Packaging Bi-eventivity in a Monoclausal Construction

Nadine Abdel-Rahman
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Abstract: This paper scrutinizes a hitherto undocumented pattern of a multi-verb construction in the Abu Gosh dialect of Palestinian Arabic, in which a change of location/position verb, V1, combines with another lexical verb, V2. V1 and V2 are inflected with the same tense/aspect and agreement features. Crucially, there is no separating functional material between the two. I argue that the construction is bi-eventive and simultaneously mono-clausal, allowing a *consequential* reading. Following Déchaine (1993), an adjunction analysis is proposed to account for the observed properties, whereby VP2 is an adjunct to VP1, headed by a fully lexical V1, which allows the selection of a goal PP complement and modification by manner adverbs.

Keywords
Multi-verb Construction, Palestinian Arabic, Bi-eventivity, Adjunction

1. Introduction

The grammars of many languages of the world generate monoclausal constructions that involve at least two adjacent verbs not separated by a functional marker, such as a coordination or a subordination. These constructions are referred to as *Multi-verb Constructions* (MVC), which constitute a large set of constructions (Aikhenvald, 2006; Altakhaineh & Zibin, 2018; Baker, 1989; Bisang, 2009; Boneh, 2020; Butt, 2010; Cruschina, 2022; de Vos, 2004; Hussein, 1990; Keine & Bhatt, 2016; Lawal, 1993; Ouali & Bukhari, 2016; Sebba, 1987; Veenstra, 2000; Versteegh, 1984; Zribi-Hertz & Jean-Louis, 2022).

In this paper, I examine one type of the MVCs that are illustrated in (1)-(3) from the Abu Gosh (near Jerusalem) dialect of Palestinian Arabic (PA), building on previous descriptive work on dialectal Arabic (Drozdík, 2008; Hussein, 1990; Versteegh, 1984). The observed surface order of the MVCs in (1)-(3) involves a closed set of initial verbs, which includes the following elements: The two deictic verbs *raːħ 'go.3SGF.PRFV'* and *edʒ͡a* '*come.3SGF.PRFV'*, and a verb of posture *kaːm 'got.up.3SGF.PRFV'*. These three verbs are referred to as V1, and the following (open class of) verbs are referred to as V2. The surface order in all of the examples below can have two distinct readings.

(1) *da:lja* *ra:ħat* *tˁafat* *el-ðˁaw*
Dalia go.3SGF.PRFV turn.3SGF.PRFV the-light
i.'Dalia went and turned off the light.'
ii.'Dalia unexpectedly turned off the light!'

(2) *da:lja* *edʒ͡at* *tˁafat* *el-ðˁaw*
Dalia come.3SGF.PRFV turn.3SGF.PRFV the-light
i.'Dalia went and turned off the light.'
ii.'Dalia unexpectedly turned off the light!'

(3) *da:lja* *ka:mat* *tˁafat* *el-ðˁaw*
Dalia got.up.3SGF.PRFV turned.off.3SGF.PRFV the-light
i.'Dalia went and turned off the light.'
ii.'Dalia unexpectedly turned off the light!'

The *consequential* reading asserts an immediate temporal relationship between the events of V1 and V2. In contrast, the *counter-to-expectation* reading (henceforth CE) expresses that an event that V2 contributes to has violated the expectations of a salient attitude holder, primarily the speaker. I claim that the surface order in examples (1)-(3) underlies syntactic and semantic ambiguities, resulting in the identification of two MVCs. Hence, the Abu Gosh dialect features a *consequential* MVC and a CE MVC. Notably, the two MVCs are also distinguished by their intonation patterns and by how V1 and V2 are prosodified into phonological phrases. The *consequential* MVC has a regular intonation, like a monoverbal sentence. In comparison,

the CE MVC is associated with an intonation emphasizing the speaker's surprise. The mapping from syntax to prosody falls outside the scope of this paper.

Specific contexts render one of the constructions felicitous while excluding the other. This contrast is illustrated in (4) and (5):

(4) Context: *Ali is sitting and working on his studies, and the TV beside his desk makes a noise. He gets up and turns it off by pressing a button on the back. The speaker responds to a question of who turned off the TV.*

ʕali kaːm tˁafa ettelfezjon

Ali got.up turned.off the.TV

i. 'Ali got up and turned off the TV.'

ii.'#Ali unexpectedly turned off the TV!'

The context above describes a typical situation of getting up and turning off the TV. Therefore, the *consequential* MVC is felicitous, whereas the CE MVC is not possible. Compare with the following example:

(5) *Context: Ali sits beside his sister, reading the news on his smartphone. While his sister is watching her favorite show, Ali, without giving notice, turns off the TV. Ali's sister says to her mother:*

ʕali kaːm tˁafa ettelfezjon

Ali got.up turned.off the.TV

i. '#Ali got up and turned off the TV.'

ii. 'Ali unexpectedly turned off the TV!'

The above example emphasizes that Ali unexpectedly turned off the TV, violating the speaker's expectations. Therefore, only the CE MVC is felicitous.

In this paper, I focus on characterizing the syntax and the semantics of the *consequential* MVC. A full-fledged account of the CE MVC is provided in Abdel-Rahman (2023). I argue that the syntactic structure for the *consequential* MVC involves V2 as an adjunct to V1, where V1 is fully lexical and part of a phrase, lacking any auxiliary-like properties. Thus, this construction denotes consequential bi-eventive semantics.

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the key properties of the *consequential* MVC. Section 3 contrasts two putative syntactic analyses. Section 4 scrutinizes the status of V1 in the *consequential* MVC. Section 5 provides an account of adjunction. Section 6 teases apart the *consequential* MVC from Covert Coordination. Section 7 concludes.

2. Properties of the *Consequential* MVC

In this section, I discuss the morpho-syntactic and semantic features of the *consequential* MVC, which are common to the well-studied cases of *Serial Verb Constructions* (SVCs) (Aboh, 2004;

Aikhenvald, 2006; Muysken & Veenstra, 1994; Sebba, 1987; Zribi-Hertz & Jean-Louis, 2022). The descriptive literature on similar constructions from Arabic considers them as genuine cases of SVCs (Drozdík, 2008; Hussein, 1990), adopting a *lato sensu* definition of SVCs.[1] In this paper, I focus on the theoretical aspects.

I begin by demonstrating that V1 and V2 in the *consequential* MVC must maintain a rigid linear order. Compare the linear order in (6) below to the one in (1):

(6) * *da:lja* *tˁafat* *el-ðˁaw* *ra:ħat*
Dalia turned.off the-light went

The permutability of the order between V1 and V2 yields ungrammaticality. In contrast, switching the order of V1 and V2 is grammatical in a coordination construction headed by *w-* 'and':

(7) a. *da:lja* *ra:ħat* ***w-tˁafat*** *el-ðˁaw*
Dalia went and-turned.off the-light
'Dalia went and turned off the light.'

b. *da:lja* *tˁafat* *el-ðˁaw* ***w-*** *ra:ħat*
Dalia turned.off the-light and-went
'Dalia turned off the light and went.'

[1] I follow Aikhenvald (2006) definition but emphasize that these properties ensue from the syntactic structure.

In a coordination construction, V1 and V2 can be interchanged due to the semantics of their head, which corresponds to the conjunctive logical operator.

Conversely, in the case of the *consequential* MVC, the order is rigid since it also mirrors the temporal dependency between V1 and V2. To illustrate this, consider the example in (8):

(8) *Context: The store is 5 minutes away*

#daːlja raːħat ʕal-xamsa eʃtarat ħaliːb ʕassetta

Dalia went on.the-five bought milk on.the.six

'Dalia went at five o'clock and bought milk at six o'clock.'

The temporal gap between V1 and V2 in the *consequential* MVC highlights the absence of a *consequential* inference, giving rise to an infelicitous grammaticality judgement. I term this characteristic *temporal unity*. In the following example, I further support this observation by introducing two temporal adverbials:

(9) *#**embereħ** daːlja raːħat eʃtarat ħaliːb **el-jum***

yesterday Dalia went bought milk the-day

'Yesterday, Dalia went and bought milk today.'

Only one temporal adverbial is allowed within this construction, emphasizing that the events denoted by V1 and V2 must be within the

same temporal interval.[2] Furthermore, in line with Todaro et al. (2019), the property of *temporal unity* can be seen by contrasting the sentences below:

(10) a. *ʕali beruħ beʃteri ħaliːb kol xamis,*
Ali goes buys milk every Thursday,
#bass belaːki-ʃ
but finds-NEG
'Ali goes every Thursday and buys milk, but he does not find any.'

b. *ʕali beruħ jeʃtri ħaliːb kol xamis,*
Ali goes to.buy milk every Thursday
bass belaːki-ʃ
but finds-NEG
'Ali goes every Thursday to buy milk, but he does not find any.'

The example above shows that it is infelicitous to assert the occurrence of the event denoted by V1 while simultaneously denying that the event denoted by V2 took place, as demonstrated in sentence *a*. In contrast, sentence *b* involves a different construction with V2 featuring in a purpose clause. In this construction, asserting that the event of V2 did not take place is felicitous since the purpose clause has a modal interpretation.

[2] See Silva--Robles et al. (2022) on a similar construction, referred to as *associated motion* construction in two Zapotec languages. Crucially, it allows times and events to intervene between the events that the construction denotes.

The lack of a dependency marker indicates the absence of overt functional material that intervenes between V1 and V2. This is demonstrated by the infelicity of the example in (11):

(11) *da:lja ra:ħat* ***#w-*** *ɛftarat ħali:b*
Dalia went and-bought milk
'Dalia went and bought milk.'

The example above illustrates that the *consequential* inference disappears when an overt functional material is introduced. Native speakers report that this is due to a perceived spatio-temporal gap between the events denoted by V1 and V2, as exhibited in (12).

(12) *da:lja ra:ħat ʕad͡ʒd͡ʒamʕa* ***w-*** *ɛftarat*
Dalia went to.the.university and-bought
ħali:b mene-ddoka:n
milk from.the-store
'Dalia went to the university and bought milk from the store.'

The grammatical example above, which includes an overt coordinator, explicitly demonstrates a spatio-temporal mismatch between the two events, where the location of V2 does not align with the goal of V1. This example lends support to the argument that the

construction under discussion cannot be reduced simply to a mere coordination construction.

Moreover, based on the extraction of the direct object, I show that the *consequential* MVC does not violate the *Coordinate Structure Constraint* (CSC) of Ross (1967), unlike extraction from coordinate structures. The CSC is defined below:

(13) Coordinate Structure Constraint
In a coordinate structure, no conjunct may be moved, nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out. (Ross, 1967, p.161)

Ross proposes the constraint in (13) to explain ungrammatical cases of extraction from a conjunct, as in the following sentence:

(14) a. Henry plays the lute and sings madrigals.
b. The madrigals which Henry [plays the lute] and [sings_] sound lousy. (Déchaine, 1993, p.246)

The sentence above is ungrammatical because the direct object was extracted from the second clause, violating the CSC. In the Arabic examples in (11) and (12), extraction in the former example (the *consequential* MVC) is felicitous; extraction from the latter is ungrammatical for the same reasons discussed above. Consider:

(15) a. *el-ħali:b*$_k$ *elli da:lja ra:ħt eʃtarat* __$_k$ *xarba:n*

the-milk that Dalia went bought spoiled

'The milk that Dalia went and bought is spoiled.'

b. **el-ħaliːb$_k$ elli daːlja raːħt ʕadʒdʒamʕa*

the-milk that Dalia went to.the.university

***w-** eʃtarat* __$_k$ *mene-ddokaːn*

and bought from.the-store

'The milk that Dalia went to the university and bought from the store.'

Another property of the *consequential* MVC is subject sharing, as the example below demonstrates:

(16) **daːlja$_j$ raːħat jaːsmin/hiː$_{j/k}$ eʃtarat ħaliːb*

Dalia went Yasmine/she bought milk

Intended: 'Dalia went and Yasmine/she bought milk.'

The events associated with V1 and V2 are required to have the same subject. Introducing another subject DP between the two verbs would result in an ungrammatical sentence.

V1 and V2 share the same aspectual inflection.[3] To illustrate, compare the following example with the sentence in (1) :

(17) **daːlja raːħat eb-tetħawwadʒ*

Dalia went.PRFV.3SGF PRES-go.shopping.3SGF

'Dalia went doing shopping.'

[3]Following Benmamoun (1999), Arabic and its dialect morphologically mark aspect.

In the example above, V1 bears only perfective morphology, whereas V2 is inflected for the imperfective, bearing a present-tense prefix as well. As a result of this mismatch, the sentence becomes ungrammatical.

I argue that the construction under discussion underlies a monoclausal structure. One argument in favor of this claim has already been presented in the discussion of CSC, following sentence *a* in the example (15). A second argument for monoclausality is based on negation marking and its scope.

Example (18) demonstrates that marking double negation on each verb individually fails to yield a grammatical sentence.

(18) **daːlja ma-raːħat-eʃ ma-ʃtarat-eʃ ħaliːb*
Dalia NEG-went-NEG NEG-bought-NEG milk

By entertaining the possibility of marking negation on each verb one at a time, the resulting sentences are grammatical, semantic differences notwithstanding, as demonstrated in (19).

(19) a. *daːlja ma-raːħat-eʃ eʃtarat ħaliːb*
Dalia NEG-went-NEG bought milk
= 'It is not the case that Dalia went and bought milk.'
≠ 'Dalia went and did not buy some milk.'

b. *daːlja raːħat ma-ʃtarat-eʃ ħaliːb*
Dalia went NEG-bought-NEG milk
Only reading:'Dalia unexpectedly did not buy milk!'

In the example above, sentence *a* is marked with negation on V1 and is associated with the *consequential* MVC. However, negation marked solely on V2, as is the case in sentence *b,* is ungrammatical in the *consequential* MVC. Notably, the only available reading in this case is the CE. For details, see Abdel-Rahman (2023).

The observation that negation is marked only on V, only once, raises the question of whether negation has wide or narrow scope. Negation only has a wide scope, meaning the proposition of the two consequential events of V1 and V2 falls under its scope, as demonstrated in sentence *a* in (19).

I have demonstrated that the construction under examination is monoclausal, with V1 and V2 sharing the same subject and aspectual inflection. *Temporal unity* and rigid ordering further indicate that V1 and V2 behave semantically as a single predicate. In the following section, I compare two primary syntactic analyses proposed as potential structures for the *consequential* MVC.

3. Syntactic Analyses

The two analyses that I consider for the syntactic representation of the *consequential* MVC are an adjunction analysis and a subordination analysis, demonstrated in (20) and (21), respectively (Aboh, 2004, 2009; Baker, 1989; Déchaine, 1993; Muysken & Veenstra, 1994;

Sebba, 1987; Zribi-Hertz & Jean-Louis, 2022). For a thorough literature review, see Abdel-Rahman (2023).

(20) [insert adj_structure] (21) [insert sub_structure]

The structure in (21) showcases two types of restructuring in the sense of Wurmbrand (2004): functional restructuring and lexical restructuring. The above structures can equally accommodate the morpho-syntax of the *consequential* MVC, due to being mono-clausal.

While a detailed implementation of sharing of tense/aspectual morphology is outside the scope of this paper, I conjecture that it should be done via the mechanism of feature sharing proposed by Pesetsky et al. (2007), specifically for the adjunction analysis. The idea is that Agree is established in a local syntactic configuration between two instances of the feature PRFV aspect, in this case. When an instance of the feature is valued, all other instances of the same feature are automatically valued. This mechanism also captures the particle *be-* that generally marks present tense, as illustrated in sentence a from (10), repeated here in (22), where the marking on V2 results from Agree.

(22) ʕali beruħ beʃteri ħaliːb kol xamis
Ali goes buys milk every Thursday,
'Ali goes every Thursday and buys milk.'

Furthermore, both structures accommodate the subject sharing property since they lack a second subject position. The facts about negation and the acceptability of only one temporal adverb follow if the construction is monoclausal. The absence of functional material is captured by the lack of intervening functional projections, including covertly headed ones. I return to this point in Section 6.

While both structures successfully account for some of the morpho-syntactic properties, noticeable differences arise in their representation of the relationship between V1 and V2. Specifically, in one structure, V1 subordinates a maximal projection of V2P, while the other treats this projection as an adjunct to the full projection of V1.

This difference between the syntactic structures is attributed to the status of V1 in the *consequential* MVC. In (20), V1 is fully lexical and projects a VP. By contrast, in (21), V1 is either a semi-auxiliary or a functional head. In either case, V1 is not phrasal but is merged as a head.

The focus of the next section will be on the status of V1 in the *consequential* MVC. Subsequently, I provide supporting evidence for an adjunction syntactic representation, as certain properties of V1 in the *consequential* MVC cannot be accommodated by the subordination structure in (21). An adjunction analysis provides the required syntactic configuration to capture these distinguishing characteristics.

4. V1 is lexical and Phrasal

In what follows, I employ semantic and syntactic tests to probe the status of V1. The aim is to provide evidence that V1 is lexical, akin to the case of verbs of directed motion in a monoverbal sentence. Furthermore, I argue that V1 projects a full VP.

By examining whether V1 lacks any lexical restrictions on the animacy of the subject DP, one can infer a certain degree of semantic bleaching. The example in (22) shows that this is not characteristic of V1 in the *consequential* MVC:

(22) a. *??el-d͡ʒarra raːħat wekʕet*
the-vase went fell
'The vase went and fell.'

b. *??el-baːsˁ raːħ sˁaff baːb eddaːr*
the-bus went parked door of.the.house
'The bus went and parked in front of the house.'

Both sentence *a* with an inanimate referring subject and sentence *b* with a DP referring to a vehicle yield semantically odd grammaticality judgments, indicating that V1 imposes restrictions on the animacy of the subject DP within the *consequential* MVC.

Comparing sentence *a* in (22) to a monoverbal sentence with the same V1 results in identical grammaticality judgements:

(23) ??*e-d͡ʒd͡ʒarra* *raːħat*
the-vase went
Intended: 'The vase went.'

The conclusion is that V1 lacks an auxiliary-like status since it imposes lexical restrictions on the subject, similar to the monoverbal *raːħ*.

The next example examines additional lexical restrictions within the *consequential* MVC, focusing on the lexical aspect of V2. This is illustrated in (24) , which includes an achievement-denoting V2 predicate.

(24) ??*daːlja* *raːħat* *neset* *mafatiːħ-ha*
Dalia went forgot keys-her
Only reading: 'Dalia unexpectedly forgot her keys!'

As seen in the example above, the *consequential* MVC restricts the lexical aspect of V2. This restriction also applies to stative predicates, as demonstrated in (25).

(25) ??*ʕali raːħ* *ħab* *waħda* *ad͡ʒnabija*
Ali went loved someone.F foreigner
Only reading 'Ali unexpectedly loved a foreigner.'

The observations in (24) and (25) strongly suggest that V1 does not behave as an auxiliary, but instead imposes lexical restrictions on the VP following it. This reflects a classic lexical relationship between a

head and its adjunct, and this type of relationship is captured under an adjunction analysis.

It is therefore expected that V1 within the *consequential* MVC takes a goal complement PP exactly like V1 in a monoverbal sentence, since verbs of directed motion inherently select for goal/path PPs.[4] Consider examples (26) and (27):

(26) *daːlja raːħat* ***ʕaddokaːn*** *eʃtarat ħaliːb*
Dalia went to.the.store bought milk
'Dalia went to the store and bought some milk.'

(27) *dahlia raːħat* ***ʕaddokaːn***
Dalia went to.the.store
'Dalia went to the store.'

The fact that V1 takes a goal PP indicates that it projects a full verb phrase. Consequently, this VP can be modified by a predicate of events, such as manner adverbials. Example (28) includes two manner adverbials, each situated within the environment of V1 and V2:

(28) *jasmiːn raːħat* ***ʕasoket*** *tˤafat*
Yasmine went quietly turned.off
el-maːkena ***ebsorʕa***
the-machine quickly
'Yasmine went quietly and turned off the machine quickly.'

[4] See (Levin, 1993; Rappaport Hovav & Levin, 2010) on verbs of directed motion lexicalizing Path/Goal.

The felicity judgment of the example in (28) supports the presence of a V1P headed by V1 and a V2P headed by V2. Notably, the acceptability of two predicates of events indicates the existence of two underlying events, thereby supporting bi-eventivity.

These properties cannot be accounted for by the subordination analysis but follow from an adjunction analysis. In the next section, I provide substantial evidence to support the claim that an adjunction analysis is the sole candidate capable of accommodating the consequential bi-eventive semantics of the construction.

5. Motivating Adjunction

Section 4 has shown that V2 is part of a V2P, allowing the selection of a PP by V1, and therefore excluding a subordination analysis, whereby V1 selects V2P (as (21) illustrates). In this section, I provide additional arguments in support of an adjunction syntactic representation. The proposed structure furnishes the required syntactic environment for V1 to express its semantic content, particularly the projection of a full VP. Consequently, it allows for a manner adverbial to modify this VP.

The adjunction analysis for the *consequential* MVC is adopted from Déchaine (1993) with slight modifications. Déchaine proposes a *bivalent predicate* account, advocating for category-free syntax and arguing for asyndetically headed structures.

She argues that the syntax of adjunction accommodates the properties of both constructions in (29), such as the consequential *and*

in sentence *a* and an SVC from Yoruba, a *bona fide* serializing language, in sentence *b*. Refer to the adjunction structures in (30) and (31) .

(29) a. I went to the store and bought some whiskey.

b. Jìmọ̀ ọ́ se ẹran$_i$ tá

AGR cook meat sell

'Jìmọ̀ cooked some meat and sold it.' (Déchaine 1993, p.178)

Déchaine's *bivalent predicates* account is framed within X-bar theory, leading to two possible directions of adjunction: A leftward adjunction, as seen in both examples (30) and (31) , and a rightward adjunction, as I argue for Arabic in the example (20).

(30) [insert leftward_English] (31) [insert leftward_Yorba]

In section 2, I showed in (15) that extracting the direct object is felicitous in the *consequential* MVC. An additional example involving wh-extraction is provided below. [5]

(32) a. *ʃu$_i$* *da:lja* *ra:ħat/ed͡ʒat* *eʃtarat* *__$_i$*

what Dalia went/came bought

'What did Dalia go/come and buy?'

b. *ʃu$_i$* *da:lja* *ka:mat* *tˁafat* *__$_i$*

What Dalia got.up turned.off

[5] Note that subject-verb inversion is not obligatory in this dialect of PA.

‘What did Dalia get up and turn off?’

In the remainder of this section, I substantiate the extraction out of a rightward adjunct. I follow Veenstra (1993), who argues that extraction out of a VP adjunct is grammatical, whereas extraction from an AspP is not. In (33), I show that the *consequential* MVC lacks a higher functional projection above the V2P, such as an AspP, via positioning a frequency adverb within the environment of V2.

(33) *ʕali raːħ bsorʕa sawwa waðʕaːjf-a marrat
Ali went quickly did homework-his sometimes
Intended: ‘Ali went quickly and did his homework sometimes’

The ungrammaticality of (33) is understood to be due to the presence of the frequency adverb *marrat*. Presumably, this type of adverb attaches to AspP. The ungrammaticality cannot be attributed to a semantic anomaly between the adverb *quickly*, which modifies a predicate of events, and the frequency adverb, which is a predicate of times (Parsons, 1994). Consider the following example, which demonstrates that both adverbs can co-occur in a simple sentence that is judged both grammatical and semantically coherent:

(34) ʕali akal marat ebsorʕa
Ali ate sometimes quickly
‘Ali sometimes ate quickly.’

To further support the proposal concerning the extraction out of adjuncts being correlated with the height of attachment, consider the contrast between comitatives and before-PPs:[6]

(35) a. *ʕali raːħ maʕ axuː-h ʕaddokaːn*
Ali went with brother-his to.the.store
'Ali went with his brother to the store.'

b. *miːn$_k$ ʕali raːħ maʕ-h$_k$ ʕaddokaːn*
who Ali went with-RP to.the.store

(36) a. *ʕali raːħ ʕaddokaːn kabel la-jaʕtˤi*
Ali went to.the.store before COMP-give
jaːsmin el-waraka
Yasmine the-paper
'Ali went to the store before he gave the paper to Yasmine.'

b. **miːn$_k$ ʕali raːħ ʕaddokaːn kabel la-jaʕtˤi* __$_k$
who Ali went to.the.store before COMP-give
el-waraka
the-paper

The contrast in the example above exhibits a pattern analogous to the one observed with adjunct VPs and AspPs, in that extraction is possible from lower constituents, but not from higher ones.[7]

[6] Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for this suggestion.
[7] See Johnston (1994) for discussion of the different attachment heights of various adjunct clauses along the syntactic spine.

The following example (37) and its corresponding structure in (38) provides evidence for the rightward directionality of adjunction in the *consequential* MVC. This is supported by the obligatory V-to-T/Asp movement in Arabic for the perfective, as suggested by Benmamoun (1999).

(37) *ʕali ma-raːħ-eʃ marrat ʕalmaktaba bsorʕa*
Ali NEG-went-NEG sometimes to.the.library quickly
sawwa waðʕaːjf-a
did homework-his
'It is not the case that sometimes Ali went to the library quickly and did his homework.'

The example above illustrates that V1 has moved above an AspP projection, where the frequency adverbial is hosted in its specifier. Additionally, it demonstrates that V1 is attached to sentential negation. The linear order of the example above is captured by the syntactic representation in (38) as follows: the structure shows that V1 moves to higher functional projections, eventually attaching to negation and landing at the T head. In contrast, V2 remains *in situ.* Importantly, postulating a leftward adjunction cannot explain how V1 would move out of an adjunction position. In addition, the movement of V1 to higher projections shows that V1 and V2 do not form a morpho-syntactic complex predicate.

(38) [Insert rightward_movement]

In summary, I have presented strong arguments in favor of the adjunction analysis for the *consequential* MVC. This analysis accounts for the lexical status of V1, and it aligns with the overall semantics of the construction as a consequential bi-eventive. This stands in contrast to the subordination analysis, which admits V1 as functional.

6. Ruling Out Functional Projections between V1P and V2P

In this section, I further corroborate that there are no functional projections between V1P and V2P, focusing on the absence of a vP above V2P. This lack of functional projections indicates a tighter lexical relation between V1 and V2P as an adjunct.

Additionally, this section indirectly argues against a covert coordination analysis at the level of vP. In section 2, the *consequential* MVC was compared to cases of overt coordination and was shown to be distinct.

The absence of a second subject position before V2 is the first argument against the presence of a vP above V2P. As previously shown in (16) repeated below as (39), two overtly realized subject DPs are ruled out.

(39) **daːlja$_j$ raːħat jaːsmin/hiː$_{j/k}$ eʃtarat ħaliːb*

Dalia went Yasmine/she bought milk

Intended: ‘Dalia went and Yasmine/she bought milk.’

The following example re-examines this position of subjects by testing the placement of the Floating Quantifier (FQ) *kullhen* 'all', within the environment of V2, between V1 and V2, and before V1, following Ouali et al. (2016):

(40) a. *el-banaːt* ***kullhen*** *raːħu* *ʕaddokaːn*
the-girls all went to.the.store
eʃtaru *buzʿa*
bought ice cream
'All the girls went to the store and bought some ice cream.'

b. *el-banaːt* *raːħu* ***kullhen*** *ʕaddokaːn*
the-girls went all to.the.store
eʃtaru *buzʿa*
bought ice cream
'All the girls went to the store and bought some ice cream.'

The two sentences presented in (40) are felicitous for the following reasons: In sentence *a*, the FQ is situated within the DP in Spec,TP. By contrast, in sentence *b*, the FQ is in its base position in the specifier of vP, following the structure in example (20). The word order, in which the FQ is placed between V1 and the goal PP, is the result of V1 undergoing movement.

In (41), the FQ is positioned after V1P and just before V2. This indicates that V2P does not include a vP position, providing further

support for the lack of an elaborate structure above V2P (see example (33) with *marrat*).

(41) **el-banaːt raːħu ʕaddokaːn* ***kullhen***
the-girls went to.the.store all
eʃtaru buzʿa
bought ice.cream

The sentence above was judged ungrammatical by two native speakers of the Abu Gosh dialect when pronounced with the intonation typical of *consequential* MVC. Notably, native speakers made corrections by adding an overt coordinator *w-* or inserting a pause immediately before the FQ, signaling a clause boundary. Indeed, this observation supports the argument that a second subject position is a characteristic of covert coordination but not of the *consequential* MVC.

Additional evidence for the argument above comes from cases of wh-extraction with subject-inversion, which is felicitous when the subject is not within the environment of V2P.[8]

(43) a. *ʃu$_i$ raːħat daːlja ʕaddokaːn eʃtarat* __$_i$
what went Dalia to.the.store bought
'What did Dalia go to the store and buy?'
b. **ʃu$_i$ raːħat ʕaddokaːn daːlja eʃtarat* __$_i$
what went to.the.store Dalia bought

[8] I thank an anonymous reviewer for the suggestion.

The contrast above shows the lack of a second subject position, namely Spec,v2P.

Instrument phrases in the *consequential* MVC are another argument against the covert coordination analysis. These phrases function as adjuncts to vP and can indicate the existence of a second vP in the construction.[9] As demonstrated in section 2, where the verbs involved in the MVC semantically manifest a single predicate-like behavior, it is expected that the construction would allow for only one instrument phrase. Permitting more than one instrument phrase would imply the presence of two underlying vPs, following Todaro et al. (2019). Consider the contrast in (44):

(44) a. ??*ʕali* *raːħ* *ʔakal* *suʃi* ***fe-ʃʃoka***
Ali went ate sushi in.the-fork
Intended: 'Ali went and ate sushi with the fork.'

b. ??*ʕali* *raːħ* ***fe-ssajjara*** *ʔakal* *suʃi*
Ali went in.the-car ate sushi
Intended: 'Ali went in his car and ate sushi'

c. *ʕali* *raːħ* *d͡ʒaːb* *ibn-a* ***fe-ssajjara***
Ali went pick.up son.his in.the-car
'Ali went and picked up his son in the car.'

[9] See Harley (2005) for instrument phrases as adjuncts to vP.

In sentence *a*, on the one hand, the instrument *fe-ffoka 'with the fork'* is odd as it cannot modify the event denoted by V1, but it is compatible with the event denoted by V2. On the other hand, sentence *b* shows the opposite case, where the instrument vP adjunct is semantically compatible with V1. In sentence *c*, the instrument phrase *fe-ssajjara* 'with the car' is compatible with V1 and V2, as they can be done with a car. The conclusion is that the *consequential* MVC allows for only one instrument phrase, which modifies the vP above the maximal projection of V1, as in (20).

This section has illustrated that the construction under examination cannot be analyzed as having a covert coordination structure since the verbs taking part in the *consequential* MVC semantically behave as a single predicate; they permit only one instrument phrase, and they share the same subject. These properties are not characteristic of a coordination structure, providing further support for the adjunction analysis of the *consequential* MVC.

7. Conclusion

This paper began with the observation that there is a sequence of three verbs, containing the two deictic motion verbs, *ra:ħ* 'went' and *ed͡ʒa* 'came' , as V1 and a verb of posture, *ka:m* 'got up', followed by a lexical verb, V2. I have shown that this sequence is associated with two distinct inferences, corresponding to two

different *multi-verb constructions*: one with a *consequential* inference, and another with the *counter-to-expectation* inference.

The paper focused on the *consequential* MVC with *raːħ 'went'* as V1, and I have shown that it denotes bi-eventive semantics that is characterized by what I referred to as the *temporal unity* property. This property distinguishes the semantics of the *consequential* MVC from the semantics of a coordinate structure.

Moreover, I have contended that the MVC underlies an adjunction relation between V1P and V2P. The lexical, rather than functional, status of V1 in this MVC supports this analysis. I have established the full lexical status of V1 through scrutinizing its semantic and syntactic properties: its restrictions on the animacy of the subject DP, the incompatibility with achievement and stative predicates, V1's ability to select for a goal PP, rather than subordinating V2P.

Moreover, I have shown that it is possible to extract only from a low adjunct (VP). This demonstrated that there are no functional projections between V2P and V1P, refuting also a covert coordination analysis. I have corroborated the rightward directionality of the adjunction analysis based on V1's movement to higher projections, stranding V2.

This paper contributes to the micro- and macro- comparative syntax of Arabic. At the micro level, I have offered a detailed syntactic characterization of the *consequential* MVC in the Abu

Ghosh dialect of Palestinian Arabic. At the macro level, the analysis that was put forth here has implications for the underlying structure of MVCs across Arabic dialects (and potentially other languages). Additionally, the diagnostics discussed in this paper can help to tease apart overt/covert coordination, subordination, and adjunction in these dialects.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Nora Boneh for her invaluable support and ongoing feedback, without which this research would not have been possible. I am also thankful to two native speakers of the Abu Gosh dialect for their patience in providing grammaticality judgments. I extended my gratitude to Noa Bassel. I sincerely thank the audience of ASAL 36 for their feedback, specifically Ahmad Al-Qassas, Maris Camilleri, and Hamid Ouali, for their valuable suggestions. I also thank the editors for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript. This research was funded by the Israel Science Foundation grant no. 2765/21.

References

Cruschina, S. (2022). Gone unexpectedly: Pseudo-coordination and the expression of surprise. In G. Giusti, V. N. Di Caro, & D. Ross (eds.), *Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 130-148.* (Vol. 274, pp. 129–148).

de Vos, M. (2004). Pseudo coordination is not subordination. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 181–192. https://doi.org/10.1075/avt.21.20vos

Déchaine, R.-M. A. (1993). *Predicates across categories: Towards a category-neutral syntax* [Doctoral dissertation].

Drozdík, L. (2008). A SEARCH FOR SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS IN ARABIC. *Asian and African studies*, *17*(1), 3–16. https://www.sav.sk/journals/uploads/101414561_Drozd%C3%ADk.pdf

Harley, H. (2005). How Do Verbs Get Their Names? Denominal verbs, Manner Incorporation, and the Ontology of Verb Roots in English. In N. Erteschik-Shir & T. Rapoport (eds.), *The syntax of aspect: deriving thematic and aspectual interpretation* (pp. 42–64). Oxford University PressOxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199280445.003.0003

Hussein, L. (1990). Serial Verbs in Colloquial Arabic. *Working Papers in Linguistics*, *39*, 340–354. https://kb.osu.edu/handle/1811/82124

Johnston, M. (1994). *The Syntax and Semantics of Adverbial Adjuncts* [Doctoral dissertation, UCSC]. https://www.proquest.com/docview/304092684?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses

Keine, S., & Bhatt, R. (2016). Interpreting verb clusters. *Natural language & linguistic theory*, *34*(4), 1445–1492. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-015-9326-4

Lawal, N. S. (1993). Serial verbs in Yoruba as adjunct phrases. *Lingua. International review of general linguistics. Revue internationale de linguistique generale*, *91*(2-3), 185–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(93)90013-M

Levin, B. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation* (p. 366). University of Chicago Press.

Muysken, P., & Veenstra, T. (1994). Serial verbs. In J. Arends, P. Muysken, & N. Smith (eds.), *Pidgins and Creoles: An introduction* (Vol. 15, pp. 289–301). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/cll.15.30muy

Ouali, H., & Bukhari, J. A. (2016). The syntax of motion light verbs in Jordanian and Moroccan Arabic. In Y. A. Haddad & E. Potsdam (eds.), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XXVIII: Papers from the Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics, Gainesville, Florida, 2014* (Vol. 4, pp. 173–191). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/sal.4.08oua

Parsons, T. (1994). *Events in the Semantics of English: A Study in Subatomic Semantics (Current Studies in Linguistics)* (p. 334). The MIT Press.

Pesetsky, D., & Torrego, E. (2007). The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In S. Karimi, V. Samiian, & W. K. Wilkins (eds.), *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture: Syntactic derivation and interpretation. In honor of Joseph E. Emonds* (pp. 262–294).

Rappaport Hovav, M., & Levin, B. (2010). Reflections on Manner/Result Complementarity*. In M. Rappaport Hovav, E. Doron, & I. Sichel (eds.), *Lexical Semantics, Syntax, and Event Structure* (pp. 21–38). Oxford University Press.

Ross, J. R. (1967). *Constraints on Variables in Syntax* [Doctoral dissertation]. https://babel.ucsc.edu/~hank/ross67.pdf

Sebba, M. (1987). The syntax of Serialisation. In P. Muysken (ed.), *The Syntax of Serial Verbs: An Investigation into Serialisation in Sranan and Other Languages* (Vol. 2, pp. 85–140).

Silva--Robles, F., Lopez, F., Duff, J., & Anderson, C. (2022). Eliciting Associated Motion Constructions in Two Zapotec Languages. *Semantic Fieldwork Methods*.

Todaro, G., & Del Prete, F. (2019). The morphosyntax-semantics interface and the Sicilian Doubly Inflected Construction. In S. Cruschina, A. Ledgeway, & E.-M. Remberger (eds.), *Italian dialectology at the interfaces* (Vol. 251, pp. 131–154). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.251.07tod

Veenstra, T. (2000). Verb serialization and object position. *Linguistics*, *38*(5). https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2000.014

Versteegh, K. (1984). *Pidginization and creolization: the case of arabic* (Vol. 33). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.33

Wurmbrand, S. (2004). Two types of restructuring—Lexical vs. functional. *Lingua. International review of general linguistics. Revue internationale de linguistique generale*, *114*(8), 991–1014. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(03)00102-5

Zribi-Hertz, A., & Jean-Louis, L. (2022). The syntax of directional Serial Verb Constructions in French-based creoles. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 37(1), 114–159. https://doi.org/10.1075/jpcl.00088.her

Abdel-Rahman, N. (2023). *Multi-verb Constructions in Palestinian Arabic* [Master thesis]. Huji.

Aboh, E. O. (2004). *The Morphosyntax of Complement-Head Sequences*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195159905.001.0001

Aboh, E. O. (2009). Clause Structure and Verb Series. *Linguistic inquiry (Online)*, *40*(1), 1–33.

Aikhenvald, A. (2006). *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology (Explorations in Linguistic Typology)* (A. Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon, eds.; 1st ed., p. 402). Oxford University Press.

Altakhaineh, A. R. M., & Zibin, A. (2018). Verb' ' + verb compound and serial verb construction in Jordanian Arabic (JA) and English. *Lingua. International review of general linguistics. Revue internationale de linguistique generale*, *201*, 45–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2017.08.010

Baker, M. (1989). Object Sharing and Projection in Serial Verb Constructions on JSTOR. *Linguistic inquiry (Online)*, *20*(4), 513–553. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178644

Benmamoun, E. (1999). Arabic morphology: The central role of the imperfective. *Lingua. International review of general linguistics. Revue internationale de linguistique generale*, *108*(2-3), 175–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(98)00045-X

Bisang, W. (2009). Serial Verb Constructions. *Language and linguistics compass*, *3*(3), 792–814. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2009.00128.x

Boneh, N. (2020). Pseudo-grammaticalization: The anatomy of "come" in Modern Hebrew pseudo-coordination constructions. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, *5*(2), 16. https://doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v5i2.4791

Butt, M. (2010). The light verb jungle: still hacking away. In M. Amberber, B. Baker, & M. Harvey (eds.), *Complex predicates: cross–linguistic perspectives on event structure* (pp. 48–78). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511712234.004

Cruschina, S. (2022). Gone unexpectedly: Pseudo-coordination and the expression of surprise. In G. Giusti, V. N. Di Caro, & D. Ross (eds.), *Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 130-148.* (Vol. 274, pp. 129–148).

de Vos, M. (2004). Pseudo coordination is not subordination. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 181–192. https://doi.org/10.1075/avt.21.20vos

Déchaine, R.-M. A. (1993). *Predicates across categories: Towards a category-neutral syntax* [Doctoral dissertation].

Drozdík, L. (2008). A SEARCH FOR SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS IN ARABIC. *Asian and African studies*, *17*(1), 3–16. https://www.sav.sk/journals/uploads/101414561_Drozd%C3%ADk.pdf

Harley, H. (2005). How Do Verbs Get Their Names? Denominal verbs, Manner Incorporation, and the Ontology of Verb Roots in English. In N. Erteschik-Shir & T. Rapoport (eds.), *The syntax of aspect: deriving thematic and aspectual interpretation* (pp. 42–64). Oxford University PressOxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199280445.003.0003

Hussein, L. (1990). Serial Verbs in Colloquial Arabic. *Working Papers in Linguistics*, *39*, 340–354. https://kb.osu.edu/handle/1811/82124

Johnston, M. (1994). *The Syntax and Semantics of Adverbial Adjuncts* [Doctoral dissertation, UCSC].

Keine, S., & Bhatt, R. (2016). Interpreting verb clusters. *Natural language & linguistic theory*, *34*(4), 1445–1492. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-015-9326-4

Lawal, N. S. (1993). Serial verbs in Yoruba as adjunct phrases. *Lingua. International review of general linguistics. Revue internationale de linguistique generale*, *91*(2-3), 185–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(93)90013-M

Levin, B. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation* (p. 366). University of Chicago Press.

Muysken, P., & Veenstra, T. (1994). Serial verbs. In J. Arends, P. Muysken, & N. Smith (eds.), *Pidgins and Creoles: An introduction* (Vol. 15, pp. 289–301). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/cll.15.30muy

Ouali, H., & Bukhari, J. A. (2016). The syntax of motion light verbs in Jordanian and Moroccan Arabic. In Y. A. Haddad & E. Potsdam (eds.), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XXVIII: Papers from the Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics, Gainesville, Florida, 2014* (Vol. 4, pp. 173–191). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/sal.4.08oua

Parsons, T. (1994). *Events in the Semantics of English: A Study in Subatomic Semantics (Current Studies in Linguistics)* (p. 334). The MIT Press.

Pesetsky, D., & Torrego, E. (2007). The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In S. Karimi, V. Samiian, & W. K. Wilkins (eds.), *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture: Syntactic derivation and interpretation. In honor of Joseph E. Emonds* (pp. 262–294).

Rappaport Hovav, M., & Levin, B. (2010). Reflections on Manner/Result Complementarity*. In M. Rappaport Hovav, E. Doron, & I. Sichel (eds.), *Lexical Semantics, Syntax, and Event Structure* (pp. 21–38). Oxford University Press.

Ross, J. R. (1967). *Constraints on Variables in Syntax* [Doctoral dissertation]. https://babel.ucsc.edu/~hank/ross67.pdf

Sebba, M. (1987). The syntax of Serialisation. In P. Muysken (ed.), *The Syntax of Serial Verbs: An Investigation into Serialisation in Sranan and Other Languages* (Vol. 2, pp. 85–140). https://web.s.ebscohost.com/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/ZTAwMHh3d19fNDA1MzA5X19BTg2?sid=022137bf-be20-43f5-af09-274ecd3d8a66@redis&vid=0&format=EB&rid=1

Silva--Robles, F., Lopez, F., Duff, J., & Anderson, C. (2022). Eliciting Associated Motion Constructions in Two Zapotec Languages. *Semantic Fieldwork Methods*.

Todaro, G., & Del Prete, F. (2019). The morphosyntax-semantics interface and the Sicilian Doubly Inflected Construction. In S. Cruschina, A. Ledgeway, & E.-M. Remberger (eds.), *Italian dialectology at the interfaces* (Vol. 251, pp. 131–154). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.251.07tod

Veenstra, T. (2000). Verb serialization and object position. *Linguistics*, *38*(5). https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2000.014

Versteegh, K. (1984). *Pidginization and creolization: the case of arabic* (Vol. 33). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.33

Wurmbrand, S. (2004). Two types of restructuring—Lexical vs. functional. *Lingua. International review of general linguistics. Revue internationale de linguistique generale*, *114*(8), 991–1014. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(03)00102-5

Zribi-Hertz, A., & Jean-Louis, L. (2022). The syntax of directional Serial Verb Constructions in French-based creoles. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, *37*(1), 114–159. https://doi.org/10.1075/jpcl.00088.her