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Introduction. Serial Verb Constructions (SVCs) in Degema (Benue-Congo) exhibit an interaction between morphology and prosody which appears to pose a challenge to existing models of the syntax-prosody interface. We show that this pattern follows from the interaction of two independently-motivated syntax-prosody mapping principles. This view is contrasted with that of Rolle (2019), who proposes a total abandonment of serial morphological derivations, whereby syntactic structures are morphologized and prosodified in parallel.

The pattern. Degema verbs are bookended by a proclitic exponing subject agreement, and, sometimes, an enclitic exponing aspect (1). All data are from Rolle (2019).

(1) Ohoso [\( o = \) 3SG.SET2=shoot=FAC] \( \dot{\text{e}} \text{n\'m} \) animal

‘Ohoso shot an animal.

SVCs exhibit one of two patterns. If a light object pronoun (2), or nothing (3), intervenes between the verbs, the entire SVC forms a single prosodic domain (by hypothesis, a PWd) and is bookended by clitics. This is ‘single-marking’:

(2) Breno [\( o = \) 3SG.SET2=follow me go=FAC] \( \dot{\text{e}} \text{n\'m} \) animal

‘Breno went with me.’

(3) Ohoso [\( o = \) 3SG.SET2=go buy=FAC] \( \dot{\text{e}} \text{n\'m} \) fish

‘Ohoso went and bought fish.’

But if a full NP or heavy object pronoun intervenes, each verb constitutes its own PWd and carries its own pair of clitics. This is ‘double-marking’:

(4) Tatane [\( o = \) 3SG.SET2=shoot=FAC] \( \dot{\text{e}} \text{n\'m} \) animal [\( o = \) 3SG.SET2=kill =FAC]

‘Tatane shot and killed an animal.’

Analysis. We adopt Rolle’s (2019) syntactic assumptions, in which the higher V takes the lower vP as its complement and within each vP, the lexical verb raises to v. We also follow Rolle in treating agreement and aspect clitics as dissociated Agr nodes inserted postsyntactically on the verb(s). Unlike him, we propose that in an SVC, the output of the morphosyntactic derivation is always a double-marking pattern like (4). The single-/double-marking alternation is derived at the syntax-prosody interface by two independently-motivated constraints:

(5) a. KINYALOLO: A single PWd must not contain identical AGR morphemes.

b. SERIALIZE: Adjacent verbs in an SVC must form a single PWd.
   \( \rightarrow \) ‘Serialization’ into a single prosodic unit is a near-universal property of SVCs (Aikhenvald 2006; Dixon 2006; Bisang 2009; Haspelmath 2016). It cannot be derived straightforwardly from their syntactic structure (e.g. via MATCH WORD), since verbs in SVCs do not form a complex head (Baker 1989; Collins 1997, 2002; Aboh 2009).

These constraints outrank the MAX constraint enforcing phonological realization of the clitics:

(6) \{KINYALOLO, SERIALIZE\} \( \gg \) MAX(AGR)

When there is no intervener (or a light intervener), SERIALIZE and KINYALOLO are in tension, and the only way to simultaneously satisfy both is to delete a copy of each clitic, (7). When there is an intervener, SERIALIZE and KINYALOLO can be satisfied without deleting any clitics, (8). Regarding
light object pronouns (2), we propose they are pre-specified as prosodically reduced (Zec 2005; Bennett et al. 2018; Tyler 2019), hence incorporate into verbs. Prosodic pre-specification also accounts for why the outer clitics survive prosodification—elaborated on in the talk.

(7) Input = SVC with light/no intervener

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[V Agr-V-Asp] [V Agr-V-Asp]</th>
<th>KIN YALOLO</th>
<th>SERIALIZE</th>
<th>MAX(Agr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. [Agr-V V-Asp]_{PWD}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. [Agr-V-Asp]<em>{PWD} [Agr-V-Asp]</em>{PWD}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. [Agr-V-Asp Agr-V-Asp]_{PWD}</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) Input = SVC with heavy intervener

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[V Agr-V-Asp] DP [V Agr-V-Asp]</th>
<th>KIN YALOLO</th>
<th>SERIALIZE</th>
<th>MAX(Agr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. [Agr-V-Asp]<em>{PWD} [DP]</em>{PWD} [Agr-V-Asp]_{PWD}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. [Agr-V]<em>{PWD} [DP]</em>{PWD} [V-Asp]_{PWD}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. [Agr-V DP V-Asp]_{PWD}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. [Agr-V-Asp DP Agr-V-Asp]_{PWD}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Against OT-DM (Rolle 2019). In OT-DM, morphological operations (e.g. Agr node insertion) and prosodification (e.g. mapping to prosodic words) are computed in parallel. The main contribution of the OT-DM account is to cast the single/double-marking distinction as part of a conspiracy to reduce multiple exponence of clitics. Single-marking is preferred because each clitic is exponed only once. But for this to happen, adjacent verbs in an SVC need to be corralled into a single ‘morphological word’ (MWd), with each MWd serving as a host for a proclitic-enclitic pair. Double-marking arises when no single MWd can be formed from the verbs in the SVC (because of the intervening DP), thus forcing two distinct MWds to be formed, each of which then carries its own proclitic-enclitic pair. The distinction between light and heavy intervening material is encoded extrinsically to the constraints (as in our account).

A first drawback is that the account of prosodic serialization in SVCs is parochial: cross-linguistically many (perhaps most) SVCs occur in the absence of agreement/clitics (Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006), so an ‘anti-clitic’ conspiracy cannot be a general explanation for prosodic serialization (hence the need for SERIALIZE). This account also relies on a stipulation that single-marking in an SVC is the default and double-marking the ‘exception’. Our (equally-stipulated) assumption that each verb in an SVC sprouts its own Agr nodes, which may be deleted during prosodification, does not lead to parallel computation. In addition, the OT-DM requires MWds as representations distinct from PWds and syntactic heads, and an associated mechanism for labelling them. Finally, computing morphology and prosody simultaneously permits arbitrary interactions, e.g. a single/double distinction depending on whether an NP is singular or plural: ‘PW\_D=PLURAL’.

**Implications for the analysis of SVCs.** Typological work on SVCs indicates that in ‘contiguous’ SVCs (SVCs with no or minimal material intervening between the verbs), the SVC virtually always forms a single prosodic unit (see references cited above). This ‘serialization’ cannot be derived via typical syntax-prosody mapping principles—it cannot be derived as a reflection of syntactic constituency, since the verbs in an SVC do not form a constituent, and it cannot be derived via independent prosodic well-formedness principles, because it requires reference to the syntactic category ‘v’. Our analysis, employing SERIALIZE, represents the first recognition of this issue and the first attempt to address it. This study thus contributes to a small but growing body of work arguing that the syntax-prosody mapping aims to satisfy certain prosodic desiderata which, while making reference to properties of syntactic structure, are not directly related to enforcing syntax-prosody isomorphy (Selkirk 1984; Clemens 2014, 2019; Richards 2016).
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