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Abstract

Syntactically and semantically, the double verb construction has always been a matter of controversy in South Asian languages. This paper is an attempt to draw a distinction between complex predicates and serial verb constructions in Gojri. It has been noted that these terms are intermingled in many ways and therefore raise different questions regarding the nature of these structures. The double verb construction in Gojri has an edge over other regional languages as they represent different categories of sentence formation.

1. Introduction

The double verb construction is a common phenomenon in South Asian languages and has been studied since long. However, there has been always controversy over the status of these constructions. The south Asian languages belong to four different families namely; Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Tibeto-Burman and Austro-Asiatic. Masica (1991, 1976) reports that these families share certain syntactic-semantic features, though they show their own individualities. The Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages have received more attention regarding this issue than their counterparts. Among other Indo-Aryan languages, Hindi-Urdu (Nespital 1997, Butt 1997 &1995, Arora 1979, Hook 1974), Bengali (Singh 1998, Ramchand 1990, Dasgupta 1977), Punjabi (Akhtar 2000 &1998, Bhatia 1993) and Marathi (Panndharipande 1990) were frequently reported.

Gojri is one of the Indo-Aryan languages which has not yet been studied from this perspective. Most of its sister languages, such as Hindi-Urdu and Punjabi, have been restricted to the complex predicate formation that is one of the forms of VV construction. However, Gojri displays another very common and well studied formation
of verb complexes that is commonly known as the serial verb construction. Serial verb constructions are a hallmark of many African languages and creoles. Jayaseelan (2004) claims that the serial verb construction is very common in Dravidian languages including Tamil, Telugu and Kannada. It seems that this construction is more common in Dravidian than the Indo-Aryan Languages of South Asia.

However, it is strange that no clear cut distinction has yet been made between complex predicates and the serial verb construction. The V-V construction is so complicated that no single definition has been put forward to capture the nature of these constructions. Unfortunately, some linguists interchange these terms and take one for the other, especially in South Asian languages as well as some other serial African languages.

Without going into the details of the history of these constructions, I will put forward different arguments that would draw a distinction between the V-V complex Predicates and V-V serial verb constructions. Consider the following examples:

1 Serial verb construction
   a. kaloo-né seb chillii khayo
      kaloo-ERG apple-NOM peel.PF.F eat.PF.M
      ‘Kaloo peeled the apple and ate it.’

   Complex predicate
   b. kaloo-né seb chil diyo
      kaloo-ERG apple-NOM peel give.PF.M
      ‘Kaloo peeled the apple (for someone else).

The above examples illustrate the difference between the serial verb construction and complex predicates in Gojri. (1a) is one of the structures for the serial verb construction (SVCs) that indicates that there are two different events described by two serial verbs which come together in a sequence. It means that two different events have their own individuality in the course of action. However, (1b) describes just one action. The second verb diyo ‘give’ in the sequence is a light verb. The light verb does not have its full lexical meaning but contributes some aspectual meanings of ‘completiveness’ and
beneficiary meaning to the meanings of the first verb *chil* ‘peel’ in sentence. It indicates that the agent performed the action for someone else. Akhtar (2000) and Butt (1995) reports that there is a general agreement that $V_2$ in a complex predicate is the bleached forms of verb and therefore lose some of its semantic content. However it can be used as a main verb, in which case it has its lexical meanings. The only preferred position for the main verb in complex predicates is $V_1$ in $V+V$ sequences.

Another sharp difference can be noted between the above examples. In SVC construction, the non-final verbs display the –*ii* inflection which I label as Serial Verb Inflection (SVI). The last verb agrees with the highest nominative case in gender and number. On the other hand, in complex predicates, $V_1$ appears either in the root or infinitive form. But here too, $V_2$ shows agreement with the highest nominative case in gender and number.

It is also very important to note that neither SVCs nor complex predicate structure permits any embedding structures. They are mono-clausal in nature and share a single tense /aspect. If the verbs are treated as predicates of different clauses, they lose the status of double verb construction. It is quite significant to note that the complex predicates never allow more than two verbs (main verb and the light verb) in a clause. On the other hand, the serial verb construction may have more than two verbs. Consider the example:

2. a. kaloo-*nɛ* seb kepii khayo
   kaloo-ERG apple-NOM.M cut.SVI eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo cut and ate the apple.’

   b. kaloo-*nɛ* seb chillii kepii khayo
   kaloo-ERG apple-NOM.M peel.SVI cut.SVI eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo peeled, cut and ate the apple.’

   c. kaloo-*nɛ* gajer xariidii chillii kutterii khai
   kaloo-ERG carrot-NOM.F bought.SVI peel.SVI cut.SVI eat-PF.F
   ‘Kaloo bought, peeled, cut and ate the carrot.’

(2a) shows that there are only two verbs involved in the structure. On the other hand, (2b) displays three and (2c) four verbs respectively which show different individual
actions. These examples also confirm the fact that it is the final verb that is always inflected for tense and agrees with the highest nominative case in person, number and gender. The non-final verbs have nothing to do with any type of agreement. This is a general phenomenon in Gojri. Consider the following examples:

3. a. kaloo-ŋε ka kәppii bәdyo (SVCs) kaloo-ERG grass-NOM cut-SVI tie-PF.M ‘Kaloo cut the grass and tied it up.’

   b. kaloo-ŋε macchi pakkaii wertii kaloo-ERG fish-NOM cut-SVI tie-PF.F ‘Kaloo cooked the fish and served it.’

4. a. kaloo-ŋε ka kәp liyo (CPs) kaloo-ERG grass-NOM.M cut take-PF.M ‘Kaloo cut the grass.’

   b. kaloo-ŋε macchi xariid lii kaloo-ERG fish-NOM.F buy take-PF.F ‘Kaloo bought fish.’

Examples (3-4) clearly illustrate that the agreement pattern is not affected by different types of V-V constructions in Gojri.

Malayalam is a well studied Dravidian language. Jayaseelan (2004:67) presents the following example:

5. naan oru maanga poTTiccu kazhuki muRiccu I a mango pluck wash cut upp-il-iTTu kaDiccu cavaccu tinn-u salt-in-put bite chew eat-Past ‘I plucked, washed, cut, pickled, bit, chewed and ate a mango.’

Consider the following Gojri example:

6. kiren-ŋε saag kәppi totti kuttri pakaii khayo kiren-ERG spinach. M-NOM cut wash cut cook eat-PF.M ‘Kiren cut, washed, chopped, cooked and ate the spinach.’
Like Malayalam, there are no conjunctions involved in this type of construction and it is the last verb that is marked for Tense and aspect. It is also important to note that all the verbs preceding the last verb are invariant and identical in Gojri with the –ii inflection. This form is known as “the frozen” past tense in Malayalam (Jayaseelan 2004:68). However, these frozen verbs do not affect the status of the final finite verb in the construction both in Gojri and Malayalam.

2. The structure of SVCs

The pattern of serialization or serial verbs has been the focus of much research yet no definition has won authenticity and prestige in literature. It was Westermann (1930:26) who first introduced the term verb serialisation as “a row of verbs one after another…[in which] the verbs stand next to each other without being connected.” Collins (1993:91) defines serialisation in more detailed way. However, more recently, Collins (1997:462) refines it as: “A serial verb construction is a succession of verbs and their complements (if any) with one subject and one tense value that are not separated by any overt marker of coordination or subordination.”

2.1 Scrambling

The constituents of the serial verb construction or the complex predicate cannot be scrambled in any way. The following sentence shows the phenomenon:

7. A simple Gojri sentence

a. kaloo-ŋə səntro [khayo ɐ] kaloo-ERG orange-M.NOM eat-PF.M.Sg be.PRES.3.Sg
   ‘Kaloo has eaten an orange.’

b. kaloo-ŋə [khayo ɐ] səntro kaloo-ERG eat-PF.M.Sg be.PRES.3.Sg orange.M-NOM
   ‘Kaloo has eaten an orange.’

c. *kaloo-ŋə səntro ɐ khayo kaloo-ERG orange-M.NOM be.PRES.3.Sg eat-PF.M.Sg
   ‘Kaloo has eaten an orange.’
It is clear from the above example that Gojri does not allow verb combinations to be separated. Any attempt to separate the verbs in these constructions results in the ungrammaticality of the sentence. Both SVCs and CPs behave the same way in this respect. Consider the following examples:

8. Serial verb construction

a. kaloo-ŋɛ ɛ sәntro [kәppii khayo]
   kaloo-ERG orange-M.NOM cut eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo cut an orange and eat it.’

b. *kaloo-ŋɛ kәppii sәntro khayo
   kaloo-ERG cut orange-M.NOM eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo cut an orange and eat it.’

c. *kaloo-ŋɛ khayo sәntro kәppii
   kaloo-ERG eat-PF.M orange-M.NOM cut
   ‘Kaloo cut an orange and eat it.’

9. Complex Predicates

a. kaloo-ŋɛ sәntro [kәp diyo]
   kaloo-ERG orange-M.NOM cut give-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo cut an orange.’

b. *kaloo-ŋɛ kәp sәntro diyo
   kaloo-ERG cut orange-M.NOM give-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo cut an orange.’

c. *kaloo-ŋɛ diyo sәntro kәp
   kaloo-ERG give-PF.M orange-M.NOM cut
   ‘Kaloo cut an orange.’

The examples in (8) and (9) show that the double verbs in both the constructions cannot be separated. (8a) and (9a) both are fine because there is no violation of rule. However, (8b-c) as well as (9b-c) are ill-formed structure because of the violation of the general rule. Unlike the simple sentences and complex predicates, the verbs in serial verb construction cannot be scrambled even as a unit. Consider the following examples:
10. a. Serial verb construction
   *kaloo-ne  [kәppii  khayo]  sәntro
   kaloo-ERG  cut  eat-PF.M  orange-M.NOM
   ‘Kaloo cut an orange and eat it.’
   b. Complex Predicates
   kaloo-ne  [kәp  diyo]  sәntro
   kaloo-ERG  cut  give-PF.M  orange-M.NOM
   ‘Kaloo cut an orange.’

The serial verb constructions in Gojri always follow the canonical SOV word order. The above example illustrates clearly that the scrambling of two or more verbs in serial verb construction in Gojri is not allowed. Their position is fixed in the structure. On the other hand, (10b) shows that this type of scrambling is allowed in complex predicates. I assume that this phenomenon is allowed in complex predicates because they describe only one event while the serial verb constructions involve more than one action in a sentence. It may be concluded from this that the serial verb construction behaves differently with respect to scrambling. Contrary to this, complex predicates follow the same pattern of simple sentences in Gojri. This is one of the evidences that the serial verb construction is different from complex predicates which are interchangeably used in many languages.

2.2 Coordination

Coordination is another test that makes a clear distinction between serial verb constructions and complex predicates in Gojri. The following examples illustrate that the two verbs in a serial verb construction in Gojri cannot be coordinated by inserting any conjunction. On the other hand, two actions in the complex predicate formation can only be described by introducing two complex predicates.

11. a.  serial verb construction
   *kaloo-ne  sәntro  kәppii  hor  khayo
   kaloo-ERG  orange-M.NOM  cut  and  eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo cut an orange and eat it.’

   b. Complex Predicates
   kaloo-ne  sәntro  [kәp  diyo]  hor  [bәnd choryo]
kaloo-ERG orange cut give-PF.M and distribute leave-PF
Kaloo cut an orange and distributed it.’

The examples above again confirm that the serial verb construction behaves in sharp contrast to complex predicates. It is interesting to note that any attempt to separate the two verbs in complex predicates results in poor grammatical structure. The series of actions which are described with different complex predicates can easily be shown in one serial verb structure in Gojri:

12. kaloo-ŋe sәntro [kәppii bәndәi ii khayo]
kaloo-ERG orange cut distribute eat-PF
Kaloo cut an orange, distributed and ate it.’

This means that a serial verb construction accommodates a wide range of events in Gojri. The example above also illustrates that there is no need to insert any conjunction in the Gojri SVCs. This rules out the possibility of the coordination analysis presented by Larsen (1991) for serial verb construction if applied to the serial verb construction in Gojri.

3. V2 is Head

Gojri is a head final language. In both the serial verb construction and complex predicates, one of the verbs selects a VP headed by the other verb. I assume that V₂ functions as a head in Gojri complex verb formations for a number of reasons. There have been introduced different tests for different languages. Dechaine (1993) argues that V₁ in Yoruba SVCs is the head because it can be repeated in the structure. Similarly, Baker and Stewart (2002) and George (1975) claim the same for Nupe. On the other hand, Nishiyama (1996:12) claims that V₂ is head in Japanese and Korean SVCs because it is repeated in these structures. It is noteworthy that in many languages this verb doubling has some semantic effects:
13. a. musa le le kata o
Musa sleep sleep house LOC
‘Musa actually slept in the house.’ (Nupe, Baker & Stewart 2002:12)

b. john-wa bill-o osi-taosi-ta koto-wa osi-taosi-ta kedo
john-TOP bill-ACC push-topple-PF fact-TOP push-topple-PF but
‘John did push and toppled Bill, but...’ (Japanese, Nishiyama 1996:12)

This is not the case for Gojri. No verb can be repeated in one clause at any level. So this test does not work in Gojri. However, there are some other tests available in Gojri that may help to establish that the V₂ is head in these structures. Consider the following example:

14. kaloo-ne xat likhii pejyo
kaloo-ERG letter-NOM write send-PF.M
‘Kaloo wrote a letter and sent (it).’

(14) illustrates that it is V₂ that is marked for tense and agreement. The verb pej ‘send’ agrees with the highest nominative argument which is xat ‘letter’ in the structure. V₁ plays no role in this regard because it has invariant inflection. The same is true for complex predicate formations as they display either root form or infinitive form in the V₁ position.

15. a. kaloo-ne xat likh liyo
kaloo-ERG letter-NOM write take-PF.M
‘Kaloo wrote a letter.’ (self-beneficiary)

b. kaloo-ne xat likha~R diyo
kaloo-ERG letter-NOM write.INF give-PF.M
‘Kaloo let the letter be written.’ (Permissive)

In Gojri complex predicates, the non-final verb either takes the root form of the verb or it appears in the infinitive form. The use of the different forms of the main verbs in the Gojri complex predicates depend upon the meaning of the sentence as illustrated in (15) above. So it can be concluded that neither the root form nor the infinitive form contributes any significant role in agreement. This also supports the idea that it is the V₂ that is the head in such formations.
There is another test available for the serial verb constructions that suggests the claim that the $V_2$ is the head in these constructions in Gojri. If the negation marker or an adverb in Gojri serial verb constructions is placed before the first verb, it affects both the verbs. On the other hand, if any of these elements precedes $V_2$ only, its effect is restricted to the second verb. This means that the second verb is always influenced by these insertions whether it is placed before the first or the second verb. This suggests that $V_2$ in Gojri serial verb constructions stands as the head.

As discussed before, there has been disagreement in the literature concerning what a serial verb actually is and what sort of unified phenomenon it represents. Many attempts have been made to define serial verbs but nothing has successfully captured the status and grammatical nature of the category. It seems that this is because of different characteristics of serial verbs present in different languages. Recently, Aikhenvald (2003:1) has tried to summarise the defining properties of the serial verbs and their construction as: ‘a serial verb construction is a sequence of verbs which act together as a single predicate, without any marker of coordination, subordination or syntactic dependency of any other sort. Serial verbs describe what can be conceptualised as a single event. They are mono-clausal; their intonational properties are those of a mono-verbal clause, and they have just one tense, aspect and polarity value.’ However, it seems that there are different components in her definition that are controversial for the linguists who are working on serial verb constructions. For example the notions like ‘conceptualising a single event, or ‘acting as a single predicate’, etc are vague and cannot help in differentiating serial verbs from other categories of verbs. The literature review of the serial verb construction brings some very conflicting and contrasting views about their properties cross-linguistically. Seuren (1990:29) argues that the vast majority of serializing languages have basic SVO order. On the other hand, Crowley (2002:11) claims that OV is the order of most serializing languages.

Collins (1997) argues that it the argument sharing that distinguishes a serial verb from non serial verb formations. He supports his claim with the following examples from Ewe:
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16. a. me fo kadəgbε gba
    I hit lamp break
    ‘I hit the lamp and broke its glass.’

    b. me fo kadəgbε gba (yεme) tsimini
    I hit lamp break its glass
    ‘I hit the lamp and broke its glass.’

Collins claims that (16a) is an example of a serial verb construction while (16b) is not. He justifies his argument by putting both the above examples into the future. He argues that the true serial verb construction allows only one future marker as shown in (17a) below while the coordination in (17b) demands that both the verbs should bear their own future marking:

17. a. me a fo kadəgbε gba
    I FUT hit lamp break
    ‘I will hit the lamp and break its glass.’

    b. me a fo kadəgbε a gba (yεme) tsimini
    I FUT hit lamp FUT break its glass
    ‘I will hit the lamp and break its glass.’

Aikhenvald (2003) argues that serial verb constructions are “a prototype construction, where in an individual language what is called a ‘serial verb’ would be expected to have most, but not necessarily all, of the defining properties.” On the other hand, scholars like Delpanque (1998:248) argues that there is nothing that can be found in what is called the serial verb construction that does not turn up in non-serializing languages. He calls it nothing but a ‘myth’ because of their variant nature.

5. Functional and formal properties of serial verb constructions

Different question are frequently raised regarding the functional and formal principles of the serial verb constructions. For example, why do we have serial verbs constructions in a very small number of languages and what different functions do these constructions perform?
Newmeyer (2004:5) presents that there are economy – and iconicity based reasons for the existence of the SVCs. This means that in serial verb constructions, conceptual dependencies exist and the chances of different propositions are reduced. Similarly, these constructions are helpful in generating meanings such as comparison and preference, which are not possible with other structures. For example Byrne (1987:225) quotes the following example from Saramaccan to express comparison:

18. a bigi pasa di mii
   3sg tall surpass the child
   ‘He is taller than the child.’

Contrary to functional principles, formal principles apply to abstract structures. Baker (2001:142) argues that serial verb constructions are only available in those languages which have no tense marking or which express tense as an independent word. This is not true. There exist some languages that have serial verbs that bear tense markers. Foley and Olson (1985:21) introduce the following example from Yimas that refutes Baker’s claim:

19. namarawt tikir-gat ya-na-pay-pu-t’
    man chair-pl 3plO-3sgS-lie-go-perf
    ‘The man carried the chair away.’

Similarly, Baker denies the possibility of serial verb constructions in VSO languages. Consider the example from Ravua by Schiller (1990) that rejects Baker’s claim:

20. ti me ho taw lik me pin ke-en
    take you go send letter you accompany to-here
    ‘Go, take the letter and come back.’

Baker (1989) further argues that verb serialization is not possible in cases where two verbs follow each other directly. According to his claim, ‘V-V adjacency is impossible in the serial verb construction.’ He supports his claim by introducing example from Sranan:

21. kofi naki amba kiri
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Kofi hit Amba kill
‘Kofi struck Amba dead.’

This can be disconfirmed here by showing that there are several serial languages which allow V-V adjacency. Gojri is one of those languages. Consider the following examples from different languages:

22. a. kaloo-ne ka kappii badyo
Kaloo-ERG grass.NOM cut-SVI tie-PF.M
‘Kaloo cut the grass and tied it up.’

b. naan oru maanga poTTiccu tinn-u
I a mango pluck eat-Past
‘I plucked and ate a mango.’ (Malayalam, Jayaseelan 2004: 67)

c. john-i sakwa-lul kkakke mek-ess-ta
john-N apple-ACC peel eat-Pst-Dec
‘John peeled an apple and ate it.’ (Korean, Chung 1993:24)

The above examples from three different languages confirm the fact that there is no restriction on the serial verbs preventing them from immediately following each other. It seems that Baker and Collins have just focused on the African languages which allow the object to intervene between the serial verbs. The whole discussion suggests that it is hard to fix a criterion for SVCs because of the variant nature of the languages in which they exist.

6. Argument Sharing


Unlike the majority of languages which have a serial verb construction, the object is not sandwiched between the two verbs in Gojri. Consider the following examples:
23. a. kaloo-nɛ seb chillii khayo
   kaloo-ERG apple-I NOM peel-SVI eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo peeled the apple and ate it.’

   b. wo à fufu ù
      they cooked fufu eat
      ‘They cooked fufu and ate it.’(Ewe, Collins 1993: 91)

   c. di uman kuk res sel
      The woman cook rice sell
      ‘The woman cooked some rice and sold it.’ (Krio, Johnson 2002: 41)

   d. bola se dran ta
      bola cooked meat sell
      ‘Bola cooked some meat and sold it.’ (Yoruba, Lord 1974)

   e. mi fringi a batra broko
      i throw the bottle break
      ‘I threw the bottle and broke it.’ (Sranan, Crowley 2002:10)

(23a) confirms the fact that the Gojri object in serial verb construction does not occur between the two verbs but instead always precedes the first verb. In all other examples (23b-e), it appears between the two serial verbs.

In many languages, it can be hard to distinguish serial verb construction from coordination structures. However, the following sections will clearly illustrate that the Gojri serial constructions are real SVCs.

6.1 The shared tense marker test

Collin (1997) observes that only one tense marker is allowed in serial verb constructions. This is also the case in the Gojri serial verb construction. Consider the following examples:

24. a. kaloo-nɛ seb chillii khayo
   kaloo-ERG apple-I NOM peel-SVI eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo peeled the apple and ate it.’

   b. *kaloo-nɛ seb chilliyo khayo
      kaloo-ERG apple-I NOM peel-PF eat-PF.M
      ‘Kaloo peeled the apple and ate it.’
Sharing of a single tense marker in (24a) confirms that Gojri displays the genuine serial verb construction. The non-final verb as shown in (24a) is inflected for the serial verb inflection viz –ii which has nothing to do with tense and is the same for all numbers and gender in Gojri. (24b) is ungrammatical because it violates the single tense marker condition on serial verb constructions. On the other hand, (24c) is fine because it has been split into two clauses and each verb in its respective clause needs its own tense marker.

6.2 The shared adverb test

Like many other Indo-Aryan, adverbs in Gojri generally follow the serial verbs. When an adverb is placed before the serial verbs, it affects both the verbs as shown in (25a) below.

25. a. kaloo-ne seb tawli tawli chillii khayo
   kaloo-ERG apple-NOM quickly peel-SVI eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo peeled and ate the apple quickly.’

b. kaloo-ne seb chillii tawli tawli khayo
   kaloo-ERG apple-NOM peel-SVI quickly eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo peeled the apple and ate it quickly.’

This evidence confirms that the Gojri serial verbs share an adverb in general. Sometimes, however there is a need to focus the second verb only in such constructions. In such cases, where the adverb is inserted between the serial verbs, it will only affect the following verb. This does not change the status of the serial verb construction in Gojri.

6.3 The shared negation marker

Like adverbs, the negation marker is also shared by the serial verbs when it precedes the two serial verbs in Gojri. Again if it is inserted between the two verbs, it affects the
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second verb only without changing the status of the serial verb construction. It is quite obvious from these tests that the morphological structure of both verbs does not change if we insert either the negation marker or an adverb between them. This confirms that Gojri display genuine serial verb construction:

26. a. kaloo-nә seb ni~ chillii khayo
   kaloo-ERG apple-NOM NEG peel- SVI eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo didn’t peel and eat the apple.’

   b. kaloo-nә seb chilli ni~ khayo
   kaloo-ERG apple-NOM peel- SVI NEG eat-PF.M
   ‘After peeling the apple, Kaloo didn’t eat it.’

6.4 The empty category test

The empty category test is also important evidence that justifies the claim that serial verbs in Gojri share an object and never allow any pronoun to occupy that position.

Consider the following example:

27. a. kaloo-nә ka kәppii bәdyo
   kaloo-ERG grass-NOM cut.SVI tie-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo cut the grass and tied it up.’

   b. *kaloo-nә ka kәppii issa~ bәdyo
   kaloo-ERG grass-NOM cut.SVI it tie-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo cut the grass and tied it up.’

The ungrammaticality of (27b) suggests that Gojri does not allow any pronoun to be inserted between the two serial verbs. This means that both the serial verbs share the same object, which always precedes the first serial verb in Gojri.

7. PRO vs. pro

A difference between the status of empty categories is remarkable in serial verb constructions cross-linguistically. Collin (1994:47, 1997:474) assumes it pro for Ewe while Nishiyama (1996:12) views it as PRO for Japanese. Other linguists favour the notion that these empty categories are either A-trace or A’-trace. So, in all we have four
different possibilities for these empty categories. I assume that the empty category cannot be either A-trace or A’-trace. It cannot be an A-trace because of Chomsky and Lasnik’s (1993) Chain Condition which says that the tail of an A-chain cannot be assigned Case. Also, as its antecedent is in a ο-position, hence violates the ο- criterion on one hand and the Projection Principle of Chomsky (1981) on the other hand. Similarly, it can not be A’-trace as it is not in a position of Case assignment.

This leaves two strong candidates for these categories. As indicated above, Collins (1994, 1997) argues that the empty category is pro in Ewe because it can be assigned a Case by the postposition yi. I assume that the empty category in Gojri serial verb constructions is PRO. This is the same phenomenon that exists in Japanese and Korean. Consider the following examples again for illustration:

28. a. kaloo-ng sentro chillii khayo
   kaloo-ERG orange. NOM peel.SVI eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo peeled the orange and eat it.’

b.  

\[
\begin{align*}
&vP \\
&\downarrow \\
&D P \\
&\downarrow \\
&\text{Kaloo} \\
&\downarrow \\
&V P 2 \\
&\downarrow \\
&V \\
&\downarrow \\
&s entro_i \\
&\downarrow \\
&V P 1 \\
&\downarrow \\
&D P \\
&\downarrow \\
&\text{PRO}_i \\
&\downarrow \\
&\text{chil} \\
&\downarrow \\
&kha
\end{align*}
\]

At first glance, the structure (28b) raises a very general question about the position of the PRO. In other words, the question arises as to how PRO can occur in a position which is governed by V and assigned Case under government of V. Following Nishiyama (1996:9) and Bouchard (1993), I argue that the notion of government discarded in Chomsky (1995), Chomsky’s (1981) PRO theorem should be modified in
terms of Case rather than government. He illustrates the distribution of PRO in the following way:

29. PRO appears in a non-Case position.

Referring to Burzio’s generalization, I argue that the verb governing PRO has no external argument in (28b), therefore the position of PRO is not assigned case.

7.1 Internal argument sharing

Internal argument sharing (object sharing) has been recognized as one of the main features of serial verb constructions cross-linguistically. This property of SVCs plays a significant role in distinguishing them from other similar structures. Collins (1993: 93) argues that in a serial verb construction, $V_1$ and $V_2$ must share an internal argument. Baker (1989:517) argues that “object sharing” can be well described in syntax and to support his claim he gives the following Sranan example and its underlying structure.

30. a. kofi naki amba kiri  
    kofî hit amba kill  
    ‘Kofî struck Amba dead.’

b. 

![Diagram of Sranan example and its underlying structure]
Baker is of the opinion that SVCs are dual headed. He assumes that the V and V’ count as heads and are dominated by upper V’; therefore they jointly constitute a single predicate. As shown in the structure, there are two competing candidates for the head i.e. [v naki] and [v’kiri]. Both these two verbs assign a O-role to Amba and share the direct object.

Collins (1994:31) points out some problems with the Baker’s analysis. He argues that Baker’s analysis does not account for any empty category within the VP headed by V_2. Secondly, the proposed structure by Baker does not satisfy the binary branching constraint (Kayne 1984 and Larson 1988). More importantly, it clashes with Collins structure (1993, 1994, 1997) of SVCs which offers two separate heads by V_1 and V_2 where V_1 is a head selecting VP_2 as its complement. Consider the following examples from Gojri:

31. a. kiren-ŋɛ looter pakkaii werteyo
    kiren- erg curry-NOM cook-PF serve-PF
    ‘Kiren cooked the curry and served it.’

b. kaloo-ŋɛ kiren-na~ soTii chaaii kuTTyo
    kaloo-erg kiren-NOM stick pick-PF beat-PF
    ‘Kaloo picked a stick and beat Kiren with it.’

c. kaloo-ŋɛ piilo mәllii maaryo
    kaloo-erg antNOM grind-PF kill-PF.M
    ‘Kaloo killed the ant by grinding it.’

Unlike in Ewe, the Gojri example (31a) illustrates that there is an internal argument that is overtly shared by both the serial verbs pak ‘cook’ and wert ‘serve’. However, the instrument of V_2 in (31b) is considered as the direct object of V_1. Ewe displays the same in such structures. This shows that there are some similarities as well as differences in SVCs across the languages that display this formation.

32. kaloo-ŋɛ sentro chillii khayo
    kaloo-erg orange. NOM peel.SVI eat-PF.M
    ‘Kaloo peeled the orange and eat it.’
The above example shows that the two verbs behave as separate transitive verbs as both the arguments are involved in the events described by the verbs chil ‘peel’ and kha ‘eat’ respectively. So it may be concluded here that both the verbs are sharing the arguments. Apparently there arise two questions: a) how can the missing arguments in situation be handled? And b) what is the underlying structure for a single clause with two separate transitive verb?

Regarding the first question, most of the discussions have focused on the shared /missing internal arguments. The external argument has not received much place in the discussions because it is thought that it has nothing to do with the sharing phenomenon. Chomsky (1995) assumes that the external argument is introduced by the little v which is above the VP level, but below TP. The little v here performs two functions. First it assigns the Agent theta role and secondly, it licenses the transitive verb form to check the Accusative case. Kratzer (1996) has a parallel idea regarding the external argument, however she introduces Voice instead of Chomsky’s little v with same structural position in the structure. So far as the second question is concerned, Baker and Stewart (2002) propose an articulated clause structure with an adjunction structure.

Following Collins (1993, 1994, 1997), I claim that V2 is head in the Gojri serial verb constructions and repeat (28b) as the underlying structure for the Gojri serial verbs:

33. a. kaloo-ŋɛ  sentro  chillii  khayo
   kaloo-ERG  orange. NOM  peel.SVI  eat-PF.M
   ‘Kaloo peeled the orange and eat it.’

b.
The structure of object sharing in Gojri serial verb is straightforward for many reasons. Firstly, the object does not intervene between the two verbs in Gojri serial verb construction contrary to the most other languages that display this phenomenon. Secondly, the verbs are generally adjacent to each other. Furthermore, the direct object always precedes the serial verbs in Gojri to satisfy head final parameter. Hence, the proposed structure fulfils the requirement within the minimalist theory of Chomsky (2005) for the Gojri serial verb constructions.

8. Conclusion

The comparative study of different double verb formations in Gojri clearly indicates that they belong to different categories of structure. Though there are some superficial similarities, their semantics and syntax displays significant differences. I have also pointed out that Gojri does not allow pro in these constructions where as it is a hallmark of these constructions in African languages.
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