he fell into the waterfall.

(128) gənaw-wa=gò thó rum=dè? **khràt si**=màt=wà=?ay=dà?.
brother-man=TOP there waterfall=ALL fall die=COMPL=VEN=DECL=HS
'The younger brother fell into that waterfall and died.' (KK1-0754)

Likewise, in the following example, the falling of the soil (V_2) should be the direct result of the crumbling (V_1), not by other events like being pushed by a bulldozer.

(129) gá=ni=gò **rùn khràt**=ìnná nday dò?phúm=phé? məgàp=káw=?ay.
soil=PL=TOP crumble fall=SEQ this front.post=ACC cover=away=DECL
'The soil crumbled and fell and covered this front post of the chief's house.' (KK1-0932)

The serial verb below also assumes a direct causation reading, namely, that one threw a frog (V_1), directly causing it to be put into the hearth (V_2).

(130) ɕù? day=phé?... ?wàn-maŋ=dè? **gəbày baŋ**=dàt=?ay...
frog that=ACC fire-debris=ALL throw put=away=DECL
'(He) threw the frog into the hearth...' (KK1-0472)

The causal relationship thus shows that serial verbs and multi-clausal constructions are not always synonymous, as suggested by Lord (1974) and subsequent studies. It is often suggested that serial verbs "describe what is conceptualized as a single event" or sub-events of a single macro-event (Aikhenvald 2006: 1). Although the notion of single eventhood is fuzzy and often not practically demonstrable (Haspelmath 2016: 306), as suggested by Cleary-Kemp (2015: 120–6), the direct causal relation holding between component verbs provides a criterion for diagnosing the eventhood of serial verbs together with other linguistic criteria associated with the macro-event property (see Bohnemeyer et al. 2007 and Cleary-Kemp 2015 for further discussions).

4 Conclusions

This paper explored the clausehood of serial verbs in Jinghpaw with a special focus on the sequential serial verbs that are symmetrical and describe successively occurring interconnected events: Are they monoclausal constructions with a single predicate character, or multiclausal constructions like coordinate and subordinate sentences? The overarching argument presented in this paper is that, in line with other serializing languages of the world, serial verbs in Jinghpaw are monoclausal constructions. As summarized in (131) below, this is demonstrated by a number of differentiating properties that distin-

guish between serial verbs on the one hand, and a chain of clauses on the other; indeed, many of these properties work in conjunction to characterize serial verbs as monoclausal constructions.

(131) Differences between serial verbs and sequences of clauses

	Serial verbs	Multiple clauses	Sections
pause intervention	impossible	possible	3.1
non-contiguity	impossible	possible	3.2
large number of components	impossible	possible	3.3
narrow aspect scope	impossible	possible	3.4
narrow negation scope	impossible	possible	3.4
narrow temporal scope	impossible	possible	3.4
narrow adverb scope	impossible	possible	3.4
different volitionality	impossible	possible	3.5
duplicate semantic roles	impossible	possible	3.6
different subjects	impossible	possible	3.6
different objects	impossible	possible	3.6
narrow question scope	impossible	possible	3.7
repetition in yes-answers	common	less common	3.7
repetition in bridging linkage	common	less common	3.8
indirect causation	impossible	possible	3.9

All the properties we explored in Section 3 illustrated the differences between serial verbs and their multiclausally paraphrased counterparts. Indeed, many of them offer arguments in favor of identifying the monoclausal nature of serial verbs. In terms of prosody, a serial verb sequence, like a monoverbal predicate, is pronounced within one intonation contour. The contiguity and the absence of an overt marker of coordination and subordination also suggest that serial verbs are unlike other types of multiclausal constructions in the language, which are overtly marked by subordinators and other related markers in order to encode syntactic dependency. Serial verbs, just like other monoclausal constructions, can be specified only for a single value of aspect, polarity, and temporal setting. Adverbs cannot independently modify each component verb in serialization. Serial verbs cannot simultaneously take different values of volitionality as well. Like monoclausal constructions headed by a single verb, serial verbs are prohibited from containing du-

plicate semantic roles, where subjects are always shared by component verbs, and when transitives are involved, objects are also necessarily shared. The whole serial verb complex, acting as a single unit, is more likely to be recapitulated in repetition phenomena such as the yes-answers to polar questions and bridging constructions in the narrative flow. Based on these initial findings, further studies are required in order to demonstrate the clausehood of other serial verb types.

Symbols and abbreviations

Intonation breaks are indicated by '/'. Clitic boundaries are marked by equals signs and other morpheme boundaries by hyphens. Square brackets are used to enclose nominalized clauses. The abbreviations used in this paper are based on the Leipzig Glossing Rules. Other abbreviations include: APPL (applicative); CONT (continuous); CONTR (contrastive); CSM (change-of-state marker); EMPH (emphatic); EXP (experiential); HS (hearsay); PER (perlative); RED (reduplicant); SEQ (sequential); SFP (sentence-final particle); SIM (simultaneous); SUPER (superlative); VEN (venitive); V_1 (the first verb in serialization); V_2 (subsequent verb in serialization); Vi (intransitive verb); Vt (transitive verb); Vol (volitional verb); NonVol (non-volitional verb).

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Serial verb constructions: A cross-linguistic typology*, 1–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2018a. *Serial verbs*. Oxford Bibliographies Online. New York: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2018b. *Serial verbs.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.). 2006. *Serial verb constructions: A cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bohnemeyer, Jürgen, N. J. Enfield, James Essegbey, Iraide Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Sotaro Kita, Friederike Lüpke, and Felix K. Ameka. 2007. Principles of event segmentation in language: The case of motion events. *Language* 83(3): 495–532.

Cleary-Kemp, Jessica. 2015. Serial verb constructions revisited: A case study from Koro. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Dai, Qingxia. 1998. Jingpoyu de liandongshi [Serial verbs in Jingpo]. *Minzu jiaoyu yanjiu* 1998.S1: 1–8.

Dai, Qingxia. 2012. *Jingpoyu cankao yufa* [A Jingpo reference grammar]. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press.

Dai, Qingxia and Xijian Xu. 1992. *Jingpoyu yufa* [A Jingpo grammar]. Beijing: Minzu University of China.

de Vries, Lourens. 2005. Towards a typology of tail-head linkage in Papuan languages. *Studies in Language* 29(2): 363–384.

Dixon, R. M. W. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in typological perspective. In R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.) *The semantics of clause linkage: A cross-linguistic typology*, 1–55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Durie, Mark. 1997. Grammatical structures in verb serialisation. In Alex Alsina, Joan Bresnan, and Peter Sells (eds.) *Complex predicates*, 289–354. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Enfield, N. J. 2008. Verbs and multi-verb constructions in Lao. In Anthony Diller, Jerry Edmondson, and Yongxian Luo (eds.) *The Tai-Kadai languages*, 83–183. London and New York: Routledge.

Enfield, N. J. and Bernard Comrie. 2015. Mainland Southeast Asian languages: State of the art and new directions. In N. J. Enfield and Bernard Comrie (eds.) *Languages of mainland Southeast Asia: The state of the art*, 1–26. Boston and Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Foley, William A. and Mike Olson. 1985. Clausehood and verb serialization. In Johanna Nichols and Anthony Wodbury (eds.) *Grammar inside and outside the clause*, 17–60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Givón, Talmy. 1991. Some substantive issues concerning verb serialization: Grammatical vs. cognitive packaging. In Claire Lefebvre (ed.) *Serial verbs: Grammatical, comparative and cognitive approaches*, 137–184. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Guérin, Valérie and Grant Aiton. 2019. Bridging constructions in typological perspective. In Valérie Guérin (ed.) *Bridging constructions*, 1–44. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Hanson, Ola. 1896. *A grammar of the Kachin language*. Rangoon: American Baptist Mission Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2016. The serial verb construction: Comparative concept and cross-linguistic generalizations. *Language and Linguistics* 17(3): 291–319.

Jarkey, Nerida. 2015. *Serial verbs in White Hmong*. Leiden: Brill.

Kageyama, Taro. 1993. *Bunpo to gokeisei* (Grammar and word formation). Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Kato, Atsuhiko. 1993. Sugokaren-go no doshirenzoku (Verb serialization in Sgaw Karen). *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 45: 177–204.

Kato, Atsuhiko. 1998. Pokaren-go (tobuhogen) no doshirenzoku ni okeru shudoshi ni tsuite (On head verbs of serial verb constructions in Pwo Karen). *Gengo Kenkyu* 113: 31–61.

Kurabe, Keita. 2010. Jinpo-go ni okeru doshirenzoku no bunpoka (Grammaticalization of serial verbs in Jinghpaw). *RIHN Descriptive Linguistics Series* 2: 15–37.

Kurabe, Keita. 2011. Jinpo-go ni okeru tsuiku-hyogen (Pallarel expressions in Jinghpaw). *RIHN Descriptive Linguistics Series* 3: 37–57.

Kurabe, Keita. 2013. *Kachin folktales told in Jinghpaw*. Collection KK1 at catalog.paradisec.org.au [Open Access]. https://dx.doi.org/10.4225/72/59888e8ab2122

Kurabe, Keita. 2017. *Kachin culture and history told in Jinghpaw*. Collection KK2 at catalog.paradisec.org.au [Open Access]. https://dx.doi.org/10.26278/5fa1707c5e77c

Kurabe, Keita. in press. A typological profile of the Kachin languages. In Paul Sidwell and Mathias Jenny (eds.) *The languages and linguistics of mainland Southeast Asia: A comprehensive guide*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kurabe, Keita and Lu Awng. to appear. Kachin orature project: Documentation, preservation, and revitalization of oral heritage in northern Myanmar.

Lefebvre, Claire and Anne-Marie Brousseau. 2002. *A grammar of Fongbe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Liu, Lu (ed.). 1984. *Jingpozu yuyanjianzhi: Jingpoyu (Outline of the language of the Jingpo people: The Jingpo language)*. Beijing: Nationalities Press.

Lord, Carol. 1974. Causative constructions in Yorùbá. *Studies in African Linguistics, Supplement* 5: 195–204.

Lord, Carol. 1975. Igbo verb compounds and the lexicon. *Studies in African Linguistics* 6(1): 23–48.

Matisoff, James A. 1969. Verb concatenation in Lahu: The syntax and semantics of "simple" juxtaposition. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 12(1): 69–120.

Matisoff, James A. 1974. Verb concatenation in Kachin. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 1(1): 186–207.

Sawada, Hideo. 1988. Gendai-biruma-go ni okeru doshihairetsu no ruikei ni tsuite (On the typology of verb sequences in Modern Burmese). *Kyoto University Linguistic*

Research 7: 73–110.

Sawada, Hideo. 2017. Ronwo-go no fukudoshi-kozo (Multi-verb constructions in Lhaovo). In Tonan-ajia-shogo kenkyukai (eds.) *Tonan-ajia tairikubu-shogengo no doshirenzoku*, 162–207. Tokyo: The KEIO Institute of Cultural & Linguistic Studies.

Solnit, David B. 2006. Verb serialization in Eastern Kayah Li. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Serial verb constructions: A cross-linguistic typology*, 144–159. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

動詞連続と単節性：ジンポー語の事例研究

倉部 慶太

【キーワード】動詞連続、節性、単節性、ジンポー語、チベット・ビルマ諸語

要旨

複数の動詞からなる動詞連続（serial verbs）が単一の節であるか複数の節であるかは、動詞連続の研究において活発に議論されてきた中心的問題の 1 つである。本稿では、ジンポー語（ミャンマー北部：シナ・チベット語族）の動詞連続のうち、特に継起を表す動詞連続に焦点をあて、音調、隣接性、構成動詞数、文法・意味範疇の共有、意志性調和、項の共有、肯定回答、節連結、使役など様々な観点から、動詞連続と複数節の連続とを比較する。結論として、動詞連続は上記の観点から複数節の連続と明確に区別され、むしろ、単一動詞を主要部にもつ単一節と同様の振る舞いを示すことを報告する。

受領日　2020年10月7日
受理日　2020年12月28日