Serial verb constructions in Papuan Malay

Yusuf Sawaki*
Universitas Papua, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author; Email: ysawaki@fulbrightmail.org

ABSTRACT

Creol languages such as Papuan Malay has serial verb constructions interested for further studies because there are lacks of similar studies done in the language. This research describes serial verb constructions in Papuan Malay. Its focus is to investigate syntactic and semantic structures of serial verb constructions. In the research, the descriptive linguistic method is used and its approach is the typological analysis where it focuses on analyzing particular linguistic features, i.e. serial verb constructions. The elicitation technique is used to collect data and it is also beneficial to supplement the syntagmatic analysis when the data is analysed in linear/horizontal order to easily look for the syntactic structure, argument structure, and argument sharing of serial verb constructions. The results show that serial verb constructions in Papuan Malay has two types, i.e. Dependent and Co-dependent serializations. Both types are categorized based on their argument structure and argument sharing properties, as well as their semantic expressions. Further, they are categorized as serial verb constructions by the definition of sequence of events within a monoclausality as the main feature of serial verb constructions in Papuan Malay. This paper gives a contribution to the theory of syntax and typology about the structural and semantic expressions of the serial verb constructions by reflecting the serial verb constructions in Papuan Malay.

Keywords: Papuan Malay, Serial Verb Constructions, monoclausality

INTRODUCTION

Serial verb constructions (SVCs), also known as serial verbs or verb serialization, are defined as "a monoclausal construction consisting of multiple independent verbs with no element linking them and with no predicate–argument relation between the verbs" (Haspelmath, 2016: 291), as illustrated in (1).

(1)   Let's **go cook** a meal

The English sentence in (1) deals with a grammatical construction that involves a) series of verbs in sequence, b) event structure, c) argument structure, and d) monoclausality. The term serial verb construction refers to an integration of formal coding and event structure as a 'grammatical construction.' Thus, this paper describes both the formal coding and event structure of SVCs.

Serial verb constructions have been studied since 1970s in the languages of Africa, Asia (in particular Southeast Asia ans East Asia), and also the languages of the Pacific region, especially in the New Guinea region (the Island of New Guinea and its adjacent islands). Serial verb constructions are also common among creole languages of the Carribean and the Pacific areas (Aikenvald, 2006: Haspelmath 2016; Lovestrand, 2021). The constructios are also known among Austronesian and Papua languages in New Guinea and its surrounding areas, including in Tanah Papua. Typological and comparative studies of SVCs among these languages have been done intensively (Senft, 2008; Foley, 2008; Sawaki, 2016; Unterladstetter, 2020).

This paper discusses SVCs in Papuan Malay, a variety of Malay spoken as the lingua franca by people in Tanah Papua. This paper, in particular, describes formal coding properties, i.e. syntactic properties, and event structures that deal with semantic expressions of SVCs in more details. Expressing SVCs in Papuan Malay commonly ranges from sintactic to discourse domains when they are operated as grammatical instruments in simplifying conversations or communications when many related events/activities are expressed in single discourse. Such grammatical constructions are therefore often

analyzed to have complex argument structure which conjugates to complex predicates (Lovestrand, 2021:111-118; Butt et al., 2021; Ezenwafor, 2019).

In many studies of SVCs in world's languages, intensive debates among linguists from different schools and theories are about whether SVCs are categorized as a simple predicate or a complex predicate structures. These debates occupy realms of syntactic theories, descriptive and typological fields which base their arguments on the structural and semantic features of SVCs found in individual languages (Svenonius, 2008: 47; Foley, 2008; Butt et al., 2021; Lovestrand, 2021). Most of the linguists from different schools and theories are, however, in agreement that SVCs are a simple predicative concept (i.e, verbal predicate) within a monoclausality as its main feature, rather than a complex predicate (Foley dan Olson, 1985; Alsina et al., 1997; Mohanan, 1997; Amberber et al., 2010; dan Butt, 2010). It is therefore Haspelmath (2015) claims that a SVC is a construction of single clause consisting of series of independent verbs without any elements linking them and with no predicate-argument relation between the verbs. Aikhenvald (2006:1) also states that SVCs are defined as sequences of verbs occuring in a single clause that share the same arguments and are not formally subordinated by any conjunction words. Serial verbs constructions describe what is conceptualized as single iven structure semantically (van Staden & Reesink, 2008; Collins, 1997; Durie, 1997; Osam, 1997; Lane, 2007; & Foley, 2010).

In terms of the formal coding, the syntactic structure of SVCs can be illustrated as in (2).

(2)   SUBY + **PRED [V^1, V^2, [V^3, V^4]** + OBY/FPrep/ADV

The structure in (2) indicates sequences of verbs in the predicate position. Note that in many Papuan languages, SVCs only operate two or three verbs in sequence, but for Austronesian languages, SVCs may have more than three verbs in sequence, in particular Papuan Malay. Looking at the predicative structure of SVCs in (2), Aikhenvald (2006) and Lovestrand (2021) provides the prototypical features of SVCs as follows: a) They are a single predicate consisting of a sequence of verbs that semantically act together; b) There are no overt markers to interrupt the sequence of events represented by the verbs such as coordination, subordination, or syntactic dependency of any other sort; c) They are conceptualized as a single event; d) They are monoclausal and have the same intonational properties as those of a mono-verbal clause; e) They may also share the same core and other arguments; f) They share the same grammatical properties of TAM and polarity value.

Two key issues in most of the definitions are that the series of verbs represents a sequence of events (represented by each verb in the sequence) as a single predicate, and that the verbs are not subordinate to one another. Thus, series of verbs in SVCs describe a single notional event and no conjunctions can be inserted between the verbs (see Aikhenvald 2006, van Staden and Reesink 2008, Aboh 2009, and Bowden 2001). Further, feature (c) stresses out SVCs as series of events which are counted as single event in the semantic notion, and feature (e) characterizes argument structure and argument sharing of SVCs (subject, object, and oblique) (Senft, 2008; Adoh, 2009; van Staden dan Reesink, 2008; Dol, 1999; Baker, 1989; Foley, 2010).

Senft (2008) classifies SVCs into several types – independent, dependent, co-dependent and complex. All types are classified based on structural and coding features of serial verbs and argument structure. Independent serialization is characterized as a construction that each verb in the sequence is fully inflected and can take the complete range of verbal inflectional morphology, including subject agreement and TAM marking. Dependent serialization, on the other hand, is a construction in which only one of the verbs in the sequence is fully inflected, while the other verbs occur as bare verb forms. They are thus dependent on the inflected verb, which carries all the grammatical information. Co-dependent serialization deals with series of verbs that are not juxtaposed but are separated by argument sharing as exemplified in (3). These three types can be illustrated in the following examples from Wooi and Papuan Malay:

Wooi (Sawaki 2016:321).

(3)	*Henda*	*hemahoy*	*hendoy*	*na*	*wampa*	*ra*	*to*
	he-t-ra	he-t-mahoi	he-t-roi	na	wang-pa	ra	to
	3PL-PL-go	3PL-PL-sit	3PL-PL-sing	at	there.2-DIST	thither	PERF

'They have gone singin there.'

Papuan Malay (Sawaki 2004)

(4)   *Orang*   ***dong=datang***   ***bawa***   ***pulang***   *dong=pu*   *anak*   *yang*
         person   3PL=come   bring   return.home   3PL=POSS   anak   REL
         de=sakit   *itu*   kemarin
         3SG=sick   that   yesterday
         'People came and took home their child who was sick yesterday.'

(5)   *Meri*   *de=bikin*   *de=manangis*
         Mary   3SG-make   3SG=cry
         'Mary made him/her cry.'

The Wooi example in (3) shows independent serialization in which all the verbs in the sequence take prefixed-subject marking indexing the same subject referent. In (4), the Papuan Malay example illustrates dependent serialization, in which only the first verb takes the subject marking, and the other two verbs are not inflected and rely on the first verb for their grammatical information. In (5), two verbs *bikin* 'make' and *manangis* 'cry' are co-dependent and are separated by the object argument of the verb 'make' and it is shared as the subject argument of the second verb.

      In terms of argument structure, both sentences (3) in Wooi, (4) and (5) in Papuan Malay provide evidence of all verbs in SVCs sharing one core argument that are the subject and the object. In (3), the subject *he-* '3PL' is shared and is overtly marked on individual verbs in the series. In (4), the subject *dong=* '3PL' is shared by all verbs in the series although it is only overtly marked on the first verb. In (5), *de* '3SG' is shared by the verbs 'make' and 'cry'. In other studies of SVCs, the structure of SVCs in (5) is also called as pseudo-serialization (Sawaki, 2016). The pseudo serialization refers to the structure that does not represent a true serialization but has semantic dependency. Noted that the types of SVCs introduced by Senft (2008) are mostly found in Austronesian languages of South Halmahera-West New Guinea group (Bowden, 2001; Dalrymple & Mofu, 2012 & 2013; Gasser, 2014 & 2015; Karubaba, 2008; Karubuy, 2011; Mofu, 2005 & 2008; Sagger, 1979; Sawaki, 2016; Sawaki & Karubaba, 2012; Silzer, 1983; Soeparno, 1983; Steinhauer, 2005; van den Heuvel, 2006).

      Serial verb constructions in Papuan Malay show all features described above. Furthermore, SVCs in Papuan Malay may allow accessibility and complexity of number of verbs in a sequence. In discourse purposes, Papuan Malay allows many verbs in sequence and they have a default semantic structure. This feature does not appear in other languages in Papua which is more restricted in number of verbs in sequence. While, for the types of SVCs described by Senft (2008), it requires a detail description for the accessibility and complexity of SVCs in Papuan Malay, especially the co-dependent type that has a variant of the dependent type.

      Before having a further description of SVCs in Papuan Malay, it is better to give an overview of the language, Papuan Malay. Papuan Malay [pmy] is a language of communication used in Tanah Papua, especially in the north coast and southwest coast of Tanah Papua. The language has been used for about 200 years. Papuan Malay is categorized as an eastern Malay variety which has some, but not many, similarities to Ambonese Malay, Kupang Malay, Sanger Malay, Ternate Malay (Paauw, 2008). Papuan Malay is considered the youngest variety among other Malay varieties to west Nusantara, especially to where is called the motherland of Malay in east coast of Sumatera and west coast of Kalimantan (Collins, 1998).

      When Papuan Malay was exactly used as a lingua franca in Tanah Papua is still debatable. It is just predicted that the language has been used for about 200 years when the native Papuans first came into a contact with western people. The intensive contact occurred when the Dutch Government opened an administrative post in Papua in 1828 (Haga, 1884) and them Chirstianity was spreaded out in Tanah Papua in 1855. In these periods, the native Papuans came in contact with Malay speaking people who worked in the Dutch government and the Chirstian missions, especially Malay speaking people of Ambon and Sanger, as well as many Malay traders from Ternate, Tidore, Banda, and East Seram (Conroy, 2013; Donohue & Sawaki, 2007; Donohue, 2011, Kluge, 2014). However, some linguists and archeologists suggest time deeper than the arrival of the Dutch government and Christianity, that is in the periodization of the old traditional trading between some regions in Papua and outside traders, especially traders from Seram, Goram, Geser and Banda in the central Maluku, and with Malay and Arabic traders, and also sailors and traders from Ternate and Tidore in the north coast who traded spices, masohi barks, Birds of Paradise,

tripang, and other forest products with the native Papuans. Malay was used as the trading language in that traditional trading. Evidence comes from Malay vocabularies that were used in the Onin Creole language in the Bomberai Peninsula, near Fakfak region. Onin Creole was used long before the arrival of the western government as the language of communication among multilingual communities in the region. Local traders of Onin, Kokas, and Karas at the southwest coast region used the language in their trading activities among themselves (Miller, 1996; Sawaki, 2018). Some Malay vocabularis or Malay-like terms were used such as *prau* 'canoe', *tripang* 'sea cucumber', *kadera* 'chair', *paduakan* 'a kind of canoe', *anakoda* 'sailor', *tatumbu* 'a net bag' were common vocabularies among people of Namatota, Aiduma, and villages along Triton Bay (currently: Kaimana regency).

In the time period, Malay and native languages of Papua, in particular, Austronesian languages were used together by the native Papuans in Teluk Cenderawasih in north coast (i.e. Biak, Ansus, Waropen, Wooi, Wandamen, Roon native speakers), Raja Ampat islands in the west coast (i.e. Maya native speakers), and Bomberai peninsula and Kaimana in the southwest coast (Kowiai, Onin and Sekar, Arguni speakers) (Sawaki, 2018). This contact resulted language convergence in which Malay resembles local Austronesian languages in terms of its grammatical features (phonology, morphology, syntax), yet still keeps its Malay lexicons. This long contact history then produces a new language, a contact language, which is technically called Papuan Malay that has different features from Malay varieties in the west Nusantara.

Papuan Malay has the following features (Sawaki, 2004). a) Papuan Malay has an SVO word order, which keeps the word order of Austronesian and Malay, as in (6) and (7).

(6) *Jon dong=kejar   sa:*
     Jon 3PL=chase   1SG
     'John and associates chased me.'

(7) *De=ada   datang ka*
     3SG=EXIST   come   Q
     'Is he/she coming?'

b) Phonologically, Papuan Malay has a simple phoneme system, that is a 5-vowel set /i, E, a, o, u/, with their allophonic variations, especially in the front and mid vowels /i, E, a/. This is considered a dialectal variation. There are 18 consonantal phonemes, that are /p, b, t, d, k, g, tΣ, dΣ, s, h, m, n, ⌡, N, r, l, j, w/. Syllable structure in Papuan Malay is CV(C) and it does not allow consonant clusters in onset or coda positions. In the suprasegmental level, the language has two stress patterns, which are penultimate and word final stress patterns (Kluge, 2014).

c) In the lexical level, there are three kinds of words. They are lexical words, grammatical words, and lexicalized words. Words like *batu* 'stone', *pohon* 'tree', *ruma* 'house', *prau* 'canoe', and *kali* 'river' are lexical words. There are words that take affixation or cliticalization processes such as *tajato* 'be fallen' and *dejalan* 'he is walking'. This words are grammatical words. Lexicalised words are words that seem to have morphological elements but are treated as an independent lexicon in Papuan Malay such as *berenang* [bErEnaN], *manyanyi* [mA⌡a⌡I], *tadampar* [tAdAmpAr], *pancuri* [pAntΣYrI].

d) Note that many words are classified as generic words, meaning words without precise word classes syntactically and semantically. They are analyzable when they are used in syntactic contexts as in (8a and b).

(8) *a. Pancuri   itu   de=dapa   tangkap   dari   polisi   dong*
     Thief   that   3SG=get   catch   from   police   3PL
     'The thief was cought by the policemen.'

     b. dong=datang pancuri tong=pu=barang
     3PL=come   steal   1PL=POSS=thing
     'they came to steal our things.'

e) Papuan Malay has very simple morphology. The subject marker pro-clitics to verbs as illustrated in (9).

(9) *Mama   de=kas=tidor   ana   kacil   tu*
     Mother   3SG=CAUS=sleep   child   small   DEM
     'my mother put the child to sleep.'

Also, there is the morpheme *ta-* 'PAS' that attaches to the verb indicating a passive sentence with unintentional meaning as in (10).

(10) *Dong=ta-jato   deng   motor*
      3PL=PAS-fall   with   motorbike
     'They were fallen with the motorbike.'

f) In the syntactic level, Papuan Malay has the followings syntactic features: inclusory pronominals, where a noun is followed by a pronoun within a noun phrase, indicating sets of participants in the noun phrase (Sawaki, 2021), as in (11a and b).

(11) a. ***[Bapa dong=]*** *dudu carita   persoalan   tu*
        Father 3PL=sit tell.story   problem   that
        My father and associates sat and discussed the problem.'

     b. *Dong=datang   bawa   pulang   [anana dong]*
        3PL=come   bring   go.home   child.RED   3PL
        'They came to bring home the children.'

Passive constructions are also found in Papuan Malay and they have two types semantically, which are the intentional passive and the unintentional passive as in (12a and b).

(12) a. *Motor   tu   dapa tabrak   dari   mobil   mera   tu*
         Motorbike   that   get hit   from   car   red   that
        'The motorbike was hit by the red car.'

     b. *Sa=jalan   baru   sa=ta-jato   di   sana*
         1SG=walk   new   1SG=PAS-fall   at   there
        'I walked then I fell there unintentionally.'

Another syntactic construction is focus construction. Papuan Malay uses this construction to express a passive-like sentence in which the patient/object is placed in the initial position and its syntactic place is retained by a pronominal copy, as in (13) and (14).

(13) *Motor   itu=tu   mobil mera   ni   yang   tabrak akan*
      Motorbike   that=FOC   car   red   this   REL   hit   3SG.NEU
     'It is the motorbike, the red car hit.'

(14) *Batu   ini=ni   orang itu   angkat akan*
      Stone   this=FOC   person that   lift   3SG.NEU
     'It is this stone, that person lifted.'

Serial verb constructions are also common in Papuan Malay that indicate a special syntactic structure in different types of SVCs found in the language. SVCs also function to simplify utterances in Papuan Malay discourse. Serial verb constructions will be well described in the following section.

METHOD

This study is a descriptive linguistic study (Himmelmann, 1998: 161-164; Tursinaliyevna, 2021) and also applies the linguistic typology approach (Croft, 2002). Descriptive linguistic focuses on ways of collecting data from a fieldwork, analyze them and describe them objectively as uttered by the native speakers of a language such as Papuan Malay. Further, Tursinaliyevna (2021:5) argues, "Language description, aiming at in-depth analyses of the world's languages. Descriptive linguistics is concerned with the study of the structure of languages through an analysis of the forms, structures and processes at all levels of language structure: phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, semantics and pragmatics. It is based on data gathered through fieldwork, preferably immersion fieldwork for extended periods of time." I also take an account of my knowledge and linguistic intuition as the native speakers of Papuan Malay to support and verify the data about any possible structures of SVCs used by native speakers of Papuan Malay.

Typological approach is used to feature SVCs in Papuan Malay and also to compare the similar constructions with other languages. Crof (2002) mentions that typology as an approach may be defined as follows: (1) a classifications of linguistic structural type across languages. This is known as typological classification; (2) the study of patterns that occur systematically across languages. It deals with typological generalization; (3) typology represents an approach or theoretical framework to the study of language that contrast with any other previous approaches.

The three definitions represent the observation of an empirical phenomenon (language) and classification of what we observe (Crof, 2002:2). Thus, typology in more specific outlook deals with an observation of specific linguistic structures and classify the structural features in more details and in some ways compare them to other languages. The objective of doing typology is to observe whether those features are language specific or language universals (Shibatani, 2015). Typology typically uses many sampling data (texts or elicited data) as its powerful tools in data analysis.

Descriptive linguistic and typology approach are used to observe and analyze SVCs in Papuan Malay. I use elicitation technique in collecting data and for the first analysis of the data. This elicitation technique is described by Payne (1997: 366-368). This technique focusses on developing sentence list or sentence elicitation that are controlled, restricted, and measured. It consists of multi sentences referring to SVCs in Papuan Malay. The data is restricted to any possible sentences to capture SVCs in Papuan Malay. The practical steps of doing elicitation are developing sentence list consisting of all possible SVCs in Papuan Malay. In the fieldwork, the sentence list is used to gather samples of SVCs by asking questions to the informants (language consultants). The informant responses are then classified by using paradigmatic or syntagmatic analysis (Namaziandost, Shafiee, & Rasooyar, 2018). In the final stage, all sentence samples are classify according to their forms, functions and meanings in order to group them into SVC types in Papuan Malay.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Results

For the simplicity, the analysis of SVCs in Papuan Malay follows the types of SVCs introduced by Senft (2008). The results show that there are only two types of SVCs found in Papuan Malay, i.e. Dependent and Co-dependent types. These types of SVCs base on the structure and formal coding features.

Dependent SVCs in Papuan Malay

Dependent serialization is a construction in which only one of the verbs in the sequence is fully inflected, while the other verbs occur as bare verb forms. In Papuan Malay, the first verb in the sequence takes the pro-cliticized subject marker and the rest of the verbs are in bare forms as illustrated in (15) and (16).

(15) *Olaf*   ***de=pintar***   ***belajar*** *bahasa*   *Inggris*
Olaf   3SG=diligent   study   language   English
'Olaf is smart studying English.'

(16) *Anana*   *tu*   ***dong=mo=pi=cari***   *ikan*   *di*   *kali*
Child-RED   that   3PL=want=go=look.for   fish   at   river
'the children want to catch fish on the river.'

Dependent SVCs allows two and more verbs lining up in the sequence in Papuan Malay. This type is productive in terms of number of verbs in SVCs. This is further described in the discussion below.

Co-dependent SVCs in Papuan Malay

Co-dependent serialization deals with series of verbs that are not juxtaposed but are separated by argument sharing. It is called co-dependent because two verbs in sequence are linked by argument shared by the first and the second verbs as in (17).

(17) *Sa=bikin   Arnol   de=jato*
     1SG=make   Arnol   3SG=fall
     'I made Arnold fell down.'

Example (17) is the causative construction. The sentence shows a cause-effect relation in which the first event indicates the cause event and the second event indicates the effect event. Both verbs, by their structural composition, are linked by argument sharing. Co-dependent SVCs vary semantically. Beside the causative construction, other constructions that fall into this type are: resultative, permisive, and depictive constructions.

Resultative constructions also require two events represented by SVCs and argument sharing to link the two events. Here the first event describes the action initiated by the subject toward the object and the second event describes the result of this action. Argument sharing features in this construction, with the object of the first event being the same as the subject of the second event, as in (18).

(18) *Tong=pukul   Jon   de=menangis*
     1PL-hit   Jon   3SG=cry
     'We hit John cry.'

Permissive constructions always consist of two verbal events. The first event is the permissive verb *kase biar* 'let' and the second event indicates that that action is permitted as in (19) and (20).

(19) *Orang itu   de=kase   biar   sa=makan*
     Person that   3SG=give   let   1SG=eat
     'The person let me eat.'

(20) *Bapa   dong=kase   biar   Anis   de=menangis*
     Father   3PL=give   let   Anis   de=cry
     'My father and associates let Anis cry.'

In (19) and (20), argument sharing conjoins two events in which the object of the first event, whether it is a pronoun or an NP, becomes the subject of the second event in terms of agreement marking on the verb of the second verb.

Depictive expression in Papuan Malay are also syntactically manifested by means of SVCs. In this construction, the first event and the second event are linked with argument sharing. It is also the object of the first event sharing its status with the subject of the second event. The object of the first event may be marked independently with a pronoun or an NP and it agrees with subject marker of the second event, as in (21) and (22).

(21) *Sa=dengar   dong=bicara*
     1SG=hear   3PL=talk
     'I heard them talk.'

(22) *Perempuan   itu   de=liat   sa=jalan*
     Woman   that   3SG=see   1SG=walk
     'The woman saw me walk.'

Discussion

Serial verb constructions in Papuan Malay may be best described in terms of the following properties: a) structural properties (Senft, 2008)); b) argument structure and argument sharing (Bradshaw, 1993; Collins, 1997); c) productivity (Aikhenvald, 2022); d) event structure and event sharing (Lovestrand, 2021).

Structural properties

Two types of serial verb constructions in Papuan Malay are not only defined by their semantic properties but also structural properties (Senft, 2008; Durie, 1997). In terms of semantic properties, these two types describes the semantic unity of multiple event in the dependent serialization and semantic dependency in the co-dependent type. In terms of structural properties, dependent SVCs and co-dependent SVCs have different structures. The structure of dependent SVCs follows the basic SVO word-order in Papuan Malay. The basic SVO word-order in Papuan Malay can be structured as in Table 1.

Table 1. Basic word-order in Papuan Malay.

ARG1	PRED	ARG2	ARG3
Subject	Subj.Mark=Verb	Object	Oblique

This structure can be illustrated as in (23).

	SUBJ	PRED (V)	OBJ		
(23)	*Om*	*[de=makan]*	*nasi*	*banyak*	
	Uncle	3SG=eat	rice	many	
	'My uncle are much rice.'				

As described earlier, the morphology in Papuan Malay is very simple. The verb is only attached by the subject pro-clitic marker as in (23). The object and the oblique are syntactically structure. The structure of Dependent SVCs allows a sequence of verbs in the predicate position and the structure can be illustrated as in Table 2.

Table 2. The structure of dependent SVCs in Papuan Malay

ARG1	PRED			ARG2	ARG3
Subject	V^1	V^2	V^3	Object	Oblique

The dependent SVCs are more productive in having verbs in sequence. Papuan Malay allows two to six verbs lining up in sequence as in (24) and (25).

(24)	*Agus*	*[de=datang*	*dudu*	*manyanyi]*	*di*	*sa=pu=dapan*	*ruma*
	Agus	3SG-come	sit	sing	at	1SG=POS=front	house
	'Agus came and sang in front of my house.'						

(25)	*[Sa=mo*	*pi*	*jalan*	*duduk*	*manyanyi-manyanyi]*	*di situ*	*dulu*
	1SG=want	go	walk	sit	sing-RED	at there	afterward
	'I want to go sit there and sing.'						

Note that in the discourse contexts, dependent SVCs may more productive in taking verbs in sequence. This is a discourse strategy to simplify utterances and to avoid a complexity in the discourse. The use of SVCs in the discourse requires a further study. This study just focuses on the syntactic structure and event structure.

Co-dependent SVCs has a different structure. The term 'Co-dependent SVCs' relates to the SVC structure in which two verbs is separated by an argument sharing, but semantically two verbs represent multiple events in a single discourse. As its structural property, the co-dependent SVC is often called 'pseudo serial verb construction'. Pseudo-SVCs is a term used to describe SVCs with a relation of semantic dependency (Sawaki, 2016: 329). Thus, the structure of co-dependent SVC is as follows:

Table 3. The structure of Co-dependent SVCs in Papuan Malay

ARG1	PRED	ARG1	PRED
Subject	V1	Object	V2

This structure explains that the subject initiates an action (V1) toward the object and the object gets the result (V2) of the subject's action. The structure of SVCs are the structure of various constructions, namely causatives, resultatives, permissives, depictives, and benefactives. The structure can be exemplified as in (26-29).

(26) *De=bikin   tong=mara*   *(Causative)*
     3SG=make   1PL=angry
     'He/she made us angry'

(27) *Dong=kase   biar   sa=jalan   kaki*   *(Permisive)*
     3PL=givelet   1SG=walk   foot
     'They let me go on foot.'

(28) *Jems   tong=dwa=dengar   dong   manyanyi*   *(Depictive)*
     Jems   1PL=two=hear 3PL   sing
     'James and I heard them sing.'

(29) *Sa=pukul   Andi   de=manangis*   *(Resultative)*
     1SG=hit   Andi   3SG=cry
     'I hit Andi cry'

For the causative construction, in particular, there is an alternate structure that appears to have a similarity as that of dependent SVCs as illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4. The alternate structure of the causative construction in Papuan Malay.

ARG1	PRED		ARG2
Subject	V1	V2	Object

This alternate structure only applies for the causative construction and cannot be applied to other co-dependent SVCs. Comparing the example in (26), the alternate structure is as in (30-31).

(30) *De=bikin   mara   saya*
     3SG=make   angry   1SG
     'He made me angry.'

(31) *De=bikin   manangis   anana   dong*
     3Tg=buat   menangis   anak-RED   3Jmk
     'Dia menyebabkan anak-anak itu menangis.'

Causative constructions also have another construction using the verb *kase/kas* 'give' which structurally applies the dependent SVC, but it semantically describes the cause-effect event. This can be described in (32) and (33).

(32) *Orang   itu   de=**kase**   **pica**   tong=pu=piring*
     Person that   3SG=give   pecah   1PL=POS=plate
     'The person causes our plates break.'

(33) *Perempuan   itu   de=**kase**   **makan** ana   kacil   itu*
     Woman   that   3SG=give   eat   child   small   that
     'The woman causes the small child eat.'

Causative constructions in (32) and (33) have a fixed structure and do not have alternate structures as in the causative construction with the verb *bikin* 'make'. Sentences as in the folliwng examples are not grammatical in Papuan Malay.

(34)   **orang itu de=kase tong=pu=ember pica*

(35)   **perempuan itu de=kase ana kecil itu makan*

Intuitively, native speakers of Papuan Malay will use the causative construction with the verb *bikin* 'make' if the constructions in (30) and (31) are used.

Argument structure and Argument Sharing

One of the SVC features is argument structure and argument sharing (Branshaw, 1993, Collins, 1997). In more specific, Haspelmath (2016: 293-296) uses the term subject- and object-sharing in argument structure. In SVCs, argument structure plays a significant role in connecting the internal arguments in the constructions, i.e. subject/actor and object/patient toward the predicate (verbs). Thus, it may be claimed that:

(36)   In a SVC, there is an argument structure that links the internal arguments (subject, object) and the predicate (V1, V2) as a single event structure.

In Papuan Malay, argument structure is morphosyntactically marked in which the subject is marked by pro-clitic and attaches to the fist verb in the sequence (dependent SVC), and the object and/or oblique is marked with an independent pronoun or a noun phrase. This is to indicate a morphological evidence that the subject is always a pro-clitic. Thus, in the co-dependent SVC, the object simultenously functions as the subject of the second verb (V2) because the argument attaches to the second verb as a pro-clitic. Semantically, argument structure indicates the argument roles in SVCs, especially when an argument has two roles as in the co-dependent SVC type in which the object/patient of the V1 may also functions as the subject/actor of the V2. This can be illustrated as in Table 5.

Table 5. The internal argument structure in the Co-dependent SVC.

ARG1	PRED	ARG2	PRED
Subject/Actor	Subj=V1	←Object/patient Subject/actor→	V2
Orang itu	*de=dorong*	*sa=*	*jato*
Person that	*3SG=push*	*1SG=*	*fall*
'That person	*pushed*	*me*	*fall'*

The internal argument structure shown in Table 5 also postulates argument sharing in verb serialization in Papuan Malay (. The subject/actor of V1 is only shared by V1 as the subject of the verb *dorong* 'push' but the object/patient *sa=* '1SG' of the V1 shares the role as the subject/actor of V2. This is different from the dependent SVC in which the sequence of verbs (V1, V2, V3) simply shares the same subject and object. Note that the subject is only marked in V1 as a pro-clitic and the object is marked syntactically after the sequence of verbs. Thus, it may be claimed for argument sharing in Papuan Malay that:

(37)   Internal argument sharing in SVCs in Papuan Malay

In a SVC, V1 and V2 must share the same internal argument whether as subject and object and/or one of the arguments shares two argument roles.

Productivity

One of the traits of verb serialization in Papuan Malay is the ability of taking a number of verbs at once in the SVCs. In Vaidya and Wittenberg (2020) and in Aikhenvald (2022), this trait describes one

of the SVC prinsciple that is productivity. In term of this prinsciple in Papuan Malay's SVCs, the dependent SVC and co-dependent SVC are different in taking number of verbs in sequence. The dependent SVC is more productive than the co-dependent SVC. As described above, the dependent SVC allows two to more verbs in sequence as in (38) to (40).

(38) ko=**pi**   **jalan**   ke   sana   suda
      2SG=go   walk   to   there   already
      'Just go there, please!'

(39) de=**mo**   **dudu**   **manyanyi**   deng   saya
      3SG=want   sit   sing   with   1SG
      'He/she wants to sit and sing with me.'

(40) *Tong=**rasa***   **mo**   **jalan**   **pi**   **bawa**   **pulang**   *barang-barang tu*
      1PL=feel   want   walk   go   carry   go.home   thing-RED   that
      'We have a desire to bring back (our) things.'

The productivity in the dependent SVC is supported by the predicative contour and the semantic event of verb sequence. The predicative contour deals with a) the phonological contour in the predicate that provides an enough space to receive number of verbs in a one-time speech unit. It is signaled by the intonation going down in the final verb in the sequence, and b) semantic contour to receive numbers of verbs in terms of their semantic categories (i.e. cognitive, desirative, directive motion, and action). In each semantic category, a SVC can receive a verb and even more. This will be further described below.

The co-dependent SVC is more restricted in taking number of verbs. For instance, a causative construction may just allow two verbs, as in (41).

(41) *Orang*   *itu*   *de=bikin*   *motor*   *rusak*
      Person   that   3SG=make   motor.bike   break
      'The person made the motor bike break.'

The productivity of this construction is restricted by a) transitivity of serial verbs and b) argument structure. In the causative construction, for instance, the causative verb (V1) is a transitive verb that requires two arguments – subject and object. The argument structure makes the object follow V1 immediately and restricts any verbs to fill the slot in the first predicate. The second verb (V2) is required by V1 in the event structure and it follows the object and they are only tightened by semantic dependency between V1 and V2.

Event structure and event sharing

Lovestrand (2021) argues that SVCs require semantic unity of events which is commonly called as 'single event,' that is the tightness of the predicates as single unit. In SVCs, series of verbs tighten up together and form a structure of events. As noticed, dependent serialization in Papuan Malay has two or more verbs in the predicate position, as in the following example:

(42) *Anak*   *itu*   *de=**pi***   **dudu**   **maen**   *kartu*   *di*   *rumah sebla*
      Child   that   3SG=go   sit   play   cart   at   house next
      'The child went to play at the neighbouring house.'

In many literatures, *pi dudu main* 'went to play' is a single event (Aikhenvald, 2006; Lovestrand, 2021). I, however, argue that this series of event is better understood as a multiple event in single semantic unit as the predicate. The multiple event is represented by series of verbs that indicates different activities, but have a unifying semantic expression, in (31). This is indicated by the motion and action verbs in a single semantic unit. This also refers to their semantic relations of all events that thighten them together as a SVC. Thus, I will treat them as 'multiple events in the single semantic unit' in terms of the event structure and event sharing.

The dependent SVC treats 'multiple event' in the form of verb sequence in very rigid and fixed order. The sequence of verbs is structured in a logical order to accommodate a semantic relations of sequence of events in the real world. Let's see an example in (43).

(43) *Tong=**rasa***   ***mo***   ***jalan***   ***pi***   ***bawa***   ***pulang***   *barang-barang tu*
     1PL=feel   want   walk   go   carry   go.home   thing-RED   that
     'We have a desire to bring back (our) things.'

The SVC in (43) structures the multiple events as follows:

DESIRATIVE		DIRECTIVE		ACTIVE	
Psychological verb		*Motion verbs*		*Action verbs*	
rasa	mo	jalan	pi	bawa	pulang

The event structure in (43) meets the logical order of shared events in the real world. It starts with inner-psychological event within the speaker's psychological mood, then acts out to the the real-world events, i.e. motion and action verbs. The semantic relation among events is fixed and rigid so it establishes semantic dependency realized in the fixed order of the verbs, which cannot be mixed up randomly (Sawaki, 2016: 329).

Likewise, the co-dependent SVC also shows a very restricted and rigid structure of events. As described in the productivity feature, the co-dependent SVC only has two verbs linked by the argument structure. The two verbs and the argument structure have structural and semantic dependency as the mono clausal unit. Again, the ideal evidence is the causative construction as in (44).

(44) *Anjing*   *tu*   *de=**bikin***   *tong=**jato***   *deng*   *motor*
     Dog   that   3SG=make   1PL=fall   with   motor.bike
     'The dog made us fall from the motor bike.'

In (44), the event structure shows that the cause event, *bikin* 'make', happens first and it causes the effect event, *jato* 'fall'. This event structure semantically tightens up the cause event and the effect-event together. In addition, the argument structure also plays a significant role in which the cause-event required the subject *anjing* 'dog' as the actor and the object *tong* '1PL' as the patient and the object simultenously functions as the subject/actor of the effect-event. This semantic dependency and argument dependency indicate the causative construction and other similar constructions, i.e benefactives, permissives, resultatives, depictives, as serial verb constructions.

CONCLUSION

Serial Verb Constructions (SVCs) are mono-clausal constructions containing series of verbs in the predicate position. In many world's languages, SVCs vary from one language to another, including Papuan Malay. The study of SVCs in Papuan Malay gives two significant points: 1) the nature of SVCs in Papuan Malay reflects the features of SVCs in a creole language. Note that many creole languages in the world are isolating languages, in which morphology is absent, but they have fascinating syntactic structures, full of complexity and productive in the grammar, 2) SVCs contribute to syntactic theories, especially the treatment of SVCs as whether simple predicates or complex ones. It is also fascinating to study the productivity of verbs in sequence, the argument structure and argument sharing that vary among world's languages (Haspelmath, 2016; Aboh, 2009; Aikhenvald, 2006; Osam, 1997; Foley & Olson, 1984).

In Papuan Malay, SVCs are more productive in the sentential to discourse levels. This study only discusses SVCs in the sentential level. All data base on the sentence elicitation, collecting sentences containing serial verbs. The purpose is to describe SVCs – their basic forms and patterns in the sentential level. This study does not cover SVCs in the discourse level in detail, although in some points, it is described. Therefore, a further study on the discourse level is important, observing the pragmatic motivation of speakers and hearers in using SVCs in expressing ideas, thoughts, and in communicating wider utterances. In a discourse, SVCs are often used to simplify utterances so that speakers do not need to use many sentences.

Another important point of this study is that the semantic analysis of event structures in SVCs gives flexibility of the syntactic system to receive series of verbs and semantic types of verbs. The order of verbs in sequence always correlates to event structure and the correlation features SVCs. This is still excluded from this study. Further study on this topic will enrich the study of SVCs.

Typologically, the study of SVCs in Papuan Malay is interesting if compared to the same constructions in other langauges, especially other Malay varieties in Indonesia. This comparative study bases on two hypothetical argumentations: as Malay-based language, all varieties of Malay might have the similar constructions, and if so, the second point is that the explanation and argumentation of SVCs in Papuan Malay can be applicable for describing such constructions in other Malay varieties and also other Austronesian languages in eastern Indonesia. These hypotheses must need a further typological study with many samples from different Malay varieties and other Austronesian languages in eastern Indonesia.

REFERENCES

Aboh, E. O. (2009). Clause structure and verb series. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40, 1. 1-33.

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2006). Serial verb Constructions in Typological Perspective. Aikhenvald, A. Y and Dixon, R. M. W. (Eds.). *Serial Verb Constructions; A cross linguistic typology*. 1-68. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, A.Y. (2022). On the rise: The expansion of Serial Verb Constructions in Tariana. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, Vol. 65, 2022, 217-231 doi: 10.5842/65-1-975.

Alsina, A., Bresnan, J., and Sells, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Complex Predicates*. Stanford. CSLI Publications.

Amberber, Mengistu, Baker, Brett and Harvey, Mark (Eds.). (2010). *Complex predicates, Cross-linguistic perspectives on event structure.* Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Baker, M. (1989). Object sharing and projections in serial verb constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20. 513-553. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178644.

Blust, R. (1978). Eastern Malayo-Polynesian: A subgrouping argument. S. A. Wurm and Lois Carrington (Eds.). *Second international conference on Austronesian linguistics: proceedings*, 181-254. Canberra. Department of Linguistics, research School of Pacific Studies, Australian national University. https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/253208/1/PL-C61.181.pdf.

Blust, R. (2013). *The Austronesian Languages*. Revised edition. Canberra. Pacific Linguistics. https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/10191/6/Blust-2013-AustronesianLanguages.pdf.

Bowden, J. (2001). *Taba. Description of a South Halmahera language*. Canberra. Pacific Linguistics

Bradshaw, J. (1993). Subject relationships within serial verb constructions in Numbami and Jabem. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 32. 1. 133-161. https://doi.org/10.2307/3623100.

Butt, M. (2010). The light verb jungle: still hacking away. Amberber M., Baker, B., and Harvey, M (Eds.). *Complex Predicates: Cross-linguistic perspectives on event structure*. 48-78. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Collins, C. (1997). Argument sharing in serial verb constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28.3. 461-497. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178987.

Collins, J. T. (1998). Malay, World Language: A Short History. Kuala Lumpur. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1998.

Conroy, J. D. (2013). *The informal Economy in Monsoon Asia and Melanesia: West New Guinea and the Malay World.* Econpapers. Online.

Cowan, H. K. J. (1955). Notes on Windesi grammar. In *Oceania* 26. 42–58.

Croft, W. (2002). Typology and universals. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Dalrymple, M and Mofu, S. (2012). *Dusner* (Languages of the World/Materials 4887). Munich. LINCOM GmbH.

Dalrymple, M. and Mofu, S. (2013). Semantics of number in Biak. *Language & Linguistics in Melanesia* 31,1. 42-55.

Dol, P. (1999). *A grammar of Maybrat. A Language of the Bird's Head, Irian Jaya, Indonesia*. PhD dissertation, University of Leiden.

Donohue, M. (2011). Papuan Malay of New Guinea. Melanesian influence on verb and clause structure. In Claire Lefebvre (ed.). *Creoles, their substrates, and language typology*. (pp. 413-435). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.95.24don.

Donohue, M. & Sawaki, Y. (2007). Papuan Malay pronominals: forms and functions. *Oceanic Linguistics. Vol. 46 (1),* 253-276. DOI: 10.1353/ol.2007.0017.

Durie, M. (1997). Grammatical structures in verb serialization. Alsina A., Bresnan, J., and Sells, P (Eds.). *Complex Predicates*. 289-354. Stanford. CSLI Publications.

Foley, W. A. and Olson, M. (1985). Clausehood and Verb Serialisation. Nichols, J. and Woodbury, A. C. (Eds.). *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause*. 17-60. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Foley, W. (2008). The notion of 'event' and serial verb constructions: arguments from New Guinea. In Wilaiwan Khanittanan and Paul Sidwell (Eds.), *SEALS XIV: Papers from the 14th Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 2004, (pp. 129-155). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Foley, W. A. (2010). Event and serial verb constructions. Amberber, Mengistu, Baker, Brett and Harvey, Mark. *Complex Predicates: Cross-linguistic Perspectives on Event Structure*.79-109.

Gasser, E. A. (2014). *Windesi Wamesa Morphophonology*. A doctoral dissertation. New Heaven. Yale University.

Gasser, E. A. (2015). The development of verbal infixation in Cenderawasih Bay. Ross, Malcolm and Arka, I Wayan (Eds.). *Language change in Austronesian languages*: Papers from 12-ICAL, 3. 1-17. Canberra. Pacific Linguistics.

Haga, A. (1884). Nederlandsch Nieuw Guinea en de Papoesche Eilanden; Historiche bijdrage, ±1500-1883. Batavia: W. Bruining,'s-Hage: Martinus Nijhoff.

Haspelmath, M. (2015). *The serial verb construction: comparative concept and cross-linguistic generalizations*. Drafted paper. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig & Leipzig University.

Hijriati, S. (2018). Serial verb constructions in Sasak language of Meno-Mene dialect: a typology and LFG approach. *Jurnal Solid ASM Mataram* Vol. 8 (2) 2018. 54-61. DOI: http://doi.org/10.35200/solid.v8i2.193.

Himmelmann, N. (1998). Documentary and descriptive linguistics. *Linguistics* 36 (1998). 161-195.

Himmelmann, N. (2005). The Austronesian languages of Asian and Madagascar: typological characteristics. Adelaar, Alexander and Himmelmann, Nikolaus (Eds.). *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*. 110-173. Great Britain. Taylor and Francis Ltd.

Indrawati, Ni Luh K. M, dkk. (2012). Serial verb constructions in Balinese (syntactic and semantic analysis). *E-journal of linguistics* Vol 6 (1) 2012. 1-12. https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/eol/article/view/4630.

Indrawati, Ni Luh K. M, dkk. (2018). Serial verb constructions in Sikkanese. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* Vol. 9 (2). 790-797. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0904.16

Karubaba, S. (2008). *Ambai inflectional and derivational morphology*. A Master Thesis. Leiden. University of Leiden.

Karubuy, T. (2011). *Verbal morphology in Wamesa language with reference to Windesi*. Undergraduate thesis. Manokwari. Universitas Negeri Papua.

Klamer, M. (2002). Typical features of Austronesian languages in Central/Eastern Indonesia. *Oceanic Linguistics* 41.2. 363–383.

Kluge, A. (2014). *A grammar of Papuan Malay*. Ph.D. thesis, Universiteit Leiden.

Lane, J. (2007). *Kalam serial verb constructions*. Canberra. Pacific Languistics.

Litamahuputty, B. (2012). A description of Ternate Malay. *Wacana* Vol. 14 (2). 333-369.

Lovestrand, J. (2021). Serial verb constructions. *The Annual Review of Linguistics*, Volume 7 © by Annual Reviews. http://www.annualreviews.org. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-031920-115317.

Moeljadi, D. & Viola O. (2017). *Serial verb constructions in Indonesian: an HPSG analysis and its computational implementation*. A paper presented at Chulalongkorn International student symposium on Southeast Asia linguistics. Chulalongkorn University. 9 June 2017.

Mofu, S. S. (2005). *Biak Morphosyntax*. A Master thesis. Oxford. University of Oxford.

Mohanan, T. (1997). Multidimensionality of representation: NV complex predicates in Hindi. Alsina, A., Bresnan, J., and Sells, P. (Eds.). *Complex predicates*. 431-471. Stanford. CSLI Publications.

Moro, F. R. (2016). *Dynamics of Ambon Malay: Comparing Ambon and the Netherlands*. A doctoral thesis. Radboud Universiteit. Nijmegen. http://www.lotpublications.nl/Documents/422_fulltext.pdf.

Osam, E. K. (1997). Serial verbs and grammatical relations in Akan. Givón, T (Ed.). *Grammatical Relations. A Functionalist Perspective*. 253-280. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.35.07osa.

Payne, T. E. (1997). *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Paauw, S. H. 2008. *The Malay contact variaties of Eastern Indonesia: a typological comparison*. A Doctoral dissertation. The State University of New York. Buffalo.

Saggers, N. (1979). *A sketch grammar of Wandamen*. Master's thesis.

Sawaki, Y. (2004). *Some morpho-syntax notes on Melayu Papua*. An Unpublished paper. Manokwari. State University of Papua.

Sawaki, Y. and Karubaba, S. (2012). *Where do person/number marking and inclusory pronominals in Papuan Malay come from?* A paper presented at ICAL 12, 4-8 July, 2012. Denpasar. Bali.

Sawaki, Yusuf. (2016). *A grammar of Wooi, an Austronesian language of Yapen Island, Western New Guinea*. A PhD thesis. Canberra. Australian National University. https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/136851/1/Sawaki%20Thesis%202017.pdf.

Sawaki, Y. (2018). *When Malay became Papuan Malay*. An unpublished paper. Manokwari. University of Papua.

Senft, G.. (Ed.). (2008). *Serial verb constructions in Austronesian and Papuan languages*. Canberra. Pacific Linguistics. https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/146747/1/594_Senft.pdf.

Shibatani, M., (2015). Linguistic Typology. In: James D. Wright (editor-in-chief), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edition, Vol 14. Oxford: Elsevier. pp. 208–214.

Silzer, P. J. (1983). *Ambai: an Austronesian language of Irian Jaya, Indonesia*. A doctoral thesis. Canberra. ANU.

Soeparno. (1983). *Morfologi-sintaksi bahasa Biak: laporan penelitian*. Jakarta. Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Sperlich, W.B. (1993). Serial verb constructions in Namakir of Central Vanuatu. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 32. 1. 95-110. https://doi.org/10.2307/3623098.

Steinhauer, H. (2005). Biak. In K.A. Adelaar and N.P. Himmelmann (Eds.). *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*. 793-823. London. Routledge/Curzon.

Svenonius, P. (2008). Complex predicates and the functional sequence. Peter Svenonius & Inna Tolskaya (Eds.). *Troms Working Papers on Language and Linguistics: Nordlyd* 35, special issue on complex predication. 47-88. https://doi.org/10.7557/12.137

Syifa, R. D. & Subiyanto, A. (2022). Konstruksi relasi semantik verba serial dalam bahasa Kedang. Widayparwa Vol. 50 (1) 2022. 24-35. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26499/wdprw.v50i1.899.

Tursinaliyevna, J. Z. (2021). Descriptive and comparative linguistics. *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research (IJAPR)*, Vol. 5 (4). 5-6. www.ijeais.org/ijapr.

Unterladstetter, V. (2020). *Multi-verb constructions in Eastern Indonesia* (Studies in Diversity Linguistics 28). Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.3546018.

Van Staden, Miriam and Reesink, G.P. (2008). Serial verb constructions in a linguistic area. Gunter Senft (Ed.). *Serial Verb Constructions in Austronesian and Papuan Languages*. 17-54. Canberra. Pacific Linguistics. https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/146747/1/594_Senft.pdf.

Van den Heuvel, W. (2006). *Biak: Description of an Austronesian language of Papua*. Ph.D. thesis, Amsterdam. Vrije Universiteit. https://www.lotpublications.nl/Documents/138_fulltext.pdf.

Vaidya, Ashwini, & Eva W. (2020). Productivity and argument sharing in Hindi light verb constructions. *JSAL* Vol. 11, Issue 3 (2020). https://ojs.ub.uni-konstanz.de/jsal/index.php/jsal/article/view/140.