Abstract. This paper investigates the word order of serial-verb constructions in Hul’q’umi’num’ Salish. Hul’q’umi’num’ SVCs are monoclausal constructions consisting of two(+) verbs that can function as independent lexical verbs, have matching aspect, share one(+) argument, and are not connected by any linking element. Two-verb SVCs may consist of transitive and intransitive verbs. The first question concerns subject and object NP placement. For constructions with two overt NPs, an alternating VSVO pattern is both preferred in elicitation, and the only order occurring in the corpus. Only shared arguments may intervene between the verb components. Hul’q’umi’num’ SVCs exhibit flexible word order in elicitation, but certain grammatical word orders generate ambiguity. Various pragmatic strategies work together to prevent or rescue ambiguous constructions. SVCs are an understudied feature of Central Salish languages; thus investigation of this topic broadens the scope of the current literature.
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1. Introduction. This paper investigates the word order of serial-verb constructions (SVCs) in Hul’q’umi’num’ the Island dialect of Halkomelem Salish (ISO 639-3 hur). Hul’q’umi’num’ does not neatly fit the typological profile of most serializing languages. Verb serialization tends to occur in analytic languages, and Hul’q’umi’num’ exhibits a more synthetic profile (Kiyosawa & Gerdts 2010a: 1). Also, serializing languages tend to be verb-final or verb-medial (Aikhenvald 2018: 188), while Hul’q’umi’num’ is predicate-initial, the word order being VSO/VOS (Gerdts 1988). Hul’q’umi’num’ two-verb SVCs may consist of two intransitive verbs (1), an intransitive verb and a transitive verb (2), or two transitive verbs (3).2

(1) ni’ huye’ ’imush thtu swiw’lus.
   niʔ høyɛʔ ʔimǝ̱t̪θ swi̱wɬ̓as
   DIST.AUX leave walk DT boy
   ‘The boy walked away (leave + walk).’  (RP 04.10.19)

(2) nem’ tsun t’itsum kwunut tthunu shun’tsu.
   ne̱m̓ cm t’itcm kʷɑ̣n-ɑt tʰɑ̣n̓ ʃə̣n̓
   go.AUX 1SG.SUB swim take-TR DT.POS catch
   ‘I’ll swim and get my catch.’  (DL 20.04.22)
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Before unpacking the behavior of multi-verb clauses, I will give some background on single verb clauses in Hul’q’umi’num’.

1.1. SINGLE VERB CLAUSES. An important research question to be addressed here concerns argument placement: where are subject and object NPs permitted to occur in SVCs? The discussion of this question will begin with the patterns found in clauses with a single verb. Salish clauses minimally consist of a predicate, which may be verbal (4), nominal, or adjectival (see Gerds & Schneider in press).

(4) ni’ tsun qw’aqwut tthu spe’uth.
niʔ can qʷaqʷ-ə tʰə speʔəθ
DIST.AUX 1SG.SUB club-TR DT bear
‘I clubbed the bear.’

The discussion of argument placement will be grounded in previous work; three relevant principles emerge from existing literature. First, Salish languages disprefer having two contiguous NPs (Gerds & Hukari 2008; Hukari 1976; Kuipers 1967: 172; Van Eijk 1997: 227). Second, ongoing topics in discourse tend to be zero (Beck 2000; Davis 1994; Gerds & Hukari 2008; Kroeber 1995). In addition to being left out, topics in Salish languages are usually the subject (Kinkade 1990; Davis 1994; Beck 2000). Finally, many of these languages interpret a single postverbal NP as the object (i.e., the ‘ONI condition’ following Gerds 1988). In order for a single postverbal NP to be interpreted as the subject, it must be marked by a reference-tracking determiner (Gerds & Hukari 2004):

(5) a. ni’ lemutus tthu swuy’qe’.
niʔ lem-ət-əs tʰə swəʔqeʔ?
DIST.AUX look-TR-3SUB DT man
‘S/he/it/they saw the man.’ // *‘The man saw her/him/it/them.’

b. ni’ lemutus tthuw’nilh swuy’qe’.
niʔ lem-ət-əs tʰəw̓ənʔəl swəʔqeʔ?
DIST.AUX look-TR-3SUB PRO.DT DT man
‘The man saw her/him/it/them.’

Gerds & Hukari (2008: 3) found the following frequencies for single-verb clauses with at least one overt NP argument: VO 53%, V 35%, VSO/VOS 9%, VS 4%). In light of these facts, multi-verb clauses should exhibit a relative high frequency of VVO and VV and a low frequency of VVSO/VVOS and VVS.

1.2. SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS. While Hul’q’umi’num’ exhibits several types of multi-verb constructions (cf. Schneider 2021), serial verbs are the focus of this paper. Hul’q’umi’num’ SVCs are monoclausal constructions consisting of two or more verbs that can function as independent lexical verbs, share at least one argument, have matching aspect, and are not

---

3 This data is restricted to transitive clauses in which both the subject and the object are third person (Gerds & Hukari 2008: 2).
connected by any linking element (cf. Aikhenvald 2018; Haspelmath 2016; Lovestrand 2018; Schneider 2021). This section will outline two types of motion SVCs and discuss the sequence of the verbs in order to set the stage for the in-depth discussion of word order.

Motion SVCs most often consist of two intransitive verbs, and they can be divided into two types: directional and associated motion (cf. Lovestrand & Ross 2021). Directional SVCs consist of two motion verbs, where at least one contributes path information. There are three subtypes of directional SVCs in Hul’q’umi’num’: MANNER + PATH (6), PATH + PATH (7), and *huye’* (PATH) + MANNER/PATH (8).

\[ (6) \quad \text{ni’ tsun } \text{’ushul t’akw’}. \]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{ni?} & \text{cən} & ?ə̃sl & \text{takw} \\
\text{DIST.AUX} & \text{1SG.SUB} & \text{paddle} & \text{go.home} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘I paddled home.’ (DL 26.04.22)

\[ (7) \quad \text{nem’ tsun hwu’alum’ tl’pestun}. \]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{nem} & \text{cən} & xʷə̑?ə̑lə̑m & \text{t̓-pestə̑n} \\
\text{go.AUX} & \text{1SG.SUB} & \text{return} & \text{VBL-United.States} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘I’m going back to the United States.’ (DL 06.12.21)

\[ (8) \quad \text{’i tsun huye’ } \text{’imush}. \]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{ʔi} & \text{cən} & \text{huye?} & ?i̱mə̑sk \\
\text{PROX.AUX} & \text{1SG.SUB} & \text{leave} & \text{walk} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘I’m going for a walk.’ (RP 13.09.19)

In the first subtype, one of the verbs, most often the first verb (V₁), indicates the manner of motion, and the other, most often V₂, indicates the direction. In the second subtype, both verbs indicate direction; each verb may encode the starting point, general trajectory, or endpoint. The ordering of the verb components is flexible with a tendency towards a logical ordering such as iconicity or general to specific. The third subtype involves the Hul’q’umi’num’ verb *huye’* ‘leave’ and another motion verb (either manner or direction). The verb *huye’* is the most frequently serialized verb in the text corpus, and it also exhibits a strong preference for occurring as the first verb component when serialized. This is in contrast to the MANNER + PATH type, where the directional component tends to occur second, and the PATH + PATH type where the order is flexible and more dependent on semantics and discourse (see Schneider 2022a).

Associated motion is defined as a verbal grammatical category whose function is to associate different kinds of translational motion to a verb event (Guillaume & Koch 2021: 3). There are three subtypes of associated motion SVCs in Hul’q’umi’num’: concurrent motion (9) and (10), purposive motion (11), and subsequent motion (12) (cf. Lovestrand & Ross 2021).

---

4 The only other work dedicated to SVCs in another Salish language is Montler’s (2008) work on Klallam (ISO 639-3: clm) motion verbs. Serial verbs in Halkomelem are also mentioned in passing by Gerdts (2010b), Gerdts and Hukari (2011), and Kiyosawa and Gerdts (2010b).

5 Two-verb SVCs are by far the most common, but constructions with three to five verbs do occur. For this paper, as well as previous studies, counts have been largely restricted to two-verb constructions. Examples of constructions with more than two verbs are included when they offer additional insight into the analysis.
(9) sus 'uw’ nem’ tst 'uw’ sisuxwum’ lhilhuts’ut.
sæs ʔəw nem ct ʔəw sisəxʷəm lilač-ət
N.AUX.3POS CN go.AUX 2PL.SUB CN wade<IPFV> cut-TR<IPFV>
‘And we would wade into the water and cut (the bulrushes).’ (ET 28247)

(10) nem’ huya’stum tl’uyq’ustum sus ‘uw’ thuhw.
ne mə həyaʔ-st-əm ʔayq-əst-əm sæs ʔəw θəxʷ
go.AUX leave-CS-PAS pin.down-CS-PAS N.AUX.3POS CN disappear
‘He (the man) was taken away, pinned down, and he disappeared.’ (WSa 410)

Imperfective aspect on both verb components indicates concurrent actions (9). In addition, certain discourse contexts can set the stage for serialized perfective verbs to have a simultaneous reading, such as (10). While concurrent motion SVCs describe simultaneous events, the other two subtypes describe sequential events. The first sequential associated motion SVC is *purposive motion* where a motion precedes an intended non-motion event, such as (11). The second sequential associated motion SVC is *subsequent motion*, where the motion event happens after the non-motion event, such as (12).

(11) nem’ tsun t’itsum kwunut thunu shun’tsu.
ne mə təcəm kʷən-ət tənən ʃənəs
go.AUX 1SG.SUB swim take-TR DT.POS catch
‘I’ll swim to get my catch.’ (DL 20.04.22)

(12) niʔ tsun lhums’t thu sth’oom huye’stuhw.
niʔ can łamët tʰəm ʃt’um həyeʔ-stəxʷ
AUX 1SG.SUB pick-TR DT berry leave-CS
‘I picked the berries and took them away.’ (DL 23.05.22)

Subsequent motion is the least common type of motion SVC in Hul’q’umi’num’ (Schneider 2022b) and in the world’s languages (Lovestrand & Ross 2021). The arguments are shared in this type of *cumulative subject* SVC (Aikhenvald 2006: 18). The resulting meaning is that ‘X did V to Y and then X took Y (somewhere)’, and it entails that subject and object moved together in some direction after the non-motion event took place.

To sum up, in directional motion SVCs, the order of the verbs is typically determined either by the construction (e.g., MANNER + PATH), or by the semantics and discourse (e.g., PATH + PATH). Concurrent associated motion SVCs have flexible verb order while sequential associated SVCs most often have temporally iconic verb order. Directional motion SVCs largely consist of two intransitive motion verbs while associated motion SVCs may include a transitive verb component. The next section will zoom out to look at patterns of word order in two-verb SVCs. Instead of being organized in terms of the verb semantics, they are categorized in terms of verb transitivity. Thus, verb order is no longer the focus but instead the analysis will focus on how the arguments are distributed.

2. Corpus and elicitation informed syntax. The most frequently occurring type of SVC in the text corpus is an intransitive-intransitive (INT-INT) construction. This includes the vast majority

---

6 A cumulative subject is when “the subject and object of VP₁ together carry out the state of affairs in VP₂.” (Ameka 2006: 130).
of the directional motion constructions discussed previously. For INT-INT SVCs (Table 1) VV is by far the most common order, with an alternating VSV pattern being the next most common.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>order</th>
<th>attested</th>
<th>count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Intransitive-Intransitive word order combinations

It is unsurprising that VV is by far the most common type of construction given the tendency of the language to zero out topics, which are usually subjects, and given that the language makes use of second-position clitics for first and second person subjects, rather than NPs. The higher frequency of VSV over VVS shown in Table 1 indicates that there is a preference for an alternating V-NP-V pattern (Gerdts & Schneider 2021). The following sections will now move to transitive constructions.

2.1. TRANSITIVE-TRANSITIVE. Table 2 contains eleven possible word order combinations for SVCs with two transitive verb components (TR-TR). On the left are orders with one or more non-overt NPs, while orders with two overt NP arguments are on the right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>order</th>
<th>DTS</th>
<th>PDS</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>order</th>
<th>DT</th>
<th>PDS</th>
<th>count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>VSVO</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVO</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>VVOS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>VSOV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSV</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VOVS</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>VVSO</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VOSV</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Transitive-Transitive word order combinations

In TR-TR SVCs, subject and object arguments are shared by the verb components. There are six possible word orders for TR-TR SVCs with two overt NP arguments. The examples below present the unambiguous word orders: VSVO (13), VVOS (14), VSOV (15).

(13) ni’ thuytus tthu swiw’lus yuq’utus tthu shuptun. (VSVO)
    niʔ     tʰə-y-t-əs           tʰə swiw’ləs     yəq-ət-əs      tʰə şəptən
    DIST.AUX  fix-TR-3SUB  DT  boy  rub-TR-3SUB  DT  knife
    ‘The boy fixed, sharpened the knife.’ (DL 07.10.22)

(14) ni’ thuytus yuq’utus tthu shuptun tthu swiw’lus. (VVOS)
    niʔ     tʰə-y-t-əs           yəq-ət-əs    tʰə şəptən      tʰə swiw’ləs
    DIST.AUX  fix-TR-3SUB  rub-TR-3SUB  DT  knife  DT  boy
    ‘The boy fixed, sharpened the knife.’ (DL 20.04.22)

---

7 Table key: DTS = determiner marked subject, PDS = pro-determiner marking subject, ✓ = grammatically and semantically unambiguous, # = subject/object unclear, * = ungrammatical, -- = not applicable.
While all three of these orders are grammatical and semantically unambiguous, the alternating pattern VSV in (13) is the only corpus-attested pattern.

The remaining three word orders, VVSO (16), VOVS (17), VOSV (18), tend to elicit ambiguous interpretations and require explicit marking of the subject with the reference-tracking pro-determiner *tthu* in order to be easily understood.

(16) `ni’ thuytus yuq’utus #*tthu/tthuw’nilh* swiw’lus thhu shuptun. (VVSO)

`ni? thəy-t-əs yəq-ət-əs #*tθə/tθəw̓nil* swiwłəs tʰə ẓəptən
DIST.AUX fix-TR-3SUB DT INANIMATEfix-TR-3SUB DT PRO:DT boy DT knife
‘The boy fixed, sharpened the knife.’

(17) `ni’ thuytus thhu shuptun yuq’utus #*tthu/tthuw’nilh* swiw’lus. (VOVS)

`ni? thəy-t-əs tʰə ẓəptən yəq-ət-əs #*tθə/tθəw̓nil* swiwłəs
DIST.AUX fix-TR-3SUB DT PRO:DT boy DT knife
‘The boy fixed, sharpened the knife.’

(18) `ni’ thuytus thhu shuptun #*tthu/tthuw’nilh* swiw’lus yuq’utus. (VOSV)

`ni? thəy-t-əs tʰə ẓəptən #*tθə/tθəw̓nil* swiwłəs yəq-ət-əs
DIST.AUX fix-TR-3SUB DT PRO:DT boy rub-TR-3SUB
‘The boy fixed, sharpened the knife.’

The constructions in (16)–(18) proved ambiguous without explicit subject marking with a pro-determiner *tthuw’nilh*; the consultant indicated that in the *tthu* examples it was unclear if it was ‘the boy’ who was being sharpened or ‘the knife’. Interestingly, the presence of an inanimate object did not seem to improve the chances of the construction being understood correctly.

The alternating VSV order is both the only construction that occurs in the text corpus and was also preferred by the consultant. The non-occurrence of the other patterns in texts can be explained by an avoidance of ambiguous orders (VVSO, VOVS, VOSV) and the established discourse features of Salish. For example, the fact that in single-verb clauses, two contiguous NPs is dispreferred at least partially explains absence of VVSO/VVOS and VOSV/VOSV in texts. In addition, the tendencies for topics to be subjects, and ongoing topics to be zero likely explains why VOVS does not occur, while VOV, such as (19), is attested and unambiguous.

(19) `ni’ thuytus thhu shuptun yuq’utus. (VOV)

`ni? thəy-t-əs tʰə ẓəptən yəq-ət-əs
DIST.AUX fix-TR-3SUB DT knife rub-TR-3SUB
‘S/he fixed, sharpened the knife.’

This section discussed constructions where both verb components are transitive and both subject and object are shared. Either argument may intervene between verb components; this can be either the shared subject (most common) or the shared object (when the subject is zero). The next sections will address constructions with an intransitive and a transitive verb component.
2.2. INTRANSITIVE-TRANSITIVE. Mixed-transitivity constructions involve one shared argument and one non-shared argument. In INT-TR constructions (Table 3), the subject is shared, and the transitive component functions to add an object into the argument structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>order</th>
<th>DTS</th>
<th>PDS</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>order</th>
<th>DTS</th>
<th>PDS</th>
<th>count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VV  --</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>VSVO  √</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVO √</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>VVOS  #</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOV *</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>VVSO  #</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSV *</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>VOV   *</td>
<td>∗</td>
<td>∗</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVS *</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>VOSV  *</td>
<td>∗</td>
<td>∗</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Intransitive-Transitive word order combinations

These constructions are limited to VSVO, VVOS, and VVSO as possible orders with overt NP arguments because the object cannot precede the transitive verb, as demonstrated by (20).

(20) a. ni’ huye’ lemutus tthu shuptun. (VVO)

ni? hayeʔ lem-ət-əs təƛəʔon
DIST.AUX leave look-TR-3SUB DT knife
‘S/he left to go look at the knife.’

b. *ni’ huye’ tthu shuptun lemutus (tthuw-nilh swiw’lus). (*VVO[S])

*niʔ həyeʔ təƛəʔon lem-ət-əs (təʔənil swiwʔas)
DIST.AUX leave DT knife look-TR-3SUB PRO.DT boy
(DL 25.10.22)

Like TR-TR, VSVO is again the only corpus-attested pattern with two overt NPs.

(21) ni’ huye’ tthu swiw’lus lemutus tthu sqwumey. (VSVO)

niʔ həyeʔ təƛ swiwʔas lem-ət-əs təƛ sqʷəmey
DIST.AUX leave DT boy see-TR-3SUB DT dog
‘The boy left to look at the dog.’
(DL 25.10.22)

Unlike TR-TR, in INT-TR both VVOS and VVSO were ambiguous without the use of a pro-determiner to mark the subject.

(22) ni’ huye’ lemutus #tthu/tthuw’nilha sqwumey tthu swiw’lus. (VVOS)

niʔ həyeʔ lem-ət-əs təƛ sqʷəmey #təʔə/ təʔənil swiwʔas
DIST.AUX leave see-TR-3SUB DT dog DT/PRO.DT boy
‘The boy left to look at the dog.’
(DL 25.10.22)

(23) ni’ huye’ lemutus tthu swiw’lus #tthu/tthuw’nilha shuptun. (VVO)

niʔ həyeʔ lem-ət-əs #təʔə/ təʔənil swiwʔas təƛəʔon
DIST.AUX leave see-TR-3SUB DT/PRO.DT boy DT knife
‘The boy left to go look at the knife.’
(DL 20.04.22)

Without any context, the examples with tthu are unclear as to who is doing the looking, and as before, the presence of tthuw’nilha makes it clear that it is ‘the boy’. Similarly to the previous set of examples, the presence of an inanimate object such as ‘knife’ did not seem to improve the chances of the construction being understood correctly.
In sum, if $V_1$ is intransitive only the shared subject may occur between the verbs; the object of $V_2$ may not intervene. The next section addresses when $V_1$ is transitive and $V_2$ is intransitive.

2.3. TRANSITIVE-INTRANSITIVE. The final type are those that consist of a transitive verb followed by an intransitive one; these constructions are the least common SVC type (>2%). Table 4 below shows the corpus counts; the subject argument is never expressed as an overt NP, and thus the pro-determiner distinction is irrelevant for this construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>order</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>order</th>
<th>count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>VSVO</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVO</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>VOVs</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VVOs</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>VOSV</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSV</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>VSOV</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Transitive-Intransitive word order combinations

Like the previous constructions, the argument between the verbs is shared; in this case, the shared argument is the object of $V_1$ and the subject of $V_2$ (marked $[O_1/S_2]$), demonstrated in (24).

In (a), the object NP (underlined) occurs in the preceding clause and the SVC word order is VV.

In (b), the object occurs between the two verbs forming VOV.

(24) a. sis 'uw' tssetus thu sta'luss. 'uw' umutus _ nem' 'u thu pqwutsun'.
   sisʔə cse-t-əs ətə stāləs-s ʔəw
   N.AUX.3POS CN tell-TR-3SUB DT spouse-3POS CN
   ?əm-at-əs nem ʔə ətə pqʷəcan
   sit-TR-3SUB go.AUX OBL DT log
   ‘She told her husband to go sit (himself) down on the log.’

b. sis 'uw' tssetus _, 'uw' umutus thu sta'luss nem' 'u thu pqwutsun'.
   sisʔə cse-t-əs ʔəw
   N.AUX.3POS CN tell-TR-3SUB CN
   ?əm-at-əs ətə stāləs-s nem ʔə ətə pqʷəcan
   sit-TR-3SUB DT spouse-3POS CN
   ‘She told him, her husband, to go sit (himself) on the log.’ (DL 11.11.22)

The verbs in the first and second clauses both have ‘the husband’ as the object. Because of the proximity, the object can be explicit in one and left out in the other.

Interestingly, $V[O_1/S_2]V$ appears to be the only word order that allows any overt NPs:

(25) a. ni’ lumnuhwus thu shuyulhs ’umut.
   niʔ lam-naxʷ-əs ətə šəyəl-s əmət
   DIST.AUX see-LCTR-3SUB DT elder.sibling-3POS sit.down
   ‘S/he saw her/his elder sibling sit down.’

b. *ni’ lumnuhwus ’umut thu shuyulhs.
   *niʔ lam-naxʷ-əs ətə šəyəl-s əmət
   DIST.AUX see-LCTR-3SUB DT elder.sibling-3POS sit.down (DL 24.11.22)
In (a), ‘the elder sibling’ is both the object of $V_1$ and the subject of $V_2$ and that sole argument must occur between the verbs in order for the construction to function. In (b), where the $O_1/S_2$ argument occurs at the end is ungrammatical. This is the same with a pronominal subject:

(26) a. ni’ tsun lumnuhw **thu q’e’mi’** ‘umut.

   ni?    con   ləm-nəxʷ  əə  qəm̓iʔ  əmət
   DIST.AUX 1SG.SUB  see-LCTR DT girl sit.down

   ‘I saw the girl sit down.’

b. *ni’ tsun lumnuhw ‘umut **thu q’e’mi’**.

   *ni?    con   ləm-nəxʷ  əmət  əə  qəm̓iʔ
   DIST.AUX 1SG.SUB  see-LCTR sit.down DT girl

Here the switch function meaning is maintained when the $O_1/S_2$ argument is between the verbs as in (a), but moving the argument to the end, as in (b), is again ungrammatical.

In addition, orders with an overt NP subject for $V_1$ (VOVS, VVOS, VVSO) test ungrammatical for the switch-function construction. Example (27) demonstrates that an alternating pattern with two overt arguments is analyzed as two clauses with distinct subjects.

(27) ni’ lumnuhwus thu shuyulhs ‘umut thu q’e’mi’.

   niʔ  ləm-nəxʷ-əs  təʔ  səyəl-s  əmət  əə  qəm̓iʔ
   DIST.AUX see-LCTR-3SUB DT elder.sibling-3POS sit.down DT girl

   ‘Her elder sibling saw the girl sit down.’

   *The girl saw her elder sibling sit down.’ (*$V[O_1/S_2]$VS$_1$) (DL 07.12.22)

Passive verbs do not behave identically to intransitive ones because the syntactic structure of the passive has only a subject, which is the undergoer of the action. The reduced ambiguity allows for a transitive-passive $VV[O_1/S_2]$ order, as demonstrated by the example below.

(28) si.i.is ’uw’ tsqw’i’qw’ul’esh, sus ’uw’ **yu they’tus, yu hwṭ’tut’θa’tum’** thu sqw’uqw’ul’ush…

   sis  ʔəw̓  c-qʷʔiʔqʷəl̓eʃ  səs  ʔəw̓
   N.AUX.3POS<RL> CN VBL-bird<PL> N.AUX.3POS CN

   yə=θey̓-t-əs  yə=xʷ-təʔθaʔ-t-əm̓
   DYN=fix-TR-3SUB<IPFV> DYN=LOC-skin-TR-PAS<IPFV> DT bird<PL>

   ‘So, he started bird hunting, then preparing them, the birds being skinned…’ (BA74)

$V_1$ is transitive and its object is the syntactic subject of $V_2$. This topic of interest is beyond the scope of the current project and will be a focus of future work.

To sum up sections 2.1–2.3, the data suggest that $V_1$ determines the subcategorization for the construction. If $V_1$ is intransitive, only the intransitive subject may occur between the verb components. In contrast, if $V_1$ is transitive, any argument shared by both verbs may occur between verb components. For TR-TR, this can be either the shared subject (most common) or the shared object (when the subject is zero). For TR-INT, the intervening NP is the argument serving as the object of $V_2$ and the subject of $V_1$. Mixed transitivity constructions, such as INT-TR, demonstrate that it is indeed possible to have unshared arguments. This fact leads to questions such as: can the arguments of TR-TR be unshared? This is the topic of the next section.

2.4. MORE ON UNSHARED ARGUMENTS. The next set of questions to address here concern constructions with two transitive verbs but different objects. In the text corpus, this most often
follows one of two different patterns: (i) a repeated object with different verbs, and (ii) a repeated verb with different objects, or some combination of the two patterns. Example (29) is from the corpus and demonstrates two different verbs with identical objects:

(29) nuts’a’ skweyul ’i’ ne.e.em’ suwq’tus kwu smuyuth, t’uhwstuhwus kwu smuyuth.

Here the two verbs suw’q’t ‘search for it’ and t’uhwstuhw ‘bring it downhill’ represent two distinct events happening to the same object. DL said that this sentence did not make sense without the comma (28.12.22). When I attempted to merge these two events into one event of going out and getting deer, it was rejected:

(30) *ni’ nem’ suw’q’tus kwu smuyuth t’uhwstuhwus.

The problem with this example is that the verb suw’q’t ‘search for it’ does not entail finding the item being searched for. This has to be treated as two distinct events; one can conceptually understand that the subject found what they were looking for during some space in between the events in a sentence like (29), but an SVC cannot be used to describe something like this.

The corpus example in (31) provides another example of how the same object can be repeated across multiple verbs, and there is also repetition of the verb root.

(31) suw’ kwunutewut thhu swakwun, yu ’i’mush thhu swakwun, suw’ hwu kwun’et-s thhu’nilh thhu swakwun.

In this example there are three verbs, the features of which have been laid out in Table 5 below.
Verb | Valence | Argument(s) | Aspect
--- | --- | --- | ---
\( kʷənət \) | Passive | Subject: loon (overt NP) | Perfective
\( yə=ʔiməs \) | Intransitive | Subject: loon (overt NP) | Imperfective
\( xʷə=κʷənt-s \) | Transitive | Subject: 3SUB Object: loon (overt NP) | Durative

Table 5. Repetition linking clauses

Each verb in this example has its own arguments; all three verbs share the referent ‘the loon’ which is expressed each time as an overt NP. Each verb also has a different aspect; the first verb is perfective, the second is imperfective, and the third is durative. Serialized verbs are expected to match in terms of clausal categories such as tense, aspect, mood, and modality (Aikhenvald 2018:1). Thus, the shift in aspect, alongside repeated overt NP marking of ‘the loon’, is evidence that these should be treated as multiple clauses, rather than a single one.

The next set of examples in (32) and (33) represent identical verbs with different objects.

(32) tsusutus ‘uw’ ne’mus q’putum kw’ syal… thuytus thu shhwa’mut, thuytus kw’i s’etl’q.

cəs-ə-təs ?əw nəməs q̓ətəm kʷ syal… ətəs

tell-TR-3SUB CNJ go.3SUB gather-TR-PAS DT wood make.ready-TR-3SUB

tə ətəs kʷətəs kw’s q̓ətəs

‘And he told them to go and gather wood, make their beds, and do things outside.’

(32) ‘And he told them to go and gather wood, make their beds, and do things outside.’

(33) ’uwu sqiq’quq’us thhu hwulmuhw kws q’ayt-s kwthu stem s’ulhtuns.

?əwə sqiq’qəq’-əs tə xʷəlmax’
NEG bound.up-3SUB DT First.Nations.people

kws q’ayt-s kʷətəs stem sʔəltən-s

‘There was no law to stop the First Nations People from catching all the different kinds of food.’

q’aytus kwthu smuyuth, q’aytus thu kwewe’uts, q’aytus thu stseelhtun.

q’ayt-as kʷətəs sməyəθ q’ayt-as əθ kʷəweʔəc

‘They could kill the deer, kill the elk, kill different kinds of fish.’ (MG 1917-1919)

The examples in (32) and (33) demonstrate the qualities of lists discussed in Gerdts and Gilkison (2018). Their work focuses on NP coordinate structures expressed with and without the connective element ‘i’ ‘and, but, or’, which occurs between NPs, for example:
(34) thuyultstewut ’u tthu lhew’qum’ i’ tthu se’uq.
θəy-əlc-tewət ?ə tə ɬəwqəm ʔiʔ tə seʔəq
made-BEN-3SUB.PAS OBL DT mussel CN DT bracken.root
‘They then prepared for them mussels and roots of the bracken fern.’ (MJJ)
(Gerdts & Gilkison 2018: 5)

The NPs mussels and bracken roots represent a closed set, and the items conceptually form a coherent unit (Gerdt & Gilkison 2018: 5). In contrast, when the connective element is not used, the NPs represent an open list:

(35) mukw’ stem s’i’lhtun’s—smuyuth, kwewe’uts, spe’uth.
makʷ stem sʔiʔltəʔ-s sməʔəʔ kʷewcʔəc speʔəθ
all what food-3POS deer elk bear
‘They have everything to eat—deer, elk, bear.’ (ST) (Gerdt & Gilkison 2018: 6)

The NPs here represent an open list of exemplars, and the items are conceived of individually (Gerdt & Gilkison 2018: 6). Given this, (32) and (33), which have identical verbs with different objects and no linking elements, can also be treated as open lists of exemplars.

3. Conclusion. In SVCs, the verb components describe a single event (or very closely related subevents). The following table sums up the findings thus far for the syntactic and discourse factors that influence the why certain word orders with overt NPs do (not) occur in the corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TR-TR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>INT-TR</th>
<th>*2NP</th>
<th>Unamb.</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Unamb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VSOV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOVS</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVSO</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOVOS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSOV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOSV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Transitive word orders with overt NP arguments

VSVO is the only construction with overt NP arguments that does not fail any of the principles. If a construction fails PI (predicate-initial), it is ungrammatical and cannot be rescued. If a construction fails either *2NP (avoid adjacent NPs) or Unamb. (unambiguous), it is grammatical but unlikely to occur in natural speech. Ambiguous constructions can be rescued by means of a subject marking pro-determiner, but as rescuing an ambiguous construction likely requires additional effort, this does not happen often. Pro-determiners are more often used to rescue transitive constructions that violate the ONI condition (two cases of VSV in Table 2).

V1 determines the subcategorization for the construction because only an argument shared by both verb components may intervene between them. If V1 is intransitive (INT-INT and INT-TR) only the shared subject may occur between the verb components. In contrast, if V1 is transitive (TR-TR and TR-INT), either the shared subject (most common) or the shared object

8 Table key: ✓ grammatical, does not violate, * violates principle, *2NP – violated by two adjacent NPs, PI (predicate initial) – violated when object NP precede its predicate, Unamb. – violated when agent/patient roles are unclear.
(when the subject is zero) can occur between the verb components. For TR-INT, the intervening argument is the one serving as the object of V₂ and the subject of V₁.

Repetition of an object NP indicates a larger and less tight-knit clause structure than that of SVCs. In a repetition verb chain, the verb roots and/or the object arguments are repeated. Examples like (30) demonstrate that certain subevents cannot be combined to form an SVC. In contrast, if the subevents are close enough conceptually, they can be represented by either a repetition verb chain (36), or an SVC (37) with only very slight differences in meaning:

(36) ni’ thuytus thhu shuptun yuq’utus thhu shuptun thuw’nilh swiw’lus.

‘The young man prepared the knife, sharpened the knife.’ (DL 24.11.22)

(37) ni’ thuytus thhuw’nilh swiw’lus yuq’utus thhu shuptun.

‘The young man prepared, sharpened the knife.’ (DL 24.11.22)

While both of these constructions are grammatical, (36) gives a more separated sense, where the more general ‘prepare the knife’ is used first and then the concept is rephrased more specifically ‘sharpen the knife’. In contrast, (37) presents a more unified reading and it is clear that prepare and sharpen describe aspects of the same event. Pawley (2009: 139–140) describes a similar phenomenon in Kalam (ISO 639-3 kmh), where SVCs are a preferred option when the story-teller does not want to differentiate between stages of a composite action.

Similar to (36), two different verbs that share a subject but have different objects are also conceptualized as making up distinct events in (38).

(38) ni’ yuq’utus thhu shuptun thuytus thhu smuyuth thuw’nilh swiw’lus.

‘The young man sharpened the knife, prepared the deer (meat).’ (DL 24.11.22)

In this example, there is no repetition of verb root or object NP, and they are linked by the shared subject. It is clear that there are two distinct events: sharpening the knife and preparing the deer (meat). This type of construction will be treated as a verb chain, keeping with Schneider (2021).

Finally, there are cases where multiple verbs are used much like a list. In (34), for example, an identical form of the verb ‘kill it’ is repeated, each time with a different animal that was killed for food. In these cases, a verb is repeated in series with different object NPs that represent an open list of exemplars.

In sum, the paper investigated the word order of Hul’q’umi’num’ SVCs. Most often SVCs consist of two verbs, either intransitive or transitive. Constructions with three or more verbs are attested but have been set aside for now. For two-verb constructions with two overt NPs, an alternating VSVO pattern is preferred, and only shared arguments may intervene between the
verb components. Hul’q’umi’num’ SVCs exhibit remarkably flexible word order in elicitation, but certain grammatically possible word orders generate ambiguity. Various discourse and pragmatic strategies work together to prevent or rescue ambiguous constructions. SVCs are an understudied feature of Central Salish languages and so it is an important area of research in the subfield. The fact that Hul’q’umi’num’ is a synthetic, predicate-initial language, and yet exhibits non-contiguous SVCs with an alternating VSVO pattern is unexpected in light of generalizations made by current SVC literature, thus investigation of this topic also broadens the scope of the typology.
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