

observed order in DGS (note that motion SVCs are distinguished from cases in which GO embeds another verb, where the inverse order *is* attested in DGS, e.g. ‘go (in order) to shop’ is signed as GO SHOP). Alternative orders for verbs of manner and of path in motion SVCs across sign languages are shown below for comparison (adapted from Benedicto et al. 2008, Lau 2012, Couvee & Pfau 2018); the sampled languages are American Sign Language (ASL), Catalan Sign Language (LSC), Argentinean Sign Language (LSA), Sign Language of the Netherlands (NGT), and Hong Kong Sign Language (HKSL).

Because manner and path are simultaneous properties of a motion event, temporal iconicity has no explanatory power here. Benedicto et al. (2008) attempt to explain the

Pattern	ASL	LSC	LSA	NGT	HKSL	DGS
$V_{\text{manner}} + V_{\text{path}}$	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
$V_{\text{path}} + V_{\text{manner}}$	✓	✓	*	✓	*	*
$V_{\text{manner}} + V_{\text{path}} + V_{\text{manner}}$	*	✓	✓	?	?	*
$V_{\text{path}} + V_{\text{manner}} + V_{\text{path}}$	✓	✓	*	?	?	*

results from ASL, LSC, and LSA in terms of VP-shell structures (complementation, rather than adjunction). They assume that V_{manner} merges in the c-command domain of V_{path} , and reason that while LSC and LSA are head-final and require V-movement operations to derive all the data, ASL, which is head-initial, should derive its unmarked $V_{\text{manner}} + V_{\text{path}}$ order without head movement, and only requires further movement to derive the more sparsely attested orders.

Complementation vs. Adjunction. The data that I have collected indicate that the same degree of flexibility is not observed in DGS as is in LSC or LSA, despite all of them being broadly head-final languages. The merge of V_{path} over V_{manner} would be sufficient to derive the DGS word order, but assuming that alternative orders are derived via V-movement, syntactic islandhood would better explain why these other orders are not attested. I thus suggest that adjunction-style analyses (à la Veenstra 1996) are more consistent with the DGS data. V_{manner} can naturally be treated as an adverbial adjunct to the main verb, V_{path} . Stereotypical adjunct behaviour matches both the resistance to alternative orders via V-movement, and the idiosyncratization in the order of transfer SVCs. Single events will be correctly interpreted, provided that the necessary event semantic information is recoverable (e.g. uniqueness of thematic relations). Where crosslinguistic similarities in interpretation appear, they stem from typological consistencies in the verbs’ lexical semantics and the influence of iconicity, and not from a single universal syntactic structure.

Selected references.

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial Verb Constructions in Typological Perspective. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial verb constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benedicto, Elena, Sandra Cvejanov & Josep Quer. 2008. The morphosyntax of verbs of motion in serial constructions: a crosslinguistic study in three signed languages. In Josep Quer (ed.), *Signs of the Time. Selected Papers from TISLR 2004*, 111–132. Hamburg: Signum Verlag.
- Couvee, Sascha & Roland Pfau. 2018. Structure and Grammaticalization of Serial Verb Constructions in Sign Language of the Netherlands—A Corpus-Based Study. *Frontiers in Psychology* 9. 993.
- Lau, Sin Yee Prudence. 2012. *Serial verb constructions in Hong Kong Sign Language*. Shatin, Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong dissertation.
- Supalla, Ted. 1990. Serial verbs of motion in ASL. In Susann Fischer & Patricia Siple (eds.), *Theoretical Issues in Sign Language Research*, vol. 1, 127–152. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.