



Serial Verb Construction vs Complex Predicates in Punjabi: An Integrated Analysis of Event Structure

Bisma Butt^{a*1} , Muhammad Ajmal Khan^b , Saqib Mahmood^c ,

Abdul Hamid^d , Aadila Hussain^e 

^a Department of English Language and Literature, University of Lahore, Gujrat Campus

^b Department of English, GIFT University, Pakistan

^c Department of English, GIFT University, Pakistan

^d Department of English & Foreign Languages, University of Swat, Pakistan

^e Department of English, Punjab University Gujranwala Campus, Pakistan

Received 10 February 2021 | Received in revised form 10 June 2021 | Accepted 20 June 2021

APA Citation:

Butt, B., Khan, M. A., Mahmood, S., Hamid, A., Hussain, A. (2021). Serial Verb Construction vs CPs in Punjabi: An Integrated Analysis of Event Structure. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 1-21.

Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.911501>

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the syntax of serial verbs in the Punjabi language. The serial verb construction (SVC) is a widespread phenomenon across the world languages and in Punjabi as well. The SVC in Punjabi specifically is used as a full event described by two sub-events, with each event described by a separate verb coming together in a sequence. It shows that two different events have their own individuality during overall event. This study is descriptive in nature and a naturalistic methodology is adopted for detailed categorization of SVC in Punjabi. The study shows how the two types of SVCs in Punjabi are completely different from Complex Predicates (CPs) because each SVC contains two VPs but only one V whereas the complex predicate constructions have only one VP but two Vs. The study also shows that the relationship between two verbs/VPs is that of adjunction but not complementation (or coordination). Since this study explores the Indo-Aryan languages which are facing the dearth of linguistic research, it is going to be a useful contribution to the domain of serial verb constructions cross-linguistically. It will also be helpful to draw a line between SVCs and CP formations in the Punjabi language.

© 2021 EJAL & the Authors. Published by Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics (EJAL). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Keywords: Complex Predicate; Indo-Aryan Language; Serial verbs, Syntax

1. Introduction

The study focuses on the serial verb constructions (SVCs) in Punjabi. This language is a part of Indo-Aryan languages. Much of the Punjabi vocabulary originated from classical Sanskrit, which had developed as a Vedic language. *Panini* gave birth to the grammar rules of Sanskrit and its spoken form could be divided into *Upbharnish* and *Prakrit* which eventually developed as modern Indo-Aryan languages such as *Sindhi* in Sindh and *Punjabi* in Punjab (Ghai & Singh, 2012). Another name of Vedic language is oldest Punjabi because it is much nearer to Punjabi as compared to Hindi. Majhi dialect is one of the literary mediums in prose and poetical works of Punjabi literature. A few dialects other than Majhi have also made an influence on it (Masica,

* Corresponding Author.

E-mail address: bisma.butt@ell.uol.edu.pk

<http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.911501>

1993). In this study, an emphasis is made on the SVCs in Punjabi to challenge the prevailing notion that Punjabi does not show SVCs (Bukhari, 2009).

Punjabi SVCs exist as their own domain and these constructions are different from complex predicates. As it is evident, two or more verbs are involved in SVCs, which occur in a sequence without any intervention (i.e. without coordination or subordination) between them. By Collins (1997) and Nishyama (1998) describes serialization as a construction of serial verbs where a succession of verbs is present in a sentence with one subject and a tense without being separated by any intervention such as coordination and subordination. We also know that SVCs are different from complex predicates as they represent two different events whereas Complex Predicates (CPs) exhibit only one action with the help of two verbs. Moreover, SVCs are found cross-linguistically on a large scale, particularly in African languages. Such constructions are also very common in Creole languages. In late 1980s, SVC became popular in research studies but was confined to only a few languages such as, Gojri, Malayalam and Yoruba (Haspelmath, 2016).

Consider the examples given below:

| | | | | | |
|-----|------|--------|------|------|--|
| (1) | bola | se | dran | ta | |
| | bola | cooked | meat | sell | |

‘Bola cooked some meat and sold it.’ (Lord, 1974)

It was a general perception that SVCs are not commonly present in South Asian Languages. However, this concept was rejected by Pandharipande (1990) who reported some SVCs in Marathi. Jayaseelan (2004) also refuted this notion by giving some examples of SVCs from Malayalam and Tamil. He believed that aspectual meanings are conveyed through SVCs in these languages like English where auxiliaries are used to express these meanings. Consider the following SVC in Malayalam:

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------|--------|----------|---------|---------|
| (2) | naan oru | maanga | poTTiccu | tinnu-u | |
| | I | a | mango | pluck | eat-PST |

‘I plucked and ate a mango.’ (Jayaseelan, 2004) (Malayalam, Jayaseelan 2004: 67-70)

Bukhari (2009) has conducted a study on SVCs in Gojri. He used minimalist framework for his research work and proved that these constructions are present in Gojri too. Contrary to Jayaseelan (2004), he argued that in Gojri, these constructions are not used to convey the aspectual meanings. He further exhibited that three types of SVCs are present in Gojri. Consider the examples:

| | | | | | |
|---------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| (3). a. | kaloo-ne | sntro | chilii | khayo | |
| | ‘Kaloo | peeled | the orange | and ate it.’ | (Consequential) |
| (3). b. | maĩ | Buto | chə ndiiTàyo | | |
| | ‘I rooted | the tree | out (by shaking it).’ | | (Resultative) |
| (3). c. | kaloo-ne | kiren-nā | də ndo | chaaii | maaryo |

‘Kaloo took the stick and hit Kiren with it.’ (Instrumental) (Bukhari, 2009: 140)

Bukhari (2009) argues that aspectual meanings in Gojri are conveyed through complex predicates while SVCs show two actions simultaneously. According to Bukhari (2009), these constructions are not present in Punjabi language. However, in this study, the researchers have attempted to refute this notion by drawing a line between serial verbs and complex predicates. Consider the following examples:

| | | | | | |
|---------|---------------------------------------|------------|--------|----------|-------|
| (4). a. | kawa | daraxt-tay | Jaa | bethya | |
| | crow.M-NOM | tree-LOC | go.SV1 | sit.PF.M | |
| | The crow flew away and sat on a tree. | | | | (SVC) |

(4). b.

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|
| o-ne | Mobile | Tor | ditta |
| s/he-ERG | mobile.M-NOM | break.V | give.PF.M |
| He broke the mobile. (CP) | | | |

(4). c.

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|
| aslam-ne | Seb | Katya | khada |
| aslam.SG.M- ERG | apple.3.SG.M- NOM | cut-SV1 | eat-SV2 |
| Aslam cut the apple and ate it. (SVC) | | | |

Above examples 4(a) and 4(c) exhibit the phenomenon of serial verb construction where two verbs are used in a sequence without any coordination and subordination to describe two different events. On the other hand, 4(b) shows the complex predicate formation where two verbs are used to describe only one event.

Jayaseelan (2004) introduced the term ‘frozen verb’ for the first verb in SVC in Malayalam. He believed first verb in this language does not show any inflection as evident in the examples given in (2). Bukhari (2009) also showed this type of SVC in Gojri. But Punjabi shows two types of serial verb constructions. First type indicates, V2 is only marked for agreement and tense as in example 4(a) while type two SVC shows, all co-occurring verbs bear tense and agreement morphology as in 4(c).

Bukhari (2009) asserts that object in Gojri does not occur between the verbs; it always comes in front of the first verb in a sentence unlike African languages.

(5).

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|
| kaloo-ne | ka | kə ppii | bədyo |
| kaloo-ERG | grass-NOM | cut-SVI | tie-PF.M |
| ‘Kaloo cut the grass and tied it up.’ | | | |

In above example (5), both the verbs are transitive, and they share the same subject and object. V2 is the head of construction as it shows tense and agreement features while the first verb in (5) shows inflection. Bukhari (2009) represents first verb as SV1, on the other hand, Jayaseelan (2004) calls this verb as ‘frozen verb’.

Bukhari (2009) also mentions SVCs in Gojri which contain more than two verbs. These verbs also show the same features of SVCs as stated above in Gojri language. They do not display any intervention between them, and they also share the same subject and object. Consider the example:

(6).

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|---------|----------|
| kaloo-ne | seb | chillii | kutərii | khayo |
| kaloo-ERG | apple-NOM | peel-SVI | cut-SVI | eat-PF.M |
| ‘Kaloo peeled, cut and ate the apple.’ | | | | |

Above example of SVC shows that it is the last verb that shows agreement with the highest nominative argument in terms of tense whereas all the verbs that precede the final verb exhibits the lexical / base form. It is evident in example (7) that verbs in a sequence do not bear any intervention. Punjabi also shows such type of phenomenon where verbs come in a sequence. Consider the following example:

(7).

| | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------------|----------|----------|
| o-ne | Kapray | Kaday | toutay | latkaye |
| s/he.SG –ERG | clothes.PL.M-NOM | take out-SVI | wash-SV2 | hang-SV3 |
| S/He took out clothes, washed them and then hung them. | | | | |

Above example shows the second type of SVCs in Punjabi. In this construction, all the verbs show agreement in terms of tense, gender, number, and person.

A variety of serial verbs and complex predicates are present in Punjabi language. It exhibits the serial verbs in a sequence which comprises two or more than two verbs without any co-

ordination and conjunction structure. Bukhari (2009) has done a comprehensive study on SVC in Gojri that is one of the Indo-Aryan languages. He discussed only one type of serial verb construction in Gojri where serial verbs express one tense value that is marked on the last verb whereas Punjabi shows two types of serial verb constructions. This property makes this language distinct from other regional languages. Punjabi SVC1 shows that only the second verb carries the tense and agreement phenomenon whereas in SVC2, all the verbs in a sequence show agreement and tense morphology without any co-ordination marker or conjunction structure.

Looking at this variation, a need was felt to examine the different features of Punjabi Serial Verb construction (SVC) cross-linguistically. Since this issue belongs to the domain of Indo-Aryan languages which are facing the dearth of linguistic research, this study is going to be a useful contribution to literature. It will also be helpful to draw a line between SVCs and complex Predicate formations in the Punjabi language

2. Literature Review

The term Serial Verb Construction (SVC) was first coined for a single language (Stewart, 1963) while dealing with the Kwa language (Akan) and was gradually extended to cover other similar phenomena – first in geographically close languages like Yoruba (Stahlke, 1974) and in historically related languages like the creoles of the Atlantic region (Zimmermann & Amaechi, 2018; Zimmermann & Amaechi, 2018). Gradually, it was also used for typologically similar languages in Southeast and East Asia (Bisang, 1998), for Papuan and Austronesian languages (Crowley, 2002; Foley & Olson, 1985), and finally for languages of the Americas (Aikhenvald, 2006) and Australia (Nordlinger, 2010).

While extending the term SVC to a new language over the time, there was a risk that its meaning may change, because the defining properties that were applicable in the original languages would have no relevance in the new language. The resulting situation was summed up by Amberber, Baker, and Harvey (2010): “Despite the availability of impressive literature on serial verb constructions, there is still surprisingly little agreement on what exactly defines serial verb constructions”. However, Foley (2010) goes even further: “Are there any universal(ly) defining properties of serial verb constructions? Probably not, although the term may still prove useful as a convenient descriptive label like reduplication”. Lord (1973) observed that it is possible for “two or more verbs, not connected by conjunctions to have the same subject”.

SVCs are mono-clausal because they carry the intonational properties like mono-verbal clause and they bear only one polarity and tense value. These constructions are frequently reported in West African and South Asian languages (Aikhenvald, 2006). According to Crowley (2002), in SVCs, all the verbs in a sequence mark for agreement and tense morphology whereas, Lord (1974) argues that a row of verbs in SVC is present without being connecting to each other.

Christaller's grammar described the Twi language, which was spoken by the Asantes and Fantes of West Africa, as having a localized serial verb phenomenon and confined to the languages of West Africa and especially to those of the Kwa group (Veenstra & Muysken, 2017). These early investigators were not concerned with grammatical-theoretical issues such as why a sentence had more than one verb or what forms such verbs used. Their primary concern was in writing pedagogical grammars that could facilitate interaction between the natives and the foreigners. However, matters changed with the dawn of the generative enterprise in N. Chomsky, Longuet-Higgins, Lyons, and Broadbent (1981) which formalized the description of a sentence in terms of the notion of a set of Phrase Structure (PS) that characterized linguistic competence.

The basic idea, then and even till now, is that a sentence has one main verb; and, to express the same thing in another way, a clause ought to have only one finite verb. This definition of a sentence or clause made the serial verb phenomena look like some kind of 'oddity' that did not fall within the traditional Euro-centered approach of this framework. It is believed that a shift occurred in the analyses of the serial verb phenomena based on N. Chomsky (1993). By this time, it was widely accepted that transformations could create structures and then later delete a few portions of them when certain conditions were met. Thus, for those who were interested in the analysis of SVCs, it was no longer vital to pursue the issue of what allows a sentence to have two or more putative finite verbs that occur without an overt conjunction or subordinator in the phrase structure of some languages unlike English.

Ansre (1966) observed that some verb-like elements do not have a full set of verbal properties even though they occupied the position that verbs would normally occupy. This launched a new era in the analyses of the serial verb phenomenon in which the primary goal was to establish the different kinds of serial verbs based on the functional status of the verbs as well as the relations between them (Abubakari, 2011; Kari, 2003; Zimmermann & Amaechi, 2018). The central goal of generative analyses of SVCs since the early 1980s has been how to account for a more restricted notion of what can be an SVC and to find out the parameters of variation. Each analysis makes a different proposal based on what it assumes to be the relevant core of so-called SVCs rather than systematically providing tests for what an SVC is.

Collins (1997) claimed that the succession of verbs is called a serial verb construction and their complements consist of only one subject and one tense value. In these constructions, subordination or coordination markers are absent. He assumed that these structures are controlled because the last verb only incorporates the other verb. But this phenomenon is not true for SVCs in Punjabi where two types of such constructions are present. Thus, contrary to Collins (1997) and agreeing with both Zimmermann and Amaechi (2018) and Abubakari (2011) that Punjabi exhibits two types of serial verb constructions where the first type shows that only second verb is marked for tense and agreement whereas the second type indicates that all the verbs in a sequence show agreement and tense morphology and in both types of the relationship between verbs is of 'adjunction' and not of complementation. Example is given below:

(8)

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|
| aslam-ne | Aam | Katya | khada |
| aslam – ERG | mango – NOM | cut – SVI | eat - SV2 |
| Aslam cut the mango and ate it. | | | |

According to Wurmbbrand (2007), these constructions are reported cross-linguistically such as Africa, Asia, and creole languages of the Atlantic and Pacific. He further claims that syntactically, these constructions were investigated under theory of Principle and Parameter in late 1980s. He considered motion verb in English as SVC. Examples are given below where (a) represents the serial verb construction while (b) does not. However, these two sentences express the same meaning.

(9)

| | |
|----|----------------------|
| a. | Go get the book. |
| b. | Go and get the book. |

In Punjabi, the object always comes before the serial verbs because this language bears SOV word order.

According to Baker (2001), the internal argument sharing is basic element of serial verb construction, and this concept is true for Punjabi where serial verbs share the single object. Kachru (1986), however, argues that serial verb constructions of South Asian languages express belief, intention, and attitude of a speaker. Through these constructions, particular meanings such as disgust and disapproval are also elaborated and thus SVCs are very much different from V+V formations. This case is also present in Punjabi and examples are given below:

(10)

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|
| mein | Ghazal | Likh | wahai |
| I.SG-NOM | ghazal.SG.F-NOM | write-SV1 | show.F-PF |
| I was able to write a ghazal. | | | |

The verb *wahai* 'show' in Punjabi serial verb construction is generally taken in the sense of 'ability'. Bukhari (2009) commented that SVC terms and complex predicate are often interchangeably used. Hence, there are a lot of questions raised against the nature of SVCs. It is therefore very difficult to draw a line between these two constructions. In his work, Bukhari (2009) attempted to show a clear-cut distinction between complex predicate and serial verbs in Gojri. Punjabi also shows this clear-cut distinction between two constructions. To illustrate, he provided the following examples:

11 (a).

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| kaloo-ne | Seb | Chillii | khayo |
| kaloo- ERG | apple-NOM | peel. F – PF | eat. M -.PF |
| ‘Kaloo peeled the apple and ate it. | | (SVC-Gojri). | |

(b)

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| kaloo-ne | Seb | Chill | diyo |
| kaloo- ERG | apple – NOM | Peel | give.M - PF |
| Kaloo peeled the apple. | | (CP-Gojri) | |

12 (a)

| | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| o-ne | dhee-nu | Jyez | day | torya |
| s/he-ERG | daughter-ACC | dowry-NOM | give-SVI | send.M-PF |
| S/He gave his/her daughter dowry and send her. (SVC-Punjabi) | | | | |

12 (b)

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------|------------|
| o-ne | Ka | Vad | ditta |
| s/he-ERG | grass..M-NOM | cut-SVI | give..M-PF |
| She/ He cut the grass. (CP-Punjabi) | | | |

Above examples show that CPs and SVCs are entirely different from each other with respect to functional and formal properties.

3. Research Methodology

The naturalistic approach considered most appropriate for linguistic inquiries was used in this study. This approach was proposed by [Noam Chomsky \(1986\)](#) to investigate different parameters of different languages under the framework of Generative Grammar (GG). According to Chomsky, the primary conception of Naturalistic research approach is that investigations of different parameters of languages should be viewed as science like other branches of science for instance, chemistry, zoology, and physics. [Noam Chomsky \(1986\)](#) used this approach very frequently in his own research writings. According to him, one of the elements of mind is language. Keeping this claim in his view, he introduced a new terminology for ‘language and mind,’ i.e. ‘Methodological Naturalism’. This approach was useful to explore the explanatory nature of any phenomenon just like any other natural phenomenon of the world.

By using this approach, exploration of new principles of different languages is possible in terms of finding new concepts and novel issues regarding naturalistic data. Further, it helps to express them descriptively to theorize them. An authentic generalization based on description of targeted data is its achievement. [N. Chomsky \(1993\)](#) has proposed Minimalist Program (MP) with the help of different operations and mechanisms to make this methodology more functional. Further, for investigation of linguistic phenomena, this methodology is best to articulate the underlying fundamental principles of a specific set of ideas in a particular language. Moreover, the researchers were provided with minimalist syntax to theorize the serial verb construction in Punjabi under investigation.

4. Results and Discussion

It is premised in this study that SVC phenomenon exists in Punjabi in accordance with the definition of [Collins \(1997\)](#) of serial verb construction given in above section. Punjabi shows two types of serial verb constructions. 4(a) shows the first type in which V2 is only marked for agreement and tense while 4(c) shows type two SVC where all co-occurring verbs bear tense and agreement morphology. Punjabi serial verbs share the tense that is marked only on the last verb in first type and marked on all verbs in a sequence in type two. All the verbs in a sequence do not allow any intervention such as coordination and subordination in the structure and they share the same object and subject. On the other hand, 4(b) is an example of complex predicate because only one action is described by two verbs. In this CP construction, first verb is used to describe the action and second verb indicates the tense and aspect.

4.1 Serial Verbs vs Complex Predicates

According to Bukhari (2009), so far, there is no agreed definition of SVCs because cross-linguistically, many variations are observed. Different views are given by different linguists. For example, Bhatia (1993) presents compound verb as a serial verb in Punjabi. Similarly, Nishiyama (1998) considers double verb constructions in Japanese as serial verb constructions. Sometimes, the terms complex predicates, compound verbs and serial verbs are used interchangeably. The following examples in Punjabi show a clear distinction between SVCs and CPs.

(a) Serial Verb Constructions

(13). a.

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| o-ne | Khat | Likh | pejya |
| s/he-ERG | letter.M-NOM | write.SV1 | send.M.PF |
| S/he cut and ate the apple. (SVC1) | | | |

(13). b.

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------|--------|
| Chor | Zevar | Le | nasya |
| thief.S.M- NOM | jewellery.P.M-NOM | take.SV | run.PF |
| The thief took the jewelry and ran away. | | | |

(b) Complex Predicates

(14).a.

| | | | |
|------------------------|---------------|---------|--------|
| asif-ne | saanp-nu | Maar | ditta |
| asif.S.M-ERG | snake.S.M-ACC | kill.V1 | put.PF |
| Asif killed the snake. | | | |

(14).b.

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|
| uzma-ne | Khana | Kha | liyaa |
| uzma.S.F-ERG | meal.S.M-NOM | eat.V1 | take.PF.M |
| Uzma took her meal | | | |

Examples (13) and (14) show a clear distinction between these two constructions in Punjabi. Serial verb constructions are shown in 13 (a-b) where two verbs describe two different events. On the other hand, 14 (a-b) show complex predicate formations where two verbs are present, but they only exhibit one action. In such CP construction, the last verb is a light verb which is not marked for lexical meaning rather it is used to show agreement features and aspectual meanings.

In Punjabi, we can construct a sentence where two verbs exist in sequence without coordination (V1V2). V1 is the main verb while V2 is the light verb. However, unlike light verbs in general, V2 gives its full lexical meaning; hence, it may be included in SVCs. For example:

(15)

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|--------------|---------|----------|
| O | Bazar | Thela | Le | gya |
| he/she. SG.M-NOM | market-LOC | bag-SG.M-NOM | take-V1 | went-PST |
| He took the bag and went to market. | | | | |

Above example superficially exhibits the Complex Predicate phenomenon where one main verb comes with a light verb, and it is used for completion of the sentence. Here light verb *gya* is not used for completion rather it is giving its full lexical meaning like serial verb. The SV1 is in 'invariant' form just like the first type of SVC. Hence, this is a distinct feature of SVCs in Punjabi.

4.2 Characteristics of Serial Verbs

Bukhari (2009) gave the following features of SVCs by citing Muysken (1995).

- Serial verb construction has only one subject.
- This construction has one direct object.
- Only one verb (either the first, second or last verb in serial order) is marked for tense and aspect.

- In SVCs, only one possible negator is allowed.
- Interventions such as coordination, subordination and conjunction are not possible
- Intervening pause is also not allowed in SVCs.

Punjabi exhibits all these rules in SVCs. However, in different languages, some variations in terms of placement of negation marker, adverbs and object are present. Different features of Punjabi serial verb constructions are mentioned below:

4.2 Agreement

Punjabi shows two types of SVCs. In both types, verbs come in a sequence without any intervention such as coordination and subordination. First type exhibits tense agreement only on the final verb and non-final verb remains as 'invariant form'; while in second type, all verbs in the sequence of SVC show tense agreement. Examples are given below:

(16). a.

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------|--------------|
| aslam-ne | Ghazal | Likh | vahai |
| aslam.SG.M-ERG | ghazal.3.SG.F-NOM | write-SVI | show-PF.F.SG |
| Aslam was able to write a ghazal. (SVC1) | | | |

(16). b.

| | | | |
|--|------------------|---------|---------|
| aslam-ne | Seb | Katya | khada |
| aslam.SG.M-ERG | apple.3.SG.M-NOM | cut-SV1 | eat-SV2 |
| Aslam cut the apple and ate it. (SVC2) | | | |

16 (a) clearly shows that in Punjabi, the final verb does not show agreement with any other case except with the nominative. In this structure, the final verb shows agreement with the highest nominative NP *ghazal* which is feminine in gender and singular in number. This verb does not bear agreement with the subject *aslam* because it represents masculine gender and verb is marked for the feminine. The first verb which is also called non-final verb *likh* has 'invariant form' and it does not agree with the highest nominative NP. 16(b) shows that both the serial verbs (masculine in gender and singular in number) in a sequence individually agree with the highest nominative NP *seb* which is also masculine in gender and singular in number.

Above examples show that Punjabi is different from Gojri as it exhibits both types of SVCs while Gojri shows only first type of construction, as [Bukhari \(2009\)](#) discusses.

4.3 Case Marking

In Punjabi SVCs, ergative case is associated with form of the final verb and transitivity. Butt (1995) and [Bukhari \(2009\)](#) argue that this case is only assigned to the subject when transitive verb displays past tense or perfect aspect. These conditions are mandatory for ergative case. Otherwise, the subject will bear the nominative case. For example:

(17). a.

| | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------|-----------|
| o-ne | munday-nu | Khat | likh | pajeya |
| s/he-ERG | boy.3.SG.M-ACC | letter.S.M-NOM | write.SV | send-M.PF |
| S/he sent the boy giving him a letter. | | | | |

(17). b.

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------------|----------|-----------|
| admi | munday-nu | school | chad | aya |
| man.M-NOM | boy.M-ACC | school.S.M-NOM | leave.SV | come-M.PF |
| The man came after dropping the boy at school. | | | | |

Above construction 17(a) and 17(b) show that the final verbs *bhej* is in transitive and *aya* is in intransitive form and perfective aspect is used in both constructions. So, the subject carries the ergative case marker *-ne* in 17(a) and nominative case in 17(b). Actually, the first verb does not

show any effect on case marking, hence, in (17b) V1 is transitive and has no effect on case marking. The first verb does not affect the case marking as V1 in 17(b) is transitive but has no effect on the case marking.

4.4 Scrambling

Scrambling of serial verbs in Punjabi is not possible but this phenomenon can be observed in CPs where the verb group is scrambled as a whole unit. In complex predicates, the verb group cannot be split up even if it contains a main verb and auxiliary. This phenomenon is given below:

(18). a.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| asif-ne | Khana | [kha | lya] |
| asif.S.M-ERG | meal.S.M-NOM | eat- PRES.3.SG | take.M.SG-PF |
| Asif has taken his meal. | | | |

(18). b.

| | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| asif-ne | [kha | lya] | khana |
| asif.S.M-ERG | eat- PRES.3.SG | take. PF.M.SG | meal.S.M.NOM |
| Asif has taken his meal | | | |

(18). c.

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| * asif-ne | Lya | khana | khaya |
| asif.S.M-ERG | take. PF.M.SG | eat- PRES.3.SG | meal.S.M.NOM |
| Asif has taken his meal | | | |

(18). d.

| | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| * asif-ne | Khana | Lya | khaya |
| asif.S.M-ERG | eat- PRES.3.SG | take. PF.M.SG | meal.S.M.NOM |
| Asif has taken his meal | | | |

According to Bukhari (2009), emphasis in the meanings can be produced with the help of scrambling of verb group in Gojri. This case can also be observed in Punjabi. Above example 18(a) shows no certain emphasis on any component while 18(b) describes the action of taking meal which shows an additional emphasis on the meaning i.e., the particular action has been performed. In examples (18c-d), it is evident that that Punjabi does not permit any combination of verbs to be separated. 18(b) shows a grammatical sentence in Punjabi where the constituent of verb group cannot be split up. On the other hand, 18(c-d) constructions are marked as ungrammatical because they show deviation from the basic rule of scrambling in Punjabi.

The semantic result of scrambling can also be mentioned in CPs as given below in 19(b). Such type of case is also present in Punjabi SVCs. Complex predicates in Punjabi also exhibit these constructions. It is therefore clear that two verbs (i.e., the main verb and the light verb) cannot be split up but they move as a whole unit. Examples are given below:

(19). a.

| | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------|
| Uzma | Khat | [likh | ditta] |
| uzma.S.F-NOM | letter.S.M-NOM | write.PRES.3.SG | give.M-PF |
| Uzma has written a letter. | | | |

(19). b.

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|
| Uzma | [likh | ditta] | khat |
| uzma.S.F-NOM | write.PRES.3.SG | give.M-PF | letter.S.M-NOM |
| Uzma has written a letter. | | | |

(19). c.

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|
| *uzma | Likh | khat | ditta |
| uzma.S.F-NOM | write.PRES.3.SG | letter.S.M-NOM | give.M-PF |
| Uzma has written a letter. | | | |

(19). d.

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------|
| *uzma | Ditta | khat | likh |
| uzma.S.F-NOM | give.M-PF | letter.S.M-NOM | write.PRES.3.SG |
| Uzma has written a letter. | | | |

Above examples verify that verb group in Punjabi CPs can be scrambled but as a whole unit. On the other hand, 19(c-d) shows separation of verb group, that is why, these constructions are marked as ungrammatical. It exhibits that Punjabi CPs permit the scrambling of verb group as a whole unit as the simple sentences do.

According to Bukhari (2009), scrambling in Gojri SVCs is not possible. Unlike Gojri, this phenomenon is present in Punjabi SVCs where scrambling of verb group is possible but as a whole unit. This also clarifies that in SVCs, the position of serial verbs is not fixed. Consider the examples:

(20). a.

| | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|----------|
| Chor | Zevar | [le | nasya] |
| thief.S.F-NOM | jewelry.S.M-NOM | take.PRES.3.SG | run.M-PF |
| The thief took the jewelry and ran away. | | | |

(20). b.

| | | | |
|--|----------------|----------|-----------------|
| Chor | [le | nasya] | zevar |
| thief.S.F-NOM | take.PRES.3.SG | run.M-PF | jewelry.S.M-NOM |
| The thief took the jewelry and ran away. | | | |

(20). c.

| | | | |
|--|----------------|-----------------|----------|
| * chor | Le | zevar | nasya |
| thief.S.F-NOM | take.PRES.3.SG | jewelry.S.M-NOM | run.M-PF |
| The thief took the jewelry and ran away. | | | |

The construction 20(a-c) shows that in Punjabi SVCs, the scrambling of verb group is possible but as a whole unit and when the verb group is split up, the sentence is marked as ungrammatical as in above example (20c).

According to Bukhari (2009), SVCs in Gojri do not permit scrambling whereas CPs show scrambling but as a whole unit. He claims that in Gojri, SVCs and CPs behave differently in this regard. Unlike Gojri, Punjabi allows the scrambling in both formations such as SVCs and CPs but still it is assumed that these constructions behave differently in terms of scrambling. It is because in SVCs, two actions are performed while in CPs only one action is performed.

4.5 Tense / Aspect

According to Durie (1997), all the verbs present in SVCs show their own aspect, tense, and agreement features. Bukhari (2009) claims by citing Stewart (1963) that serial verbs can have only overt forms. He further concludes that in Gojri, it is the final verb which bears the agreement features. It is very interesting to note that CPs also behave in the same manner as SVCs. Their first verb appears in root form, and they share the single tense marker and aspect. The structure of both formations is always same. These constructions are however marked different on semantic grounds. Complex predicates often display the first verb in infinitive form which is not possible in SVCs. Consider the following examples:

(a) Complex Predicate:

(21). a.

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| o-nu | Khat | Likhna | paya |
| s/he.S-OBL | letter.M-NOM | write.INF | fall.M.PF |
| S/he had to write a letter. | | | |

(b) Serial Verb Construction:

(21). b.

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------|------------|
| uzma-ne | Khat | likh | pejya |
| uzma.S.F-ERG | letter.S.M-NOM | write-SV1 | send.M.-PF |
| Uzma wrote a letter and sent it. | | (SVC1) | |

(21). c.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| uzma-ne | Seb | katya | khada |
| uzma.S.F-ERG | apple.S.M-NOM | cut.M-SV1 | eat.M.-SV2 |
| Uzma cut the apple and ate it. | | (SVC2) | |

In CP 21(a), the final verb is in infinitive form and shows agreement with the highest nominative argument *khat* 'letter' as they are marked for same gender and number while in SVC 21(b), two actions are performed (i.e. writing a letter and sending it). In these constructions, both the verbs share the same subject *uzma* and object *khat*, the last verb is marked for tense, aspect, and agreement features. Whereas (21c) shows that both the verbs share the same subject and object and marked for tense/aspect and agreement features. 20(b) is an example of SVC1 in Punjabi while 21(c) depicts the SVC2.

4.6 Coordination

In this section, coordination test will be applied to draw a line between SVCs and CPs in Punjabi. In CPs and SVCs, two verbs cannot be split up by any coordination marker. However, in CPs, there is only one way to demonstrate two events i.e., replacement of last verb with the suffix-*kay* and insertion of two complex predicates. Examples are given below:

Serial Verb Construction

(22). a.

| | | | | |
|---|----------------|--------|----------|-----------|
| *daakiya | Khat | de | Or | aya |
| postman.M.S-NOM | letter.M.S-NOM | give.V | and.CONJ | come.M.PF |
| The postman delivered the letter and came back. | | | | |

Complex Predicates

(22). b.

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| asif-ne | Kitaab | [phaar-kay] | [saat | ditti] |
| asif.S.M-ERG | book.S.F.NOM | tear-CONJ | throw.V | give.S.F-PF |
| Asif tore the book and threw it away. | | | | |

Above example 22(a) shows that coordination marker is not allowed in SVCs in Punjabi. If separation of series of verbs happens, the sentence becomes ungrammatical. On the other hand, 22(b) exhibits that a conjunction can be used to display two actions performed by CP constructions but if this conjunction is used to intervene between two main verbs to display two actions, the result will be a grammatical construction. Examples are given below:

(22). c.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------|----------|-------|---------|
| *uzma-ne | Seb | [kaat | or | khaa] | leya |
| uzma.S.F-ERG | apple.S.M-NOM | cut.V | and.CONJ | eat.V | take-PF |
| Uzma cut an apple and ate it. | | | | | |

Above example (21c) clarifies the concept that a conjunction can be used between two CPs with

light verbs to represent two actions performed by complex predicates, otherwise the sentence would be ungrammatical.

4.7 Confirmation Tests

According to Bukhari (2009), in South Asian languages, it is not easy to differentiate between SVCs and CPs. He introduces some tests which can be used for a language to confirm the existence of SVCs. In the following sections, these tests will be applied to confirm the existence of SVCs in Punjabi.

4.8 The Shared Tense Marker Test

Bukhari (2009) claims by citing Collins (1997) that in Gojri, only one tense marker is allowed in SVCs. But in Punjabi there are two types of SVCs which make this language distinctive from others. Type one indicates that V2 is only marked for agreement and tense; while type two shows that all co-occurring verbs bear tense and agreement morphology.

(23). a.

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| aslam-ne | Ghazal | Likh | vahai |
| aslam. M. SG – ERG | ghazal.F. 3. SG – NOM | write – SVI | show. F .SG- PF |
| Aslam was able to write a ghazal. | | | |

(23). b.

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| aslam-ne | Seb | katya | khada |
| aslam. M. SG – ERG | apple. M.3 .SG - NOM | cut - SV1 | eat - SV2 |
| Aslam cut the apple and ate it. | | | |

Above example 23(a) illustrates that in Punjabi both the verbs share a single test marker which verifies the existence of SVC in Punjabi. In this construction, the non-final verb remains in invariant form while final verb shows inflection and is marked for tense and agreement features. Punjabi shows another type of SVC which is demonstrated in 23(b) where both verbs show tense agreement.

4.9 The Shared Adverb Test

Shared adverb test is another way to confirm the existence of SVC in Punjabi. When an adverb is placed before the serial verbs, it affects both the verbs in the construction. Consider the examples below:

(24). a.

| | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|
| batche-ne | Kapre | Chetti | La | sattay |
| child.S.M-ERG | dress.P.M.NOM | at once.ADV | remove.SV | throw.P.M-PF |
| The child immediately put off the dress and threw away. | | | | |

(24). b.

| | | | | |
|---|---------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| *batche-ne | Kapre | La | chetti | sattay |
| child.S.M-ERG | dress.P.M.NOM | remove.SV | at once.ADV | throw.P.M-PF |
| The child immediately put off the dress and threw away. | | | | |

Above example 24(a) exhibits that object in Punjabi is shared by serial verbs which is an essential requirement for SVCs. But the sentence would be marked as ungrammatical when the adverb intervenes between the serial verbs as in 24(b). However, an adverb can be inserted between the serial verbs with suffix *-kay* with the first verb and a light verb with the final verb. Consider the following example:

(25).

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|
| batche-ne | kapre | la-kay | chetti | satt | dittay |
| child.S.M- ERG | dress.P.M.NOM | remove.CONJ | at once.ADV | throw.SV | give.P.M- PF |
| The child removed the dress and at once threw away. | | | | | |

As discussed before, shared tense marker is the basic condition for SVCs; therefore, the structure in (25) violates this rule and it is no more a serial verb construction.

When the non-final verb takes a suffix, the construction expresses the completeness of the action. It is important to note that agreement features are only marked on final verb, though both the verbs have their own tense marker as example (25) shows. In this construction, final verb agrees with the highest nominative argument *kapre* ‘dress. Example is given below:

(26).

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| bace-ne | Topi | la-kay | foran | satti |
| child.S.M-ERG | cap.S.F-NOM | remove-PF | at once.ADV | throw.F-PF |
| The child removed the cap and at once threw away. | | | | |

Above example (26) illustrates that gender and number have no effect on suffix-*kay*, only tense marker represents perfective aspect.

It is interesting to note that in Punjabi, CPs do not permit any adverb to intervene between two verbs. It always precedes the CP or even the object or subject without any effect on the meanings. Consider the example:

(27). a.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-----------|
| o-ne | Gaind | achanak | saat | ditti |
| s/he.S-ERG | ball.F-NOM | suddenly.ADV | throw.SV | give.F-PF |
| S/he suddenly threw the ball away. | | | | |

(27). b.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|----------|--------------|-----------|
| *o-ne | Gaind | Saat | achanak | ditti |
| s/he.S-ERG | ball.F-NOM | throw.SV | suddenly.ADV | give.F-PF |
| S/he suddenly threw the ball away. | | | | |

(27). c.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| o-ne | Achanak | gaind | saat | ditti |
| s/he.S-ERG | suddenly.ADV | ball.F-NOM | throw.SV | give.F-PF |
| S/he suddenly threw the ball away | | | | |

(27). d.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|---------|---------|
| baal | Acahanak | rier | gea |
| child.S.M-NOM | suddenly.ADV | slip.SV | go.M-PF |
| The child slipped instantly. | | | |

27. e.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------|---------|
| acahanak | Baal | rier | gea |
| suddenly.ADV | child.S.M-NOM | slip.SV | go.M-PF |
| The child slipped instantly. | | | |

Above examples 27(a-e) clarify that in Punjabi, the CPs like SVCs do not permit adverb to intervene between the verbs. However, the examples through 27(c & e) show that an adverb can precede the object and subject.

4.10 The Shared Negation Marker Test

As stated above, the serial verbs share the negation marker, so for this, the shared negation marker test will be applied to confirm the existence of SVC in Punjabi. Serial verbs share the negation marker when it appears before them, but it affects only second verb when it intervenes between the two verbs. See the following examples:

(28). a.

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------|---------|----------|
| Chor | Zevar | nahii | Le | nasya |
| thief.S.M-NOM | jewellery.P.M-NOM | NEG | take.SV | run.M-PF |
| The thief took the jewellery and ran away. | | | | |

(28). b.

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------|-------|----------|
| Chor | Zevar | le | Nahii | nasya |
| thief.S.M-NOM | jewellery.P.M-NOM | take.SV | NEG | run.M-PF |
| The thief took the jewellery and ran away. | | | | |

Above examples (28) show that Punjabi serial verb construction bear negation markers.

4.11 The Empty Category Test

The empty category test also helps to identify that serial verb share the same object and do not permit any pronoun to intervene between them in Punjabi SVCs. Following example verifies this concept.

(29). a.

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|
| Kaa | bootay-tay | Jaa | bethya |
| crow.M-NOM | tree-LOC | go.SV | sit.PF.M |
| The crow flew away and sat on a tree. | | | |

(29). b.

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|----------|
| *kaa | bootay-tay | Jaa | oday-tay | Bethya |
| crow.M-NOM | tree-LOC | go.SV | that.LOC | sit.PF.M |
| The crow flew away and sat on a tree. | | | | |

The construction of 29(b) shows that if a pronoun occupies in between serial verbs, the result would be an ungrammatical sentence whereas vice versa in 29(a) is grammatical and no pronoun intervene between serial verbs. This also clarifies that serial verbs share the same object/adverb which comes before them.

4.12 Types of Serial Verb Constructions in Punjabi

A serial verb construction that displays internal argument sharing is a true SVC (Bukhari, 2009). By citing Dechaine (1993), he claims that there are four types of SVCs, namely resultative, instrumental, dative, and sequential serial verb constructions. Collins (1997) also reported three major types of SVCs. These include instrumental, resultative, and consequential serial verb constructions. He further argues that SVCs are also called direct object sharing SVCs. However, all types of SVCs are not part of every language. According to Stewart (1963), Nupe and Yoruba show several kinds of SVCs that can be marked on syntactic grounds. Further, Malayalam also shows more than ten SVCs (Jayaseelan 2004). Stahlke (1974) claims that Yoruba shows four kinds of serial verb constructions. Punjabi also exhibits three types of SVCs, namely resultative (RSVC), consequential (CSVC) and instrumental serial verb constructions (ISVC). Following examples verify this claim.

(30). a.

| | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------------|
| asif-ne | Topi | La | sutti |
| asif.S.M-ERG | cap.F-NOM | remove.SV | throw.F-PF |
| Asif removed the cap and threw away. (Consequential) | | | |

(30). b.

| | | | |
|--|---------------|---------|---------------|
| o-ne | Chor | maar | nasaya |
| s/he.S-ERG | thief.S.M-NOM | beat.SV | make run.M-PF |
| S/he made the thief run away (by beating him). (Resultative) | | | |

(30). c.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|--------|-----------|
| o-ne | Darakht | aari-naal | kaat | suttya |
| s/he.S.M-ERG | tree.S.M-NOM | saw-INS | saw.SV | fell.M-PF |
| S/he sawed the tree with saw and felled it. (Instrumental) | | | | |

In following section, these types are explained in detail.

4.13 Consequential Serial Verb Constructions

This type of SVC contains two transitive verbs that share the same object and subject. CSVC exhibits the events in a natural order. Above example 30(a) directs that the subject performed two actions i.e., removing the cap and throwing it. But it also clarifies that 'Asif removed his cap first and after then he threw it. In this construction, the second verb *sutti* is not a result of the action performed by first verb *la* 'remove' whereas it is the next action performed by the agent and both the verbs also share the object.

Bukhari (2009) states that in CSVC, both the verbs share the internal argument, and this type is commonly used in serial languages. Examples are given below:

(31). a.

| | | | |
|---|-------------|---------|----------|
| kaloo-ne | seb | kəppii | khayo |
| kaloo-ERG | apple-NOM.M | cut.SVI | eat.PF.M |
| 'Kaloo cut an apple and ate it.' (Gojri, Bukhari 2009: 141) | | | |

(31). b.

| | | | |
|--|--------|------|-----|
| wo | à | fufu | ù |
| they | cooked | fufu | eat |
| 'They cooked fufu and ate it.' (Ewe, Collins 1993: 91) | | | |

Punjabi also shows these serials. Consider the following example:

(32). a.

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|
| aslam-ne | Khat | likh | pejya |
| aslam. M. SG – ERG | letter. M.3 .SG - NOM | write - SV1 | send.M-PF |
| Aslam cut the apple and ate it. | | | |

(32). b.

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| aslam-ne | Seb | katya | khada |
| aslam. M. SG – ERG | apple. M.3 .SG - NOM | cut - SV1 | eat - SV2 |
| Aslam cut the apple and ate it. | | | |

The constructions in (32) show that transitive serial verbs need a direct object. (32a) suggests that the last verb shares the object with non-final verb while (32b) exhibits that both the verbs individually share the same object. It is therefore evident from above examples that Punjabi serial verbs share both arguments (i.e., internal, and external).

4.14 Resultative Serial Verb Constructions

This type of SVC represents that the main event is described by the first verb and last verb exhibits the current state/condition of the patient as an outcome of the main event. This kind of SVC is not common in many serial languages such as Korean where only same kind of verbs are used to share the same argument in an SVC (Kang, 1997:17). The following examples state this:

(33). a.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|
| o-ne | Darakht | kaat | suttya |
| s/he.S-ERG | tree.S.M-NOM | cut.SV | fell.M-PF |
| S/he fell the tree (by cutting it). | | | |

(33). b.

| | | | |
|--|---------------|---------|---------------|
| o-ne | Chor | maar | nasaya |
| s/he.S-ERG | thief.S.M-NOM | beat.SV | make run.M-PF |
| S/he made the thief run away (by beating him). | | | |

(33a) example represents the RSVC which can be transcribed as “s/he cut the tree and as a result fell it down”. This demonstrates that serial verbs are of same type and bear a cause-effect relationship. Like CSVC, this type of SVC also shares both the object and subject.

Bukhari (2009) claims that in Gojri resultative serial verb construction, the restriction of same type of verb is not applicable as given in 33(c). It represents V1 as intransitive while V2 as transitive verbs. Consider the following example:

(33). c.

| | | | |
|--|-------|---------|----------|
| maī | nikka | nəssii | nəpɾyo |
| I | child | run-SVI | catch-PF |
| ‘I caught the child (by running after him).’ (Gojri, Bukhari 2009) | | | |

4.15 Instrumental Serial Verb Constructions

In this type, the instrumental argument is shared by the serial verbs. Such type of construction is also present in Punjabi. Examples are given below:

(34). a.

| | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------------|---------|----------|
| asif-ne | kute-nu | Pathar | chuk | marya |
| asif.S.M-ERG | dog.S.M-ACC | stone.S.M-NOM | pick.SV | hit.M-PF |
| Asif picked the stone and hit the dog with it. | | | | |

(34). b.

| | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------|--------|-----------|
| o-ne | baaz | pathar-nal | maar | suttya |
| s/he.S-ERG | eagle.S.M-NOM | stone-INS | hit.SV | drop.M-PF |
| She hit the eagle with a stone and killed it. | | | | |

This type is different from CSVC and RSVC. According to Bukhari (2009), co-reference is involved in argument sharing as object in 33(a) and (b) where first verb is used as an instrument of second verb.

Bukhari (2009) claims that this type may not be considered as true SVC because it involves two objects. But the researchers assume that in all serial languages, variations are observed as stated above. So, this issue will be left for future investigation in detail.

4.16 Meanings of Serial Verbs in Punjabi

In this section, the focus is on the meanings and uses of Punjabi SVCs. It is considered that different SVCs may present different readings in this language. Unlike complex predicates, this phenomenon is very limited in Punjabi and different forms of main verbs are used in CPs while in SVCs, this is not possible. This restriction narrows the scope of the meaning and use of these constructions. Punjabi SVCs express the ability, as well as its volitional and benefactive meanings.

4.17 Ability Meaning

It has been mentioned earlier that ability of a person can be expressed through different ways. In Punjabi, these ways are complex predicates, modal *sakna* and serial verbs are used for this purpose. Consider the examples:

(35). a.

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|
| aslam-ne | Ghazal | likh | vahai |
| aslam.SG.M-ERG | ghazal.3.SG.F-NOM | write-SVI | show-PF.F.SG |
| Aslam was able to write a ghazal. | | | |

(35). b.

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------------|
| o-ne | Khat | par | sunaya |
| s/he.SG-ERG | letter.SG.M-NOM | read-SV1 | make listen.F.SG-PF |
| S/he was able to read a letter. | | | |

Above examples verify that through serial verbs, ability meanings are expressed, and they also follow the agreement pattern. The constructions 35(a) and 35(b) show that the final verbs *vahai* and *sunaya* agree in terms of gender and number with the highest nominative arguments *letter* and *khat* respectively.

It is interesting to note that both CPs and SVCs are used to generate ability meanings, so, what is the basic semantic difference between them? It is assumed that CPs express this meaning with full competence of the agent while in SVCs, the agent exposes his ability occasionally or unexpectedly. It seems that the agent is not famous for performing these actions habitually or frequently. Besides this, the main difference is also present i.e., a serial verb construction exhibits different events while CP demonstrates only one action performed by the subject. Consider the examples:

(36). a.

| | | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------|-----------|
| o-ne | larke-nu | khat | Likh | pajeya |
| s/he-ERG | boy.3.SG.M-ACC | letter.S.M-NOM | write.SV | send-M.PF |
| S/he was able to write and post the letter. | | | | |

(36). b.

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|---------|----------|
| o-ne | Khat | likh | liya |
| s/he-ERG | letter.S.M-NOM | write.V | take- PF |
| S/he was able to write the letter. | | | |
| S/he wrote the letter completely. | | | |

These examples clearly reveal the main difference between SVC and CP. In 36(a), two actions are performed by two serial verbs and there is no ambiguity in the meaning which can be interpreted as ‘the letter was not only written by the subject, but it was also sent to *larke* who is the addressee in the construction. On the other hand, 36(b) illustrates that ability and completive meanings are expressed through only one action performed by two verbs in CP construction. Therefore, it can be claimed that ability meanings can be expressed through SVCs.

It is very important to note that Punjabi SVCs are also used to express those ability meanings in which a goal is achieved for a specific time. Consider the example given below.

(37).

| | | | | |
|---|---------------|----------|------------|---------|
| o-ne | do ganty wich | kam | muka | dasya |
| s/he-ERG | in two hours | work-NOM | finish-SV1 | show-PF |
| S/he managed to finish her/his work in two hours. | | | | |

Above example shows that subject performed two actions i.e., *muka* ‘finish’ and *dasya* ‘show’ for a specific period *do ganty* ‘two hours’.

4.18 Benefactive Meaning

The benefactive meanings are also generated through SVCs. The grammaticalized benefactive meanings are involved in the Punjabi language. For this purpose, dative maker-*nu* with post-positions *-lai* ‘for’ and *-vaasty* ‘for the sake of’ etc. are used. The following examples verify the concept.

(38). a.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| o-ne | dhee-nu | jyez | day | torya |
| s/he-ERG | daughter-DAT | dowry-NOM | give-SVI | send.M-PF |
| S/He gave his/her daughter dowry and sent her. | | | | |

(38). b.

| | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------|----------|-----------|
| O | kaky-lai | basta | le | aya |
| he-NOM | child-DAT | bag-NOM | take-SVI | come.M-PF |
| He got the bag for the child and came back. | | | | |

Above example 38(a) illustrates that an action is performed by the subject through which the dative argument *dhee* ‘daughter’ is being benefited while in 38(b), the postposition *-lai* is used which is also called emphatic marker. In Punjabi, the speaker uses this marker to emphasize his/her point. It is very interesting to note that the light verbs such as *de* ‘give’ and *le* ‘take’ are used as non-final verbs in SVCs frequently as shown in 38(b), though they convey benefactive meanings in CPs very productively.

4.19 Causatives

This type of meanings can also be expressed through Punjabi SVCs. These constructions take a causative marker *-vaa* with the main verb just like CPs. Examples are given below:

(39). a.

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|------------|----------------|-----------|
| o-ne | aslam-nu | khat | likhvaa | pejya |
| he-ERG | aslam-DAT | letter-NOM | write-CAUS-SV1 | send.M-PF |
| He got a letter written and sent to Aslam. | | | (SVC) | |

(39). b.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|------------|----------------|-----------|
| o-ne | aslam-nu | khat | likhvaa | ditta |
| he-ERG | aslam-DAT | letter-NOM | write-CAUS-SV1 | give.M-PF |
| He got a letter written for Aslam. | | | (CP) | |

In Gojri serial verb constructions, these meanings are also expressed but main verb shows *-ii* inflection while CPs do not show any inflection in this regard. The examples 39(a & b) show this phenomenon whereas this case is very different in Punjabi. Both the constructions do not show any type of inflection but the main difference is present i.e., CPs only exhibit one action while SVCs show two actions.

(40).

a.

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|----------------|---------|
| kiren-ne | kousar nā | xat | likhvaaii | pejyo |
| kiren-ERG | kousar-DAT | letter-NOM | write-CAUS-SVI | send-PF |

Kiren got a letter written and sent to Kousar.’

b.

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------|---------|
| kiren-ne | kousar nā | Xat | likhvaa | diyo |
| kiren-ERG | kousar-DAT | letter-NOM | write-CAUS | give-PF |

‘Kiren got a letter written for Kousar.’ (Bukhari 2009:151)

c.

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|------------|----------------|-----------|
| *o-ne | aslam-nu | Khat | likhvaya | pejya |
| he-ERG | aslam-DAT | letter-NOM | write-CAUS-SV1 | send.M-PF |
| He got a letter written and sent to Aslam. | | | | |

Above example 40(c) is an ungrammatical sentence which reveals that verbs do not show any agreement with the highest nominative argument *khat* ‘letter’ in the construction. It is because in Punjabi no inflection is possible on any of the verbs of serial verb construction.

4.20 Volitional Meanings

In most of the Indo-Aryan languages, volitional meanings are expressed through CP construction or ergative case marker. However, in Punjabi, these meanings are also conveyed

through serial verb constructions but in a limited scope. It is therefore assumed that Punjabi shows more constructions in this regard as compared to other languages. Consider the following examples:

(41)

| | | | | |
|--------|----------|------------|----------|----------|
| o-ne | boay-nu | Jandra | maar | vahaya |
| he-ERG | door-DAT | lock.M-NOM | kill-SV1 | see.M-PF |

He locked the door and examined it (intentionally).

Above example confirms the assumption that Punjabi serial verbs express the volitional meanings. In this construction, the last verb shows agreement with the highest nominative *jandra* 'lock'. However, it is stated earlier that simple verbs do not express volitional meanings in Punjabi, but they can be conveyed with some semantic differences through CPs.

(42). a.

| | | | |
|--------|----------|-----------|--------|
| o-ne | chawal | tou | vekhay |
| he-ERG | rice-NOM | touch-SV1 | see-PF |

He examined the rice by touching it (intentionally).

(42). b.

| | | | |
|--------|----------|-------|---------|
| o-ne | chawal | tou | ditty |
| he-ERG | rice-NOM | Touch | give-PF |

He examined the rice (intentionally).

In construction 42(a), the volitional meanings are expressed through SVC where two events *tou* 'touch' and *vekhay* 'see' are done deliberately while in 42(b), only one action *tou* 'touch' is done though some aspectual content is added in the meaning of the main verb.

5. Conclusion

It can be concluded that a wide range of SVCs are present in Punjabi. The serial verb construction (SVC) in Punjabi indicates that there is a full event described by two sub-events, and they are described by two separate verbs which come together in a sequence. It shows that two different events have their own individuality during overall event. SVCs are totally different from CPs. Two events are described in serial verb constructions where the same argument is shared by both the verbs whereas only one action is done through complex predicates. Moreover, the serial verb constructions (SVCs) in Punjabi are of two types and completely different from complex predicates because SVC contains two VPs but only one V whereas the complex predicate constructions have only one VP but two Vs. The study also shows that the relation between the two verbs/VPs is of adjunction and not of complementation (or coordination).

The Research and Publication Ethics Statement

No ethical considerations were violated in this study.

The Conflict of Interest Statement

In line with the statement of Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), we hereby declare that we had no conflicting interests regarding any parties of this study.

References

Abubakari, H. (2011). *Object-sharing as symmetric sharing: Predicate clefting and serial verb constructions in Kusaal*. Universitetet i Tromsø, Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/10037/3539>

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2006). Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. *Serial verb constructions: A cross-linguistic typology*, 1-68.

Amberber, M., Baker, B., & Harvey, M. (2010). *Complex predicates: Cross-linguistic perspectives on event structure*: Cambridge University Press.

- Ansre, G. (1966). The verbid-a caveat to 'serial verbs'. *Journal of West African Languages*, 3(1), 29-32.
- Baker, M. (2001). *The Atoms of Language: The Mind's Hidden Rules of Grammar*. Basic Books, New York.
- Bhatia, T. K. (1993). Punjabi: a congnitive-descriptive grammar. *Psychology Press*.
- Bisang, W. (1998). Grammaticalization and language contact constructions and positions. *Typological studies in language*, 37, 13-58.
- Bukhari, N. H. (2009). *The syntax of serial verbs in Gojri*. University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, Retrieved from <https://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.500946>
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Butt, M. (1995). The structure of complex predicates in Urdu. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Chomsky, N. (1993). A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In K. Hale and S.
- Chomsky, N., Longuet-Higgins, H. C., Lyons, J., & Broadbent, D. E. (1981). Knowledge of language: its elements and origins. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. B, Biological Sciences*, 295(1077), 223-234. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1981.0135>
- Collins, C. (1997). Argument Sharing in Serial Verb Constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28(3), 461-497. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178987>
- Crowley, T. (2002). *Serial verbs in Oceanic: A descriptive typology*: Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Dechaine, R. M. (1993). Predicates across categories: Towards a category neutral syntax. Ph.D Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Durie, M. (1997). Grammatical structures in verb serialization. Complex predicates, ed. by Alex Alsina, Joan Bresnan, and Peter Sells, 289– 354. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information (CSLI).
- Foley, W. A. (2010). *Events and serial verb constructions*: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, W. A., & Olson, M. (1985). Clausehood and verb serialization. *Grammar inside and outside the clause*, 17, 60.
- Ghai, W., & Singh, N. (2012). Analysis of automatic speech recognition systems for indo-aryan languages: Punjabi a case study. *International Journal of Soft Computing and Engineering (IJSCE)*, 2(1), 379-385.
- Haspelmath, M. (2016). The Serial Verb Construction: Comparative Concept and Cross-linguistic Generalizations. *Language and Linguistics*, 17(3), 291-319. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2397002215626895>
- Jayaseelan, K. (2004). The serial verb construction in Malayalam. In *Clause structure in South Asian languages* (pp. 67-91): Springer.
- Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*: University of Illinois Press.
- Kang, S. (1997). A comparative analysis of SVCs and Korean V-V compounds (1- 36). Florida: University of Florida.
- Kari, E. E. (2003). Serial verb constructions in Degema, Nigeria. *African study monographs*, 24(4), 271-289. doi:<https://doi.org/10.14989/68224>
- Lord, C. (1973). Serial verbs in transition. *Studies in African linguistics*, 4(3), 269-296.
- Lord, C. (1974). Causative constructions in Yoruba. *Studies in African linguistics*, 5, 195-204.
- Masica, C. P. (1993). *The indo-aryan languages*: Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, P. V., T. (1995). "Serial Verbs." In Jacques Arends, Pieter Muysken, and Norval Smith, eds., *Pidgins and Creoles: An Introduction*. Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Nishiyama, K. (1998). Serial verbs and VV compounds. *Language History and Linguistic Description in Africa*, 2, 259.
- Nordlinger, R. (2010). *Agreement mismatches in Murrinh-Patha serial verbs*. Paper presented at the Selected Papers from the 2009 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society.
- Pandharipande, R. (1990). Serial verb construction in Marathi.
- Stahlke, H. (1974). Pronouns and islands in Yoruba. *Studies in African linguistics*, 5(2), 171.
- Stewart, J. M. (1963). Some restrictions on objects in Twi. *Journal of African Languages*, 2(2), 145-149.
- Veenstra, T., & Muysken, P. (2017). Serial Verb Constructions. In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Second Edition* (pp. 1-51).

- Wurmbrand, S. (2007). How Complex Are Complex Predicates? *Syntax*, 10(3), 243-288.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2007.00110.x>
- Zimmermann, M., & Amaechi, M. (2018). Find construction analyze: Making sense of serial verb constructions. *Handout from talk presented at the Goethe University Frankfurt*.