2.0 Introduction

In this chapter, we would be focusing on three closely related types of constructions that come under the Multi Verb Constructions (MVC) in Malayalam. Before we begin our discussion, an explanation of the nomenclature followed in this study is in order.

In our discourse, the term MVC covers only the Malayalam constructions that have a Verb-Verb pattern. In the general theoretical parlance, the notation MVC stands for a larger set of constructions which includes any construction that has multiple instances of verbs or verbal elements. But we will adopt a different categorization under the same naming. In other words, though we call what we analyze here multi-verb constructions, it does not cover all the constructions with multiple verbs. But in our terminology, the term MVC refers to what would, in general terminology be, called V-VC. The deviation from general terminology followed in the field is in view of the complicated classification we may have to do as the study progresses through its sections and examples.

All the constructions that we are going to analyze in this chapter are MVCs of the V-VC pattern. As we are going to see in the discussions coming forth, the Malayalam MVC is identified as having three major sub-categories under it: the Non-contiguous constructions, the Intervened constructions, and the Contiguous
constructions. These constructions show resemblance to three generally identified constructions that are often considered closely related, the Consecutive Constructions (ConC), Covert Coordinations (CC) and Serial Verb Constructions (SVC).

Prima facie, Non-contiguous constructions are sequential verb constructions made up of two or more verbs which together represent a single-event with a successive or simultaneous sub-event specification. Intervened constructions will have an overt object associated with each verb and that intervenes the consecutive sequence of the multiple verbs, and hence the name. The constituent verbs in this type of construction appear to be coordinated covertly, usually a conjunction type coordination and together they constitute a single-event reading. Contiguous constructions, on the other hand, comprise a compound of verbs constituting a single clause, construing a single event. In all these types, the whole construction bears the same value for tense/aspect/modality and many other grammatical modifications, but varies with respect to their interaction with polarity marking.

If all these are single event constructions, it is not very surprising that these constructions may share some of the properties that have been identified for single event constructions such as SVCs, across the languages.

However, what is interesting is that, in anticipation, these constructions do not share all those features of a single-event construction. There lies the subtle difference between the three types of single-event Multi Verb Constructions of Malayalam. That means these are not easily classified into SVC and non-SVC types of the MVC. This very point makes the study of this phenomenon in Malayalam interesting. We will look at these constructions in detail in the coming sections.
The chapter is divided into five sections, starting from the introduction in (§ 2.0). The second section (§ 2.1) through its two sub-sections gives a brief outline of the Malayalam language, history of the Malayalam linguistic tradition and some basic linguistic facts about Malayalam. The third section (§ 2.2) gives a description of the Malayalam verb phrase and sets the stage for discussion on the main topic. The fourth section (§ 2.3) through its five sub-sections covers the main point of this chapter, the multi-verb construction in Malayalam. The fifth section (§ 2.4) concludes the discussion.

2.1 The Malayalam language

Malayalam is one of the twenty-six scheduled languages of India, and it is respected as one of the few classical languages of the country, too. It is the official language in the state of Kerala and in the union territories of Lakshadweep and Puducherry. A formal literary variety and a multiplicity of colloquial varieties form the linguistic vastness for the 34.8 million plus people.

Different views are held with respect to the origin of the Malayalam language. Some linguists and historians hold the view that it derived from the Proto-Dravidian, a common original language of the Dravidian languages. It is also considered as having developed as a western dialect of Sen-Tamil in the 6th century (cf. Ezhuthachan 1975), while another prominent view is that the language is split-formed from Sanskrit, which would date further back in time than the Sen-Tamil origin date. Generally, it is accepted that Malayalam belongs to the Dravidian family of languages.
2.1.0 Linguistic tradition in Malayalam

There are two prominent linguistic traditions in Malayalam, the one that mainly follows the Indian (Sanskrit) tradition of grammatical analysis and the one that follows the Western traditions. Most of the Western accounts of Malayalam grammar were either for missionary or for the colonial purposes. European missionaries like Arnos Padiri, Dr Anjelos Francis et. al. had done some considerable work in the field, though it was meant for helping the Western missionaries out in the new land. Robert Drumond's (1749) *Grammar of Malabar Language*, F. Spring's (1839) *Outlines of a Grammar of the Malayalam Language*, Rev. Joseph Peet's (1860) *A Grammar of the Malayalam Language*, etc. are examples for this.

As the descriptive grammarians of old insisted on Sanskrit as the model grammar for Malayalam (including many other languages), there was hardly any linguistic study done specifically on Malayalam in the early periods. *Lilathilakam*, written in the fourteenth century (by an anonymous author) could be the earliest grammatical account of Malayalam though it properly cannot be called an account on the grammar of Malayalam (Ezhuthachan 1975:2). After *Lilathilakam*, there was a gap of centuries before a proper grammatical account of Malayalam appeared. Since the middle of the nineteenth century, some accounts on Malayalam grammar like that of Dr Gundert's *Malayalabhaasha vyaakaranam*, Rev. George Mathan's *Malayalamayute Vyaakaranam*, Paachu Moottatu's *Keralabhashayute vyaakaranam*, Kovunni Nedungadi's *Kerala kaumudi* came out. Among these, *Lilathilakam*, *Kerala Kaumudi* (Kovunni Nedungadi), *Vyaakaranamitram* (Sheshagiri Prabhu), *Keralapaniniyam* (A.R.Rajaraja Varma) etc. would be considered following the Indian (Sanskrit) tradition of linguistics while *Malayalabhasa Vyaakaranam* (Gundert),
Malayaalamayute Vyaakaranam (Rev. George Mathan), A Grammar of the Malayalim Language (Joseph Peet), A Progressive Grammar of Malayalam for Europeans (L. J. Frohnmeyer) etc. can be considered done in a Western tradition of linguistics.

Among these, A.R. Rajaraja Varma's was a groundbreaking work in the field. Sheshagiri Prabhu's and M. Krishnan's combined work (1904) Vyaakaranamitram was another substantial contribution to the field of early Malayalam linguistics. By the twentieth century, the field of Malayalam linguistics was dominated by three works; A. R. Rajaraja Varma's Keralapaniniyam, Kovunni Nedungadi's Kerala Kaumudi, and Sheshagiri Prabhu's Vyaakaranamitram. Of these, Keralapaaniniyam overshadowed all other works on Malayalam Grammar. (Ezhuthachan 1975:5).

2.1.1 Basic linguistic facts about the Malayalam language

Geographically, Malayalam is spoken mainly at the South-West coastal region of India. It has neighbours like Tamil in the South-East, Kannada in the North-East, and Tulu, further North. While the whole of West is the Arabian Sea. This very geography has helped Kerala to enrich its linguistic vastness, especially through the sea trade it has maintained since the BCs, with foreign countries with languages like Arabic, Portuguese, Dutch etc. It has a lot of borrowings from geographically nearer languages like Sanskrit, Tamil, Kannada, Urdu, and Tulu, too.

The writing system is called 'koleluttu' (Rod Script) and is believed to have been developed in the 13th century, from the Grantha script, which itself derived from the Brahmi script. Malayalam has 54 characters of which 18 are vowels. The consonant characters have an inherent vowel sound /a/ in the script. In writing,
diacritics can appear above, below, before or after the consonant, indicating suppression of the inherent vowel and a change to another vowel.

Malayalam is a head-final language with an agglutinative morphology. Like other Dravidian languages, it has an SVO word order. It uses the Nominative-Accusative case marking system with five cases; nominative, accusative, genitive, dative, locative. Grammatical values of tense/aspect, mood, and polarity are shown on the verb in the form of inflections on the root word. But not all grammatical categories are overtly marked. For instance, the verbs are generally analysed to be not showing any formative elements of agreement (person, number or gender) on them. Gender is marked only on the third person singular pronoun. Therefore, it is said the pronominal system has natural gender in Malayalam. Non-humans are marked neuter gender while human masculine/feminine distinction is made according to sex. Other than affixation, the Malayalam verb may show syntactic property change as a result of what may be called lexical re-analysis or grammaticalization. Many verbs in Malayalam, like in many other languages, follow a general grammaticalization cline like the one given below (Ota Ogie (2009)\(^1\)).

\[
\text{Full verb} > \text{(Light verb)} > \text{Auxiliary} > \text{Clitic} > \text{Affix}
\]

Verbs in Malayalam take suffixes and postpositions. The traditional view is that, in the formation of verbs, "before suffixes are added to the roots, changes are effected in the latter by adding some particles which are called \textit{vikaranas}. They have no independent meaning. Roots with the \textit{vikaranas} become 'theme' to which the tense

\(^1\) This is a revised grammaticalization cline given in Ota Ogie by combining the Hopper and Traugott (1993) proposal of grammaticalization cline and Butt and Geuder's (2001) argument to exclude light verbs from the cline since they bear a polysemy relationship with their full verb counterparts and exhibit differences in formal behaviour from auxiliaries.
or number suffixes are added" (cf. Ezhuthachan 1975:200). In other words, a typical verb will have a verb-stem and a grammatical suffix gets added to it. Unlike other Dravidian languages, a finite verb in Malayalam is inflected only for tense/aspect, and not for person, number, and gender.

2.2 The Malayalam Verb

The verb phrase of Malayalam consists of a main verbal element, coming as the right-most element in the phrase, which may or may not be preceded by other verbal elements in the form of simple verbs or verb phrases. The verb can be inflected for grammatical category (tense, aspect, mood, polarity) marking, causativization and nominalization.

(1) avan oru kadha paRanj.u
    he one story say-Past
    'He narrated a story'

The root of the verb in the above construction is \textit{paRay}. Some of its different incarnations are,

(2) Malayalam verb forms

a. \textbf{Infinitive}
   
   paRay.uka
   say.Inf
   'Saying'

b. \textbf{Past}
   
   paRanj.u
   say-Past
   'Said'
We would not attempt a detailed account of the verbal system of Malayalam here. There are different plains such as syntax, semantics, morphology, along which verbs can be classified into categories. Since our focus is on one particular type of

2. For instance, Auxiliary verbs, though are derived from lexical verbs, do not function as regular verbs. They are generally used with some functional role such as verbal modifier, vector verb etc., Though they have a full lexical past, diachronically, they carry little of their original meaning. Since their functions are quite different from that of the verbal categories discussed above, we will not consider them in this study.

3. Semantically, Malayalam verbs can be classified into two major classes: Lexical and Functional, where lexical verbs denote specific events and hence they have specific meaning. Functional verbs are verbs used as 'dummy' verb and 'be' verb (aak) in cleft constructions and copular constructions. It
verb construction in this study, we would take a path that would go directly into our point of discussion.

As we said, the Malayalam VP consists of a main verb and, optionally, one or more sub-verbs. It is noted in Malayalam linguistics that these two verbs have differences between them though both come under the general verbal category. Keralapaniniyam identifies these two as two types of verbs of Malayalam, in Rajaraja Varma's terms "muTTuviNa" and "paTTuviNa", meaning "full-fledged" and "dependent" respectively. The former roughly corresponds to 'finite verb' forms and the latter to 'participial verb' form. The "paTTuviNa" is further divided into "vinayeccaam" and "peerecccam", meaning "verbal dependent" and "nominal dependent", respectively. To consider example; the verb root var 'come' has the following forms,

(3) Verb forms in Malayalam (Athialy1987:40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>vannu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Past</td>
<td>varunnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>varum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carrries no lexical meaning of its own. This can be further classified into Processive (eventive) (ooTì, kiTTì) and Stative (unTì, veeNam). The Processive verbs are further divided into two categories; those which can take an agent (ooT 'run', kaan 'see') and those which cannot take an agent ( kiTT 'get' viSak 'be hungry'). Stative verbs take Dative subjects while Processive verbs take Nominative subjects. For another classification, Keralapaniniyam (also) divides verbs into two categories; Simple and Causative. Ordinarily, the verb will have a simple stem and the the causative form of verb will have an additional -kku, but there are instances where the verb will have a causative form (like naTakkuka) but not the causative meaning. This type of verbs are called kaaritaas (with causative form but not with meaning) others akaaritaas (Similar to Gundert's 'strong and weak forms) (cf. Ezhuthachan 1975:39).
b. Non-finite (Participial):

Verbal dependent – \textit{vannə}  
Nominal dependent - \textit{vanna}

The finite verb can come in three different forms\textsuperscript{4}. Generally, the main verb of the sentence comes out in this form. Therefore, in a Multi Verbal Construction, only the main verb will be finite and hence full-fledged. When there are more than one verb in a phrase, the verbs other than the main verb come in non-finite form. Based on their dependency nature, they will show up in either of the two forms listed above.

Let us look at the non-finite verb forms a bit in detail. There are two types of non-finite verb forms. One is verb dependent (\textit{vinayecam}) and the other is noun dependent (\textit{peereccam}). Of these, the verbal dependent forms occur as part of the verb phrase and nominal dependent forms occur as part of the noun phrase, under the main-verb phrase. Rajaraja Varma further divides the non-finite verbal dependent verb forms (\textit{vinayeccam}) into five types. These five types cover the whole of morphological forms of a non-finite verbal segment in the language. They can be listed as below;

(4) Verb-dependent non-finite verbal forms (Athialy1987:41)

\begin{tabular}{ll}
  \textit{mun} & "Prior" \\
  \textit{pin} & "Anticipatory" \\
  \textit{tan} & "Contemporaneous" \\
  \textit{naTu} & "Infinitival" \\
  \textit{padikam} & "Conditional"
\end{tabular}

The Prior form is always closely related to the Past tense form. In Malayalam, Past tense is expressed in two ways, morphologically. The verb in Past tense form

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{varaam/varaNam} also comes in this group under the title Modals, though they are not referred to in Athialy 1987.
ends either in -u or in -i. For the -u type Past verbs, the Prior form is obtained by replacing the -u with -ə as in (5a) below. The -i type, generally, retains the vowel, or sometimes is reduced to null as in (5b) below.

(5) Prior form

a. \( \text{kaTicc}u \rightarrow \text{kaTicc}ə \)
b. \( \text{poTTi} \rightarrow \text{poTTi} \)

Except the Prior form, all other forms are obtained by adding a suffix to either the root form of the verb or to the Prior form. All these additions are done with appropriate sandhi modifications. Anticipatory form (pin) is obtained by adding a suffix -aan to the verbal base. When used in a verbal segment along with other verbal elements, Anticipatory form generally conveys a meaning of 'intention' as in \( \text{kaaN-aan cennu} \) 'reached to see'. The Contemporaneous form (tan) is obtained by adding a suffix -umbooL to the verbal base as in \( \text{nil-kk-umbooL} \) "While standing"5. The Infinitival form (naTu) is obtained by adding a suffix -uka to the verbal base, as in \( \text{nil-kk-uka} \) "to stand". The last form, Conditional form (paad'sikam) is obtained by adding -aal, interestingly not to the verbal base but to the Prior form of the verb, with appropriate sandhi modifications as in \( \text{nil} \rightarrow \text{ninnə} \rightarrow \text{ninn-aal} \) "If stand"6.

As we said, Malayalam can have multiple verbal elements in a single verb construction. In such cases, generally, the verbs will be divided, functionally, into 'main' and 'sub' types. The main verb will be the right-most element in the verb phrase. The sub-verbs will precede it. Verb phrases that precede the main verbal element have to be connected to the latter through any of the syntactic association

5. This seems to be a connector between two clauses to imply a meaning that "while event of clause one was happening, event of clause two happened or will happen"
6. Conditional forms can be made using the conditional conjunction, -enkIL also.
such as coordination, subordination etc. whereas simple verbal elements that precede the main verbal element can stand freely or be associated syntactically. There is no theoretical limitation on the number of verbal elements a verb phrase can have in it. The main verbal element can be finite or non-finite, but the other elements in the phrase have to be invariably non-finite, where finiteness is not associated with tense marking. In constructions with multiple verbs, the verbal elements that precede the main verb will be in their "Prior" form, organized syntactically in the order of sequence of events indicated by each of them. It is identified that, semantically, the verbs in "Prior" form indicate either an event prior to what is denoted by the next verbal element, or the manner in which the event denoted by the next verbal element took place (cf. Athialy 1975:42). Therefore, it can safely be assumed that the constructions in which the verbs other than the main verb are in Prior form are instances of multi-verb construction like SVC. Let us look at these constructions in detail.

2.3 Multi Verb Constructions in Malayalam: Properties

With the varying inflected or grammaticalized forms, Malayalam verbs constitute verb phrases with one or more than one verb. VP constructions where a sequence of juxtaposed VPs occurs in a simple sentence is attested in many languages across the world (cf. Chapter 1). In such constructions, two or more elements (verbs) jointly represent the predicate of a single clause. The term generally used for such constructions is Multi Verb Constructions (MVC). I would assume (along the lines of Shibatani (2009), among others) that MVCs come as a category of constructions under complex predicates. Justifying that assumption, we would consider a working definition that an MVC is a series of related verb phrases with or without any marker
of syntactic dependency (subordination, co-ordination etc.) and shared argument. This will keep away complex predicate constructions in which each constituent element is not a verb. For instance, constructions such as verb plus nominal element, verb plus particle etc. will be excluded from MVC. On the other hand, based on this definition, constructions like Consecutive Constructions (ConC), Covert Coordination (CC), Serial Verb Constructions (SVC) etc., which are actually manifestations of different basic types of constructions such as $V+$Modifier, $V(P)+V(P)$, $V+$Mood, $V+$infinitival complement etc. would be included among MVC.

Despite abundant documentation and discussion, universally, MVCs still stand short of a unified typological description or structural definition. In this chapter, we will analyze the Multi Verb Constructions in Malayalam in terms of its properties and features. As we said in the previous chapter, it is not reasonable to expect all the features that MVC exhibits in a particular language to appear in another language too, especially when the languages are totally different. Since this is the scenario, in our take on Malayalam MVCs, we will be looking at the data and will be defining the nature of MVC in Malayalam based on that. Nevertheless, we will be using some widely attested characteristic properties of the constructions as a touchstone in our evaluation of Malayalam data.

Constructions that fall under MVC in Malayalam can vary along different lines. They differ in the number of verbs, the morphological distribution of verbs, nature of particular verbs, eventuality, et cetera. Let us look at these points with examples.
2.3.0 **Number of verbs**

Though there is no upper limit, there is a minimum number when it comes to the number of verbs a Multi Verb Construction has to have. An MVC has to have a minimum of two verbs, and it can take more than two also, as shown in (6-9).

(6) avaL ooTi oLiccə
   She run-Compl hide-Past
   'She hid quickly'

(7) raaju raadhaye vaTi eTuthθə aTiccə
   Raju radha stick take-Compl beat-Past
   'Raju beat Radha with/taking a stick'

(8) avaL veedana kaTiccə-piTiccə ninnu
   She pain bite-hold-Compl stand-Past
   'She suffered the pain'

(9) paathram nilathθə viiNə poTTi-ccithaRi-ppooyi
   vessel ground fall break-piece-go-Past
   'Vessel fell on ground broke into pieces'

The difference in the number of verbs does not necessarily classify the construction into different categories. What constitutes the difference between constructions within the MVC paradigm is the nature of verbs involved, the manner of distribution of the verbs involved, and the kind of eventuality they constitute etc. Let us look at these properties of MVC in Malayalam.

2.3.1 **Nature of verbs**

A prominent feature of MVC is that the verbs participating in the construction can be of different nature depending on the nature of particular verbs involved. Some of them can have a main-event verb and a verb describing the manner in which the
main event was carried out, as shown in example (10). Some constructions can take a light verb, usually as V2\textsuperscript{7}, as shown in example (11). Another category is the instrument verbs, where verbs with lexical meaning get grammaticalized into postpositional or instrument/comitative meanings, as shown in (12). Some of them can be resultative/consequential as shown in (14) etc. Let us look at them in examples.

(10) Nature:Manner

a. vimaanam kappalil paRann(ə)-iRangi
   aeroplane ship on fly-get down-Past
   'Aeroplane landed on ship'

b. pailattə vimaanaththil ninnə caaTi (y)-iRangi
   pilot aeroplane in from jump-get down-Past
   'Pilot jumped down the plane'

Here, the verbs paRannə 'fly' and caaTı 'jump' are verbs that show the manner in which iRangi 'got down' was carried out. Therefore, these two verbs have to be considered 'manner verbs' that describe the manner in which the event described by the other verb was carried out. It may be noted that this scenario divides the verbs of the construction into two types. The verb which represents the event/action as 'main/head' verb and the verb/s that describe the way the event denoted by the main/head verb as 'manner' verbs. The main verb, generally, comes as the last verb in the sequence (since Malayalam is a head-final language) and bears the tense/aspect, mood and polarity inflection. If these constructions are called SVCs, then they may be called properly as 'manner SVCs'.

Light verbs are, usually, verbs that have undergone grammaticalization or lexical re-analysis. They do not function in their full lexical capacity, a role they carry

---

\textsuperscript{7} The numerical value along with the 'V' is its ordinal value showing its morphological position in the series of the verbs when counted from left to right.
out in their independent contexts of appearance. Instead, they add some shades of meaning to the predication in the form of directionality, addition of an argument or sometimes, they introduce an applicative meaning to the construction. Let us look at some examples for what appears to be instances of light verb constructions in Malayalam.

(11) Nature: light verb

a. pooliis kuttavaaLiye kooTathikkǝ viTTǝ-koTuththu
   police accused court leave-give-Past
   'Police gave the accused to the court'

b. pooliis aayudhangaL piTcc-eTǝththu
   police weapons hold-take-Past
   'Police seized the weapons'

c. oru moothiram kaLanju-kiTTi
   one ring lost-got-Past
   'A ring was found lost'

d. oru moothiram kaLanju-pooyi
   one ring lost-go-Past
   'A ring was got lost'

In the above constructions, the second verbs (V2) seem to be not functioning in their full lexical meaning. In other words, they are not contributing much to the meaning of the construction, compared to the contribution of the other verb. They are, on a superficial observation, conveying the directionality of change of possession. For instance, in the first example, the presence of koTuththu 'give' as the light verb indicates a loss of possession whereas in the second example, the light verb eTǝththu 'take' indicates a gain of possession. In a similar way, in the third and fourth examples, the presence of light verbs kiTTi 'got' and pooyi 'go' indicates a sense of gain and loss.
of possession, respectively.

But, here there is a contradiction with what we have discussed in the section above this. We had observed that, of the main and sub-verbs, the main verb comes right most since the language is head-final. In these constructions, the right most verb is a light verb, and there is no action/event of a kind the verb represents independently. Instead, the final light verb stands for a directionality or applicative purpose. This demands a re-analysis of our earlier observation.

The verbs of an MVC can appear in other forms such as the following.

(12) Nature: Instrument
a. raaju appam kaththi koNTǝ muRiccu
   Raju bread knife bear-Compl cut-Past
   'Raju cut the bread with knife'

b. raaju appam kaththi vaccǝ muRiccu
   Raju bread knife place-Compl cut-Past
   'Raju cut the bread with knife'

c. raaju appam kaththi eTuthθǝ muRiccu
   Raju bread knife take-Compl cut-Past
   'Raju cut the bread with knife'

In the three examples above, three different words with proper lexical meaning are functioning as instrument marking verbs. The word koNTǝ has a lexical meaning 'bear/ got (hit)', as in (13a) below. The word vaccǝ of the second example has a meaning 'place' lexically, and the word eTuthθǝ of the third example has a meaning 'take' in its normal lexical environments, as shown in examples (13 b-c) below.
Light verbs versus lexical verbs

a. aanakkǝ veTi koNTu
   elephant bullet fire get hit-Past
   'Elephant got hit by a bullet'

b. kuTTi pusthakam meeshayil vaccu
   child book table-on place-Past
   'Child kept/placed the book on the table'

c. kuTTi pusthakam eTuththu
   child book take-Past
   'Child took the book'

Therefore, it is tempting to assume that these verbs have undergone grammaticalization; in (12) they appear in their grammaticalized form, standing for a postposition or marking an instrument.

Another type of multi verb construction is the resultative or consequential constructions. Here, one of the verbs indicates a resultant state-of-affairs or a consequence.

Nature: Resultative/consquential

a. raaju paambine aTiccǝkonnu
   Raju snake-Acc hit-kill-Past
   'Raju killed the snake'

b. paathram viiNǝpoTTi
   vessel fall-break-Past
   'Vessel broke by falling'

In these constructions, though one of the two verbs will be a result of the other verb, together they constitute single eventuality of a resultative or consequential nature.

As we saw in the above sub-sections, the nature of verbs involved in the
construction is classifying the construction into specific types. The instrumental role of verbs makes an instrumental verb construction, the resultative nature of verbs makes a resultative verb construction and so on. Another plain where the constructions under MVC differ is with respect to the distribution of the verbs, morphologically. Let us look at that feature.

2.3.2 Morphological distribution of the verbs

The verbs in a Multi Verb Construction of the form Verb-Verb Construction (V-VC) can come, generally, in three different morphological formats; Non-contiguous, Contiguous and Intervened. In the Non-contiguous, the constituent verbs can come as a sequence of independently standing verbs. In the Contiguous type, the constituent verbs can be morphologically compound, and in the Intervened type of MVC, the constituent verbs can come with objects/arguments intervening them.

2.3.2.0 Non-contiguous MVC

In non-contiguous type, the constituent verbs appear as a sequence of closely related verbs. The verbs may be separated morphologically with a space or phonologically with a rhythmic tone, pause or absence of gemination.

(15) Non-contiguous

a. naaya ente cherippə kaTiCcə muRiccə kaLanju
dog my chappals bite-Compl cut-Compl lose-Past
'Dog left my chappals bite-torn'

b. kuTTi cooRə cavaccə araccə iRakki
child rice tooth-Compl crush-Compl swallow-Past
'child swallowed (the) food tooth-crushed'
2.3.2.1 **Intervened MVC**

Another verb distribution pattern under MVC is the Intervened type of constructions.

(16) Intervened

a. raaju kaththi eTəththə appam muRiccu  
Raju knife take-Compl bread cut-Past  
'Raju cut the bread taking a knife'

b. kuTTi peena eTuththə cithRam varaccu  
child pen take-Compl picture-Acc draw-Past  
'Taking a pen, child drew a picture'

In this type of constructions, the sequence of verbs is intervened by elements such as objects, adverbs etc.

2.3.2.2 **Contiguous MVC**

The third type of MVC is the one in which the sequence of verbs appears contiguous to each other. Here the verbs are morphologically attached to each other.

(17) Contiguous

a. raajaavə ayalraajyam piTic-eTuththu  
king neighbouring country hold-take-Past  
'The king conquered the neighbouring country'

b. kukkaR SabdaththooTe poTTi-ththeRiccu  
cooker sound with break-throw off-Past  
'Cooker burst loudly'

As we saw in the above sections, there are three different patterns of verbal morphology coming under MVC. In our discussion of the constructions, we will consider these three as the three closely related types of constructions that come under
MVC. We will develop our observation and analyses keeping these types as the center point.

A level at which these constructions share their properties so that they come under the common category of MVC and at the same time differ from each other is the event semantics. There are clear similarities and subtle differences between the eventualities indicated by these constructions. Hence, it will be crucial in our analysis of Malayalam data of this type that we identify the event-patterns these constructions show.

2.3.3 Eventuality in Multi Verb Constructions

A simple verb phrase may have a structure where one verb constitutes one predicate representing one event. When there are more verbs than one, it may be for the purpose of representing multiple events, or a single composite event comprising sub-events, or to induce an idiomatic meaning. Dechaine (1993), Manfredi (2005) etc. identify two kinds of serialization in MVC; multi-event serialization and single-event serialization. Of the three categories of MVC, ConC and CC, come under multi-event serialization while SVC comes under single-event serialization (Ogie 2009:338).

Wechsler (2003:6-7) introduces three types of interpretations for eventuality-patterns of MVC; Serial interpretation, Goal interpretation and Coextensive interpretation. Serial interpretation gives a reading where one event is followed by another event, serially. This will have an "and then" meaning though it is not an instance of covert coordination. It can be viewed as a concatenation of two events in time. Goal interpretation gives an end point for the first event. In other words, this
will have a transition from the first event to another state or event which will mark the culmination of the first event. In Coextensive interpretation, the multiple events are viewed as sharing the same temporal trace. Pustejovsky (1995) has a similar view. He introduces a sub-eventual approach to the analysis of multi-event constructions. The relation between the main event and its sub-parts consist an ordered relationship between the sub-events. He has identified three different ordering in this relationship. One, Partial order relation, where the first event \((e^1)\) and the second event \((e^2)\) are being the sub events of the main event \((E)\), \(e^1\) is exhaustively and temporally ordered before \(e^2\), in sequentiality. Two, Overlap relation where \(e^1\) and \(e^2\) occur simultaneously, sharing the same temporality. And three, Ordered overlap relation, where \(e^1\) starts before \(e^2\), but both end simultaneously. Ogie (2009:201) relates the above two perspectives (Wechsler (2003) and Pustejovsky (1995)) in which the Serial interpretation corresponds to Partial order relation, Goal interpretation corresponds to Ordered overlap relation and Coextensive interpretation corresponds to Overlap relations.

To summarize, a multi-event V-VC is represented as an event \(E\) containing two sub-events \(e^1\) and \(e^2\), where the two are distinct subevents of an event \(E\) and the relation between them can be of three types. Type one, the first event can temporally precede the second. Type two, the first event can begin temporally before the second and culminate along with the second event. And type three, the two events begin and end together. In other words, of the three types, a sequentiality is apparent between the sub-events of two types (first two), while such a sequentiality is not available in one type (last type). Eventualities, where the sequentiality of sub-events are available, can be called *heterogeneous* eventuality whereas those where the sequentiality is not
apparent can be called *homogeneous* eventualities. An eventuality is homogeneous if there is no difference between a proper part and the entire eventuality. In this type, the eventuality holds at a time value \( t_1 \ldots n \), and at any sub-interval of this time value, the eventuality still holds. In heterogeneous eventualities, the eventuality holds at a time value, but the sub parts are not the same as the whole though it is perceived as a single event in total (Ogie 2009:141).

It has been observed in Malayalam that the "Prior" form (cf. § 2.2) semantically indicates the events happened before the main verb or it stands for a modification (manner) in which the event described by the main verb was executed. In other words, when there are different sub-events, the verbs are separated sequentially, where the sequential order represents the temporal ordering of the sub-events. We will conclude the discussion on eventualities of MVC here, in the forthcoming sections we may discuss Malayalam examples for these points. Let us move onto the discussion on MVC.

### 2.3.3.0 Eventuality in Malayalam MVC

We have identified three types of constructions under MVC in Malayalam, the Non-contiguous, the Intervened and the Contiguous types. A closer look at these constructions raises the issue of event structure. Do the two verbs that are sequentially arranged project separate events or a single event? Let us look at three typical examples of MVC in Malayalam. Consider the three examples below.

(18) naaya ente cherippə kaTiccə muRiccə kaLanju
dog-Nom me-Acc chappals bite-Compl cut-Compl lose-Past
'Dog left my chappals bite-torn'
raaju kaththi eTuththə          appam muRiccu
Raju    knife    take.Compl    bread cut-Past
'Raju took knife (and) cut bread'

kukkaR  SabdatthooTe  poTTiththeRiccu
cooker    loudly                 break.throw off-Past
'Cooker burst loudly'

The example (18) is an instance of Non-contiguous MVC. Here the verbs 'bite', 'cut' and 'lose' stand morphologically separate and convey a meaning of closely associated series of actions. Each event can be temporally sequenced. That means, within the whole event, there are sub-events that are in a temporally preceding or following relation with the other events in the construction. The whole construction is understood as one event, an event of 'destroying the chappals' though the subtle details of temporal progression of the event have been specified through separate verbs.

The order in which the verbs stand expresses the sequentiality of the sub-events. And, on a closer look, we can see that each verb except the last one is telic, that is, they are bearing a completeness marker (which is either a schwa or a sound homophonous with the Past marker) on them. It is to be noted that the verbs representing the particular events in such constructions are not fully tense/aspect inflected, only the last verb is tensed. All other verbs are in their "frozen past form", which is actually the 'completive' aspect form (cf. Section 2.3.4.0 for a discussion on this issue). What is crucial is that, though there are multiple verbs representing multiple events, together they constitute a whole eventuality. That means, in this type, the individual verbs specify the details of a larger, whole, single event. Therefore, the individual verbs in this construction can be viewed as representing the sub-events of a
whole event. This is a property that can be called consecutive appearance of multiple eventualities. Therefore, it is a single event construction, but it has specifications within it for the temporal progression of the whole event through its sub-events. In other words, the Non-contiguous constructions is a *heterogeneous single event* construction, where the total event is explained in terms of sub-events.

Now, let us consider the example (19). This is an instance of Intervened MVC where there appears an element between the constituent verbs. On a superficial observation, the construction does not seem to be following the V-V pattern, on the other hand, they show a subtle clause division between the events represented by each verb. What distinguishes it from a multi-clausal construction is the availability of a single-event reading for the construction. Though it has two verbs and each verb has an object associated with it, the construction has a single event reading. And the construction takes a tense/aspect value that is of the right-most/final verb and, therefore, the construction gets a single TAM marking, which is a property identified for single-event constructions, generally. It may be noted that the verbs other than the final one, are in a completive aspect (telic) (cf. Section 2.5.1 for a discussion on this issue). See (21a) below.

(21)  

    a.   raaju  aviTe  pooyi        kaaryam  paRayum  
        Raju   there  go-Compl  matter     tell-Fut  
        'Raju will go there (and) tell the matter'  
    b.   kaaryam   raaju   aviTe  pooyi        paRayum  
        matter       Raju    there   go-Compl  say-Past  
        'Raju will go there (and) tell the matter'  

In both these examples ((19) and (21)), the two verbs represent two events which are, event-wise and temporally related in a serial manner. This assumption is
strengthened by the fact that we need to put a conjunction marker between the events when paraphrased into non-serializing languages like English. This induces a presence of an implicit 'and' in this construction, as shown in the gloss. Therefore, there is a chance for it to be a multi-event construction of serial type.

Consider the third example, (20), listed in the beginning of this section, repeated as (22) below. This is an instance of Contiguous type of MVC. We may find it similar and at the same time different from the two types identified above (Non-contiguous and Intervened). See the example repeated below.

(22)  
kukkaR SabdatthooTe poTTi-ththeRiccu 
cooker loudly break.throw off-Past

'Cooker burst loudly'

In the Contiguous type of constructions, the verbs are sequenced in such a way that, unlike in the other two types, they are attached to each other. Though the two verbs are identifiable, it is evident from the stem-initial consonant gemination (bolded in the example above) that the two verbs are attached into one morphological structure\(^8\). The verbs are not standing for their individual meaning, instead, give a single-event meaning. In such constructions, if the verbs are detached by any means (adverb insertion, specific negation, object introduction etc.) or a change is brought about in the order, the meaning of the construction changes completely. Especially,

---

8. It has to be noted that gemination of the stem initial consonant cannot be the sole proof for morphological compunding, since there are instances when the stems are fused without consonant gemination. See for instance,

1. meeghangaL pooy-maRanju  
cloud-Pl go-hide-Past

'Clouds are gone away'

Here, though the verbs 'go' and 'hide' are morphologically fused and stand as one unit, there is no gemination in the verb boundaries.
the kind of idiomaticity associated with the construction when the verbs are arranged in this pattern disappears, if anything disturbs the 'togetherness' of the verbs. Therefore, it is plausible to assume that Contiguous construction stands for a single-event reading instead of a sequence of sub-events. See the examples given below.

(23) avaL oLicc-ooTi
    She hid-run-Past
    'She eloped'

(24) avaL ooTi (y)oLiccu
    She run hid
    'She hid quickly'

(25) pooliis aayudhangaL piTcceTǝththu
    police weapons hold-take-Past
    'Police seized the weapons'

(26) pooliis aayudhangaL piTikk-aathe eTǝththu
    police weapons hold-Neg take-Past
    'Police took the weapons without holding (them)'

Here, it may be noted that in (23) and (25), there is no completeness marker on the pre-final verb(s) while, in the second one, there is. From this, it may be (wrongly) assumed that the completeness marker brings about a sequential-event nature to the serial construction while constructions without a completeness marker are idiomatic in nature. Compare (23) to (27), which has a completeness marker identifying on the first verb. It is evident that the idiomatic reading is not available when there is a completeness marker present.

(27) avaL oLicc ooTi
    She hid-Compl.run-Past
    'She hid-run'
But, more data on idiomatic constructions show that it is a lexical property of the verbs along with their morphological ordering that brings about the idiomatic meaning to the verb sequence. Therefore, from the data available, it may not be plausible to assume that the presence of a completeness marker renders the construction SVC and the absence of it renders it idiomatic.

Coming back to our point, constructions like (20/22), though there are two verbs, it is difficult to identify the two verbs as two events. There is no sub-event specification available in this type of constructions. The verbs other than the main verb is not implying any other event that constituted a part of the whole event, instead, it is, often, a modificational verb that specifies the manner or similar aspects of the event of the construction. In other words, the verbs represent only one event, not multiple sub-events that together constitute a whole event. In other words, the two verbs here are better understood as representing a single event. Though there are two verbs which have a full lexical property in their independent appearances, in this scenario, only one verb seems to be bearing the meaning of the construction.

2.3.3.1 Light verb constructions: a re-analysis

In Contiguous type of MVCs, there is only a single-event reading available and unlike in other instances of MVCs, there is no specification of the sub-eventuality that together constitute the whole composite event. This might pose a question: what is the role of the other verb in such constructions then? To answer the question consider a similar example.
There are two verbs here, 'say' and 'give'. The immediate question it raises is whether there are two events represented as one by each verb or is it a composite event. In other words, following the line we developed in the section above, are these type of constructions single-event or multi-event? If we analyse (28) as V1 bearing the semantic weight, as can be seen in the gloss, then, the action is of 'saying', and there is no activity of 'giving' distinct from that of 'saying'. That means, in such constructions, the 'other verb' (i.e. The verb which is not directly contributing to the event structure of the construction) is representing some other function such as an applicative marker (by introducing a beneficiary as in the case of ditransitive constructions), vector verb, as in the case of (31), or some adverbial function. See the examples below.

(28) paRanjǝ-koTǝkk-unnu
    say-give-Pres
    'Instruct'

(29) raaju raadhakkǝ uththaram paRanjǝ-koTǝththu
    Raju  Radha  answer  say-Compl-give-Past
    'Raju told the answer to Radha'

(30) Raju enikkǝ uththaram paRanjǝ-thannu
    Raju  I  answer  say-Compl-give-Past
    'Raju told me the answer'

(31) moothiram viiNǝ-pooyi
    ring    fall-Compl-go-Past
    'Lost a ring'

(32) moothiram viiNǝ-kiTTi
    ring    fall-Compl-get-Past
    'Found/got a ring'
In the above constructions, only the verb 'say/fall' bears the crucial meaning of the construction. In that case, *koTǝththu* 'give' (or 'off') or *pooyi* 'go' can be considered a light/vector verb. That goes for *thannu* 'give' and *kiTTi* 'got' of the (30 and 32) examples too. The two pairs of constructions (29 and 30 & 31 and 32) are different only in terms of the directionality of the action, which is conveyed by the light/vector verb-part of the construction. In other words, the crucial difference between the two constructions is conveyed by the light/vector verb. That means, in these constructions, there is only one event and the second verb is adverbial in function. Other than directionality, a verb in such a series can take adverbial functions such as manner, instrumentality, direction, location etc., too.

In the above examples, *koTǝththu* 'give' was analysed as light/vector verbs, considering its bleached semantic role in the whole construction. That is, an event of 'giving' is not assumed here. But, what if we assume it that way. There can be a transfer of possession of some 'verbal materials' in the case of 'say-give'. That means it is the giving of the ideas in the form of vocal/verbal materials that is the main event. And the verb *paRanjǝ* 'say' represents only the manner in which the event of a transfer of possession of that vocal/verbal material has happened. For instance, compare the following pair.

(33)  
*paRanjǝ-koTǝththu*

'Instruct/tell'

(34)  
*ezhuthi-koTǝththu*

'gave in writing'

In the case of (34), 'gave in writing', it is easy for us to assume that there was a 'transfer' event of some material form, generally conceived to be in the form of a
written text on a physically identifiable object like paper. It is, I assume, the absence of such a materially distinguishable object with/on which the event of transfer is done, that conditions the speaker-hearer to assume a 'saying' event interpretation instead of a 'giving' interpretation for this construction. In the 'giving' interpretation, the whole construction is seen as an event of 'giving done in the manner of saying'. Therefore, I would conclude that the two constructions above are single-event constructions, different in the manner in which they are carried out, one has the manner of 'saying' (33), and the other has the manner of 'writing', (34). In this interpretation, these types of constructions cease to be a light verb construction, instead becomes one among the different multi verb constructions where one verb is indicating the manner in which the other verb's event is carried out.

From our discussion on koTǝththu/thannu constructions, a possible conclusion I draw is that in these constructions, each of the verbs of the series can stand for two different roles; lexical role and functional/adverbial role. The putative 'light/vector verb' (V2/right-most verb) can stand for directionality role which is its functional role. The preceding verb would be the main event verb or lexical verb in such contexts. In the same position, the 'light/vector verb' can stand as a lexical verb (main event) and then, the preceding verb (V1) will be in its functional/adverbial role showing the manner, instrumentality and such aspects of the main verb.

Therefore, it can be concluded that these constructions are instances of adverbial/functional roles of lexical verbs, in which the directional adverbials come after the main (event) verb while manner adverbials come before the main (event) verb. And hence, they may not be called light verb constructions. This can be considered an instance of lexical re-analysis happening on these verbs. When they
function as directionality or instrumentality markers, they are in their functional role, a role gained out of losing their lexical status.

What is crucial here is that there are two slots in which the lexical re-analysis is happening. In the manner changing constructions (such as (33) and (34)), the V2 is standing as the main event and, therefore, V1 is undergoing re-analysis. On the other hand, in the direction changing constructions (such as (31) and (32)), V1 is standing as the main event and V2 is re-analysed into a direction/instrumentality marker. Therefore, in the two types of constructions, verbs of two different slots are undergoing re-analysis\footnote{A similar property is noted in Edo. In Durational, Directional and Locational constructions, V2 is re-analyzed whereas in Manner constructions, V1 is re-analyzed (cf. Ogie 2009:262).}.

In constructions of the type (20), with this analysis, it is clear that there is only one event represented by the two verbs. And therefore, it is difficult to identify a sequentiality or temporal succession with the morphological order of the verbs (which was possible in the other two types discussed above). The verb other than the main verb is a manner verb which describes different ways and styles in which the main event happened. What it implies is that there is no multiple eventualities available in such constructions. What is available is a single-event reading, in which all verbs other than the main event verb stand for a description of the event, not for any subtle temporal split of the whole event. This property, along with their specific properties like the prohibition of iconicity permutations and detaching, can be sufficient to consider the Contiguous type of MVCs as different from the other two types of MVCs (Non-contiguous and Intervened) in Malayalam.

To summarize, the three examples we saw in the beginning of this section are
similar in their features that they all have a single-event reading available on them. With that similarity, they maintain a difference between them with respect to the type of single-event reading they introduce: heterogeneous single event and homogeneous single event. The Non-contiguous and Intervened MVCs, with their internal specification for temporally distinct sub-eventualities, occurred in a succession constituting the whole event, introduce a heterogeneous single event reading. While the Contiguous MVC introduces a homogeneous single event reading as there are no sub-eventualities available, and the construction is purely a single event.

Therefore, the MVC paradigm in Malayalam can be assumed to be in two patterns of single-event reading: heterogeneous and homogeneous. Non-contiguous constructions and intervened constructions being of the former pattern and contiguous constructions is of the latter pattern.

2.3.4 Grammatical category marking in Malayalam MVC

There are different grammatical category marking that fall on the verb of a verb phrase. These markings are generally identified as occurring once for one clause. Hence, we would observe how grammatical category marking is appearing on the constituents of what we identified as MVC in Malayalam.

2.3.4.0 Aspect/Tense marking in MVC

Whether in the form of Aspect, Tense or Mood, a verb needs to have its specification for temporal orientation on it. It is generally assumed that what distinguishes different constructions within an MVC is the tense/aspect specification. Of the three types of constructions under MVCs, generally, serial verb constructions (SVC) take only a single specification for it, while consecutive constructions (ConC)
and covert coordinations (CC) can take different tense/aspect specifications for their constituent verbs. Let us look at this feature in the Malayalam MVC. Consider a construction:

(35) ii praSnaththinu oru vazhi kaNTə-piTikk-aNam
    this problem-Dat one way see-Compl-hold/catch-Mod

'This problem needs to be found a solution to'

'The meaning is not quite transparent as the gloss indicates. The first V in a V-VC is invariably in an aspectually completive form with a telic marker inflected on it. It is often confused as bearing a past tense inflection. The construction in (35) is not past. -aNam is a modal particle indicating future, obligation/compulsion. Compare it with (36) below.

(36) Tense-aspect inflections
    a. kaNTə-piTikk-unnu
       see-hold-Pres
    b. kaNTə-piTikk-um
       see-hold-Fut

The suffix -rV in Edo expresses something like past perfect and gives a subtle contrast in meaning between the sentences in simple past and sentences with -rV suffix in Edo (cf. Ogie 2009:98). A similar case is reported by Larson (2010) for Baule verbs.

On similar lines, I would analyze the past tense-like suffix on the pre-final verbs in Malayalam MVC as a completeness marker (notice that we have been glossing it as '-Compl'). Though there are some instances where the completeness marker is similar to the past tense marker, in most of the cases it is a schwa, which is
not a past tense marker in the language. See the examples below.

(37) caaTi-ppooyi
    jump-Compl.go-Past
    'Escaped'

(38) viTTə-koTəththu
    leave-Compl.give-Past
    'Gave off/released'

In the above constructions, the first verb caaTi 'jump' of the first example has a past tense suffix -i on it. In independent contexts, it should be glossed 'jump-Past'. But here it is not analysed past. Similarly, in the second example, the schwa in the first verb viTTə is not a past tense marker, but still the verb is considered complete in aspect (cf. Athialy 1987 for a discussion on this). This difference comes evident when the last verb is non-past. See the examples below.

(39) kaLLan caaT-i-ppook-um
    thief-Nom jump- i -go-Fut
    'Thief will escape'

(40) bandhiye viTT-ə-koTəkk-aan pookunnu
    captive-Acc leave-ə-give-prospective go-Pres
    'The captive is going to be released'

In both the cases above, the first verbs 'jump'/caaTi and 'leave'/viTTə can be very reasonably glossed 'complete' than 'past'.

Based on this we can plausibly claim that the pre-final verbs in what appears to be MVC in Malayalam are completive in aspect. This assumption comes true of all the three formats of MVCs we identified in Malayalam (Non-contiguous, Intervened and Contiguous). See the examples (18-20) from section 2.4.2 repeated below as (41-43):
In example (41), which is an instance of Non-contiguous MVC, the pre-final verbs, 'bite' and 'cut' are in a completive form with a stem final schwa. The tense of the construction is the tense of the final verb, 'Past', marked with a stem final -u. In example (42), which is an instance of Contiguous MVC, the pre-final verb 'break' is in a completive form, though its stem-final element resembles one of the two Past-tense markers in Malayalam, -i. Here too, the construction gets the tense of the final verb. In example (43), which is an instance of Intervened MVC, the non-final verb, 'take' is in completive form with a stem final schwa, and the construction is in Past tense because the last verb is tense marked as Past.

Therefore, it is a general property across the types of MVC in Malayalam that the pre-final verbs (verbs other than the main verbs) are in a completive aspect, and not in Past tense. In addition to that, the tense of the construction is the same as the tense of the main verb. At this point, we are not going to the intricacies of the expression of tense, aspect and mood on the Malayalam verbal stems. Suffice it to say, since the past inflection is only of morphological nature, with no syntactic or semantic bearing, it may be reasonable to gloss it 'completive' rather than 'past'.

(41) naaya ente cherippə kaTiccə muRiccə kaLanju
dog my chappals bite cut-Compl lose-Past
'Dog left my chappals bite-torn'

(42) kukkaR SabdatthhooTe poTTi-ththeRiccu
cooker loudly break-Compl.throw off-Past
'Cooker exploded loudly'

(43) raaju kaththi eTəththə appam muRiccu
Raju knife take-Compl bread cut-Past
'Raju took knife (and) cut the bread'
2.3.4.1 **Negation**

Negation can be a property and a test at the same time. If the construction behaves as a single unit syntactically, negation applies only once. We can use this as a test for SVC-hood of constructions.

Prima facie, there are two negation markers associated with MVCs in Malayalam viz. *illa* and *-aathe*, and they come as marked once for a construction\(^\text{10}\).

\[
\begin{align*}
(44) & \text{pooliis aayudhangaL piTicc.eTuth.th.illa} \\
& \text{police-nom weapons-Dat hold-Compl.take-Past.Neg} \\
& \text{'Police did not seize weapons'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(45) & \text{pooliis aayudhangaL piTikkaathe eTuththu} \\
& \text{Police-Nom weapon-Pl-Dat hold-Neg take-Past} \\
& \text{'Police took the weapons without holding'}
\end{align*}
\]

There are some differences between these markers. The place at which each of these negators, *-illa* and *-aathe*, comes cannot be altered. That is, the marker *-illa* can come only on the last verb of the series and the marker *-aathe* cannot come on the last verb, but can come elsewhere. Another difference is that *-illa* comes with finite verb forms while *-aathe* comes with non-finite verbs.

\[
\begin{align*}
(46) & \text{(*)pooliis aayudhangaL piTi.kaathe eTuththu} \\
& \text{police-nom weapons-Dat hold-Neg take-Past} \\
& \text{'Police did not seize weapons' (not OK for this reading)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(47) & \text{*pooliis aayudhangaL piTicc.illa etuththu} \\
& \text{Police-Nom weapon-Pl-Dat hold-Past-Neg take-Past} \\
& \text{'Police did not seize weapons'}
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^{10}\) Negation in Malayalam has different allomorphs such as *veNTa*, *-alla*, *-illa*, *-aa*. And the *-aa* marker alone can come in further different forms such as *-aathe*, *-aatha*. 
It appears that the negation marker -aathe can leave the construction in two polarity values\textsuperscript{11}. It negates the element it comes attached with while the rest of the elements are not negated. -illa on the other hand, negates the whole construction.

\begin{verbatim}
(48)  avan aviTe pooyi paRanj-illa
     he there go-Compl say-Neg
 'He did not go there (and) tell'

(49)  avan aviTe pook-aathe paRanju
     he there go-Neg say-Past
 'He told without going there'
\end{verbatim}

Negation using -illa is a strong piece of syntactic evidence that verbs in Contiguous Constructions are forming a single unit. We will discuss these points in detail in the coming chapters. As for now, we will conclude our discussion on negation here. In the next chapter, we will meet the topic again to analyze it with respect to SVC.

\subsection{Nominalization}

If the morphologically single constituent nature of MVC is reflected in their syntax, we will expect them to have a single $V \rightarrow N$ conversion by suffixation. Consider the following contiguous verb structures;

\begin{verbatim}
(50)  poTTi-ththeRiccu
     break-Compl-cast off-Past
     'explode'

(51)  kaNTa-piTiccu
     see-Compl.hold-Past
     'invented/found'
\end{verbatim}

When the above structures are nominalized, they become as given below.

\textsuperscript{11} We will contest this point in the coming chapters when we discuss the SVCs in detail.
(52) poTTi-ththeRi
    'explosion'

(53) kaNTa-piTuthham
    'envention/finding/discovery'

It is clear from the above examples that the morphologically fused verb complex can be nominalized by a single instance of nominalization. This is because the two verbs are acting as one constituent. If the two Vs are separate, we would expect a form where both have undergone nominalization suffixation, as shown below, which are not grammatical forms in the language.

(54) *poTTal-ththeRi
    break-Nomin.cast off-Nomin
    'explosion'

(55) *kaaNal-piTithham
    see-Nomin.find-Nomin
    'invention/finding'

This evidence strengthens our assumption that the morphologically fused forms stand for one event (unit). But this does not help us distinguish homogeneous single event constructions from heterogeneous single event constructions. Since homogeneous single-event constructions can be nominalized in one go, we expect the heterogeneous single-event constructions to be nominalized separately for each verb. But that is not the case. See the examples below.

(56) kaTiccə muRiccə kazhiccu
    bite-compl cut-Compl eat-Past
    'bite, cut ate'
If each constituent is nominalized, the construction goes ungrammatical, see (57). The construction can be nominalized by adding a nominalizer only to the last constituent of it (58). Therefore, nominalization per se is not helping us to classify the different types of MVC. On the contrary, this is a strong point to prove that all the three types of MVCs we discussed are single event constructions. This proves that all types of MVC of Malayalam obey the "single grammaticalization marking for construction" constraint of serialization.

2.3.4.3 Other suffixes

Suffixation is a property that can be observed to learn more about the character of MVC in Malayalam. The general assumption about multi-verb constructions is that single event constructions will have a single marking for grammatical specifications while multi-event constructions will have multiple specifications. We will observe how the grammatical category marking is coming on Malayalam MVCs since all the types under it are single-event constructions.

Apart from tense/aspect, mood and polarity suffixes that we saw in previous sections, there are other suffixes that appear on MVCs. Elements such as conditional suffix -aal, temporal anchoring suffix -mbooL, instrumental marker koNTo, causativizer -pp, relativizer particle -a, comparative correlative -tooRum, etc. are also
inflected once for the construction. Let us look at some examples.

(59) poTTi-ththeRicc-aal
    break-Compl-throw off-Cond
    'If (it) explodes'

(60) kaththi eTuththə      muRi-kk-umbooL
    knife    take-Compl break-Contemporaneous
    'While cutting, taking the knife'

(61) poTTi-ththeRi-koNTə
    break-Compl-throw off-Inst
    'Because of/with explosion'

(62) poTTi-ththeRi-pp-iccu
    break-Compl-throw off-Caus
    'Made (it) explode'

(63) ....uNTaakki         kazhic-a    paathram
    prepare-Compl  eat-Rel       vessel
    'the vessel in which ate...'

Therefore, it can be concluded that irrespective of the wordhood, both contiguous and non-contiguous (including Intervened) constructions in Malayalam are grammatically marked once for the construction. That strongly suggests that all these three types (Contiguous, Non-contiguous, and Intervened) are single-event constructions. Then the question is how they are different. The difference between their eventuality specification is that, in Non-contiguous and Intervened constructions, the eventuality is heterogeneous single-event, which means, there can be sub-events that constitute the whole event of the construction. Whereas in the Contiguous type construction, it is homogeneous single-event, which means there can't be a subdivision between the eventualities in such constructions.
2.3.4.4 **Adverb insertion**

Some multi-verb constructions allow adverbs to intervene between the verbs, while others do not. In this section, we will try to generalize this phenomenon and see if we can use it as a mechanism to distinguish between different types of MVCs in Malayalam.

By adverb insertion, we mean, the presence of an adverb between the verbs or on any position in the construction that would modify the event described by only one of the multiple verbs. Presence of an adverb that would modify the whole event is not considered adverb insertion. Let us look at the three types of MVC in terms of how they react to the presence of an adverb between the verb constituents.

In the case of Non-contiguous construction, the adverb can come in between any of the verbs in the sequence. Consider the example given below.

(64) kuTTi cooRə cavaccə araccə nannaayi kazhiccu  
child rice tooth-Compl crush-Compl well eat-Past  
'child ate (the) food tooth-crushed well'

(65) kuTTi cooRə cavaccə nannaayi araccə kazhiccu  
child rice tooth-Compl well crush-Compl eat-Past  
'child ate (the) food tooth (and) well crushed'

(66) kuTTi cooRə nannaayi cavaccə araccə kazhiccu  
child rice well tooth-Compl crush-Compl eat-Past  
'child ate (the) food well tooth-crushed'

In the three instances above, the meaning of the construction is different, with respect to the adverbial modification. In the first example, it is the 'eating' event that is modified, in the second example, it is the 'crushing-eating' event and in the third case, the whole event is modified. That means it is the event coming to the right of the
adverb that is modified by the adverb. In other words, the adverb scopes over the verbs that are in its c-command domain. That is, it is when the adverb appears in the left-most position, the whole construction gets that adverbial meaning.

We will not go into the details of adverbial modification in Malayalam, here. Suffice it to say an adverb can intervene in this type of constructions. Now let us look at the other types of MVCs. Consider the Intervened construction given below.

(67) raaju kaththi eTuththǝ appam krǝthyamaayi muRiccu
Raju knife take bread correctly cut-Past
'Raju took knife (and) cut the bread correctly'

(68) raadha cooRǝ uNTaakki samaadhaanaththooTe kazhiccu
Radha rice prepare peacefully eat-Past
'Radha prepared rice (and) had peacefully'

In the above examples, the adverbs are modifying only the event that is coming to the right of it. The adverb krǝthyamaayi 'correctly' in the first example is describing only the 'cut'ting part of the event, not the 'taking' part. Similarly, in the second example, the adverb samaadhaanaththooDe 'peacefully' is describing only the 'eating' part of the event and not the 'cooking' part. Therefore, if we have to describe the V1 in the above examples, the adverb has to come left to V1.

(69) raaju veegam oru appam eTuththǝ muRiccu
Raju quickly one bread take-Compl cut-Past
'Raju quickly took a bread (and) cut (it)'

Here, each verb is modified by the adverb preceding (coming left to) it. If that is the case, then we can assume that, if there is only one adverb and that is preceding the V1, then the scope of adverb falls on the entire event (both V1 and V2 or V1...V_n), not just the verb immediately following it. This assumption turns out to be correct, at
least from the data we have in hand. See the examples below.

(70) raadha nannaayiTǝ cooRǝ uNTaakki kazhiccu
    Radha well rice prepare ate
    'Radha prepared rice (and) ate well'

In the examples above, the adverb 'well' describes the whole event, not just the
verb immediately following it. That means the whole event is conceived to be
executed in the manner the adverb describes, not just the V1. If this assumption is on
the right track, then we can propose that each verb as having a syntactic slot for an
adverb above it and it is empty, the adverb in the higher slot scopes over it (right-ward
scope), giving the whole construction the modification. In other words, if there is no
adverb specifically modifying V2, then the scope of the adverb of V1 ranges over it,
giving the whole event the modification.

This wide scope of the adverb is blocked not just by another adverb between
the verbs, but by DPs also. See the examples below.

(71) raju veegam oru kaththi eTuththa appam krathyamaayi
    Raju quickly one knife take bread correctly
    muRiccu
cut-Past.
    'Raju quickly took a knife (and) cut the bread correctly'

A point to be noted here is that the presence of a DP between the verbs divides
the whole event into sub-events and modifies the sub-event that is to the right of it.
Whereas when the DP is to the left of both the verbs, then there is no sub-event
division of the construction and the whole event gets the same specification. This was
the same scenario with respect to adverbs too. When an adverb is coming in between
the verbs, it modifies the one to its right, bringing in a sub-event distinction and when
it is coming to the left of both the verbs, it modifies the whole event. The next section links this with the homogeneous/ heterogeneous distinction we had noted earlier in single event constructions.

2.3.5 V1 reanalyzed as functional

As we know, the scope of a modifier is its c-command domain. Therefore, in the structures under discussion, if the adverb is at the left-most slot of the VP1, it should c-command both the verb phrases and thereby have scope over both the verbs. On the other hand, if each of the VPs takes a separate adverb (as in (71)), we see that the scope is limited to the VP to its immediate left. This seems to create a problem for our contention that SVCs in Malayalam are all single event. However, we had also identified a subtle distinction, namely homogeneous and heterogeneous single event readings. This distinction has its structural correlate in an optional reanalysis that an SVC seems to undergo, subject to certain conditions. The proposal we want to advance at this point is as follows:

Non-contiguous and Intervened SVCs start out as multi event constructions, and they retain so in an example like (71). This is clear from the impossibility of wide scope for veegam 'quickly' in (71), as already noted.

However, the Non-contiguous and Intervened SVCs have another route by which they can turn themselves into single event constructions. Take (70). We had earlier shown (a la Aboh (2009)) that V1 in SVC is only functional. This, in turn, will support the single event reading. We propose that in a structure like (70), with the adverb taking a wide scope, V1 which starts out as lexical, gets reanalyzed as functional. This reanalysis is reflected in the heterogeneous single-event reading.
available in Non-contiguous and Intervened constructions.

It has to be noted that the proposed reanalysis will be blocked by another adverb/DP separating the linear sequence of the V1 and V2.

2.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, we looked at some of the general properties of the Malayalam data for verb-verb construction (V-VC) under the title Multi-Verb Constructions (MVC). It is identified that MVCs of the V-VC type have different shades in Malayalam. They come in three morphological formats; Non-contiguous, Intervened and Contiguous. There are certain properties that all these three constructions share, and hence, they were classified under the same label, MVC. However, there are properties that are specific to each of these types. This renders an otherwise easy classification difficult.

The constituent verbs of an MVC have no limit on the number, except for the limitations imposed by production and perception. Similarly, a division of constituent verbs into main and modifying verbs is available in all the three types too. All these constructions take single marking for tense/aspect/modality/nominalization/causativization etc. which is marked on the final verb of the construction. All the verbs other than the final verb is defective with respect to grammatical marking, and they come in a completive aspect form. Based on these similarities, they are categorized under the same title MVC in Malayalam. With these properties, the tripartite division of the Malayalam MVC appears to resonate with the general classification in the literature. The Non-contiguous construction appears to be similar to Consecutive Construction, the Intervened Construction to Covert Coordination and
the Contiguous Construction to Serial Verb Construction.

However, there is a subtle and very crucial difference between the three types. Though they have multiple verbs, distributed in different formats, they all appear to imply a single-event reading. In addition to this, there seems to be some important specification with respect to the kind of single-event reading they give. This is reflected in their morphology too. The Non-contiguous and the Intervened types, which give a heterogeneous single-event reading, have their constituent verbs morphologically separated either by an audible pause, which is reflected as a space in orthography, or an intervening element such as a DP/advP/PP etc. On the other hand, the Contiguous type, which gives a homogeneous single-event reading, has its constituent verbs morphologically fused with an audible gemination or very close proximity between the verbs.

It can be generalized from this that the 'single-event reading' generated by the Contiguous type of construction is more of a pure single-event nature than the reading generated by Non-contiguous or Intervened. This division extends itself into a larger frame where we can classify the MVC in Malayalam into two types, homogeneous single-event constructions and heterogeneous single-event constructions.

The behavior of these constructions with respect to the morphological distribution of verbs and event semantics hints a possible analogy to the three types of MVCs generally attested in languages across the world, Consecutive Constructions (ConC), Covert Coordination (CC) and Serial Verb Construction (SVC). However, there is ample evidence to claim that the verbs in these constructions together indicate a single event, a property exhibited only by SVCs in the MVC group.
Now the crucial question is whether these constructions are the instances of three closely related types of MVCs of the V-VC type or are they three different instances of SVCs. In order to verify whether the constructions observed in Malayalam are SVCs, in the coming chapters, we will subject these three constructions to the standard tests of SVC-hood such as syntactic tests for extraction, argument sharing, grammatical category marking, polarity distribution, etc.