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ABSTRACT

This thesis focuses on describing the recipient construction of Naxi, a minority language spoken in the Naxi autonomous county in the northwestern Yunnan province of China. The Naxi language belongs to the Yi language branch of the Tibeto-Burman language family. It has been a matter of great importance to document Naxi in its entirety because it is seriously endangered.

This thesis is very special for the following two reasons. First, unlike most of the other subfields of linguistics, studying the grammar of an undocumented language cannot be done in a comfortable research room or in a library; it must be done in the field. Most of the Naxi data provided in this thesis were gathered directly from native speakers in the field. Second, this thesis not only provides a basic grammatical description of the recipient construction in the Naxi language, but it also includes pioneering.

The basic grammar is introduced in Chapter 2 before discussing the recipient construction. In our analysis, Naxi is an ergative language involving an active case marking system. Furthermore, Naxi is traditionally classified as an SOV or APV/SV language; however, certain traits show that it could be considered a 'free word order' language. We also found that structural topicalization in Naxi only occurs in the triadic constructions, including the instrumental construction, the benefactive construction, and the recipient construction.

In this thesis, the recipient construction is defined as “the triadic construction which involves the thematic role—recipient”. The recipient construction in Naxi consists of three different patterns: the ditransitive construction (or double object construction), the dative construction, and the GIVE serial verb construction. Each of them contains
three NPs: an agentive subject, a theme-object, and a recipient-object. We further discuss the verbs which occur in the recipient construction. We found that ditransitive verbs occur much less frequently in Naxi than do dative verbs or GIVE serial verbs. In addition, the semantic classifications among the ditransitive verbs, the dative verbs, and the GIVE serial verbs are different from one another. Those discussions are treated in Chapter 3, Chapter 4, and Chapter 5, respectively.

In this study, we also found an argument concerning the constituent ‘verb-GIVE’, mentioned in the last chapter. Some examples related to the syntactic property of the ‘verb-GIVE’ sequences in the ditransitive construction and the dative construction will be discussed briefly. It is doubtless that the ‘verb-GIVE’ sequence could be identified as either a serial verb pattern or a compound verb. However, a reasonable judgment will not be made in this thesis; this question is open to discussion.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Naxi\(^1\) is a minority language spoken in the Naxi autonomous county in the northwestern Yunnan province of China which has a population of approximately 240,000 (He 1986). The Naxi language is generally classified as belonging to the Yi\(^2\) language branch of the Tibeto-Burman language family. The Naxi language has been variously influenced in its phonology and syntactic structure by prolonged contact with Chinese (including Mandarin and other Chinese dialects), Tibetan (especially Kham Tibetan), and the Bai\(^3\) languages.

1.1 Naxi

The Naxi, a minority people with a long history of living mainly in the Northwestern Yunnan province, created and developed a hieroglyphic writing system called Dongba pictographs in the 13th century. The Naxi Dongba Script, a sutra in 500 volumes used by the Naxi shamans (called Dongba) and written in Dongba pictographs, has been recognized by international academic and cultural circles as a most invaluable human heritage. At present, there are still a few aged shamans and linguists who can read and write the Dongba Script word for word. This unique writing system is alive, but not for long. Because it takes over 15 years to become proficient in the Dongba Script, few Naxi want to learn it.

---

\(^1\) Naxi is also spelled Nakhi, Naqxi, Nasi or Nahi.
\(^2\) Yi (also called Lolo or Wu-man) is classified as Tibeto-Burman, with a population of 7 million distributed in the mountains of Southwest China.
\(^3\) The Bai language is usually classified as Tibeto-Burman. Most Bai speakers, numbering approximately 1.4 million, are distributed across the northwestern Yunnan province of China.
The Naxi language is a tonal\(^4\) Tibeto-Burman language of the Yi branch. It has been affected in various ways by contact with the larger populations of Han, Tibetan, and Bai speakers. In fact, many Naxi elders (over 60 years old) are bilingual with either Tibetan or Bai; in addition, most second-generation native speakers (between 18 and 59 years old) are bilingual with Mandarin. According to similarities and dissimilarities in phonology, vocabulary, and grammar, the Naxi language can be divided into two major dialect groups: the Western dialect and the Eastern dialect. The former is spoken by approximately 200,000 natives primarily living in the area extending north and west from Lijiang Town, one of the most beautiful ancient towns of China located in the shade of the Jade Dragon Mountain. The latter extends to the northeast of the Naxi autonomous county, with a population of approximately 40,000. According to He (1986) and Jiang's (1993) classification of Naxi dialects, the Western dialect is further divided into three accents, which are named based on their dialectal zones: 1) the Dayanzhen accent, 2) the Lijiang Plain accent, and 3) the Baoshanzhou accent. In addition, the Eastern dialect is also subcategorized into three accents: 1) the Yongning Plain accent\(^5\), 2) the Beiqu Plain accent, and 3) the Guabie accent. Dialectal difference between the two main dialects affects general intelligibility\(^6\). For example, the Yongning Plain accent is apparently not understood by Dayanzhen speakers. Currently, only five percent of Naxi children can

\(^{4}\) Naxi has four tones: a ‘high level’ tone, represented as \(\ddot{1}\); a ‘mid-level’ tone, represented as \(\ddot{1}\); a ‘low falling’ tone, represented as \(\ddot{4}\); and a ‘low raising’ tone, represented as \(\ddot{4}\) (He 1986: 10).

\(^{5}\) He (1986) poses that the Yongning Plain accent spoken by the Mosuo (or Moso) minority belongs to the Eastern dialect of Naxi. However, some linguists regard the Yongning Plain accent as a distinct language, named the “Mosuo” language. The Mosuo people are very famous for their special marriage system called “tisese”—“walking to and fro”.

\(^{6}\) Dialects are “subdivisions of languages (Crystal 2000: 114).” Generally, it is usually said that dialects are mutually intelligible; however, the ‘dialects’ of Naxi (Western dialect and Eastern dialect) are mutually unintelligible in their spoken form. We use the ‘dialects of Naxi’ because they share the same written form (Dongba pictographs).
speak Naxi; the rest tend to speak Mandarin as their mother language. The Naxi language is thus endangered.

1.2 Fieldwork

Due to the shortage of data existing literature, I had to conduct fieldwork in the Naxi autonomous county in order to collect first-hand data. The purpose of the fieldwork was to find out which triadic verbs can occur in the recipient construction, including the ditransitive construction, the dative construction, and the GIVE serial verb construction. From January 10, 2004 to July 28, 2004, totaling 200 days, I stayed in Lijiang Town and Kunming City in Yunnan province of China, investigating the Naxi language. Because all of my informants live in Kunming City, I spent five months there collecting data from them. The oldest informant was Jiren He (83 years old), the author of “Naxi Yu Jian Zhi” (Naxi Grammar) and the most famous Naxi linguist in China. The only female informant was Qinglian Zhao (34 years old); she works as a secretary for the Committee of Yunnan Minority languages. The third informant was Wanchuan He (33 years old); he is a lecturer teaching in the Department of Chinese Language and Literature in the College of Yunnan Police Officer. All of them speak the Western dialect of the Naxi language as a first language and Mandarin as a second language. This thesis does not represent any data of the Eastern dialect of the Naxi language.

1.3 Scope of Study

This thesis focuses on describing the recipient construction of Naxi. In this study, we define the recipient construction as “the triadic construction which involves the thematic role—recipient”. “Recipient” usually refers to the animate participant passively,

7 This statistic is based on my investigation in the Lijiang Primary School in May 2004.
even unwillingly, implicated by the happening or state expressed by the "verbs of transfer", such as give, send, mail, and so on. It is typically associated with the grammatical relation of the indirect object (also called dative object), as in (1). In sentence (1), the dative object Mary takes the recipient role.

(1) Recipient as an indirect object in English
   John mailed the letter to Mary.
   Direct object          Indirect object
   Recipient

In some languages, such as English and Mandarin Chinese, the recipient can be the primary object in the ditransitive construction in which neither of the objects occurs with an adposition or a dative case marker, as in (2). In sentence (2), the primary object Mary takes the recipient role; the other object is referred to as the secondary object (O'Grady 2004: 45).

(2) Recipient as a primary object in English
   John mailed Mary the letter.
   Primary object         Secondary object
   Recipient

Sometimes, the subject behaves as a recipient (Crystal 2000: 323), as in (3a). In (3a) the subject John takes the recipient role. In addition, some verbs, such as get and receive, must take a recipient subject, as in (3b). Note that such constructions involving the recipient subject will not be included or discussed in this study.

(3) a. Recipient as a subject in English (data from Crystal 2000: 323)
   John has seen a vision.
   Subject             Recipient

b. Recipient as a subject in English
   John received a ticket from Mary.
   Subject             Recipient
In this thesis, we note that the recipient construction in Naxi consists of three different constructions: 1) the ditransitive construction (or double object construction); 2) the dative construction; and 3) the GIVE serial verb construction. The ditransitive construction contains three NPs: an agentive subject; a theme-object; and a recipient-object. The theme-object normally precedes the recipient-object, as in (4). Note that the ergative case \(-nur\) is obligatorily used with the agentive subject.

\[(4) \text{ Ditransitive construction in Naxi} \]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Subject} & \text{Agent} & \text{Theme} & \text{Pri. Obj.} & \text{Sec. Obj.} & \text{Recip.} \\
\text{brother} & \text{Erg} & \text{flower} & \text{teacher} & \text{give} & \text{Perf} \\
\end{array}
\]

'Older brother gave the teacher flowers (as a present).'

The dative construction in Naxi also involves three NPs: an agentive subject; a theme-object; and a recipient-object. It has three types: in one, the recipient-object (or indirect object) marked by the dative case marker \(-t\) precedes the theme-object (or direct object); the ergative case \(-nur\) is overt, as in (5a). In the second type, the recipient-object also precedes the theme-object; but the ergative case \(-nur\) is covert, as in (5b). In the third type, the theme-object precedes the dative-marked recipient-object, and the ergative case \(-nur\) is marked for agentive subject obligatorily, as in (5c).

\[(5a) \text{ Dative construction: recipient-object preceding theme-object} \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{Subject} & \text{Agent} & \text{Employee} & \text{Dat} & \text{money} & \text{some} & \text{give} & \text{Perf} \\
\text{brother} & \text{Erg} & \text{teacher} & \text{Dat} & \text{money} & \text{some} & \text{give} & \text{Perf} \\
\end{array}
\]

'Older brother gave some money to the teacher.'

---

8 There is one exception that is still an unexplained puzzle—the ergative case \(-nur\) cannot be employed when the agentive subject is first person singular \(y\).

9 He (1985) defined \(se\) as a perfective aspect marker. It should be noted that Naxi does not have the past tense marker.
b. Dative construction: recipient-object preceding theme-object

Subject
Agent
Recipient
Theme

brother
teacher
Dat
money
some
give
Perf

Subject
Dir. Obj.
Indir. Obj.

Agent
Theme
Recipient

‘Elder brother gave some money to the teacher.’

c. Dative construction: theme-object preceding recipient-object

Subject
Agent
Recipient
Theme

brother
Erg
money
some
teacher
Dat
give
Perf

Subject
Indir. Obj.
Dir. Obj.

Agent
Recipient
Theme

‘Elder brother gave some money to the teacher.’

The GIVE serial verb construction involves three NPs (an agentive subject, a theme-object, and a recipient-object) and two verbs (a main verb and the verb \( \text{za}l \) ‘to give’). In the GIVE serial verb construction, the main verb precedes the verb \( \text{za}l \) ‘to give’; the recipient-object is placed between the main verb and \( \text{za}l \) ‘to give’, as in (6). In sentence (6), the main verb is \( \text{zy}l \) ‘to take’; the theme-object \( \text{ni}l \) ‘fish’ always precedes the recipient-object \( \text{su}\text{lt}\text{sul} \) ‘teacher’. Example (6) also shows that the GIVE serial verb construction has two types: in one, it does not involve the dative marker \(-\text{to}\)\(l\), as in (6a); in the other, it involves the dative marker \(-\text{to}\)\(l\), as in (6b).

(6) a. GIVE serial verb construction not involving dative marker \(-\text{to}\)\(l\)

Subject
Agent
Recipient
Theme

brother
Erg
fish
one
Cl
take
teacher
give
Perf

‘He took a fish (from someone) to the teacher.’

b. GIVE serial verb construction involving dative marker \(-\text{to}\)\(l\)

Subject
Agent
Recipient
Theme

brother
Erg
fish
one
Cl
take
teacher
Dat
give
Perf

‘He took a fish (from someone) to the teacher.’
Before discussing the recipient construction, we will provide the basic grammar in Chapter 2, including case, word order, transitivity, intransitivity, and structural topicalization.

1.4 Structure of the Thesis

In this section, we outline the structure of the remainder of this thesis.

In Chapter 2, we will introduce the basic grammar of Naxi, including case, word order, transitivity, intransitivity, and structural topicalization in the triadic constructions and the recipient construction.

In Chapter 3, we will consider primarily the syntactic and semantic characteristics of one of Naxi’s recipient constructions—the ditransitive construction. We will discuss the syntactic classification of ditransitive constructions. Some universal features of the ditransitive construction will be demonstrated. Also a discussion of Naxi’s ditransitive construction concerning cross-linguistic comparison will be provided. Finally, we will discuss semantic classifications of Naxi’s ditransitive verbs.

In Chapter 4, we will discuss some syntactic and semantic features in dative constructions. The definition of the dative construction will be clarified. Some characteristics of Naxi’s dative construction will be demonstrated. Naxi’s dative verbs and their semantic classifications will also be provided. Finally, we will compare Naxi’s dative verbs and ditransitive verbs with regard to semantics.

In Chapter 5, we will give a comprehensive account of Naxi’s GIVE serial constructions, including their syntactic and semantic nature; some defining features related to the GIVE serial construction will be included. We will also provide Naxi’s GIVE serial verbs and their semantic classifications. The comparison between
ditransitive verbs and the main verbs of the GIVE serial verb construction will also be discussed.

Finally, in Chapter 6, we will summarize the findings about Naxi's recipient construction in Naxi. Some questions of Naxi's recipient construction useful for further study will be briefly discussed.
CHAPTER 2
BASIC GRAMMAR IN NAXI

In this chapter, we will introduce the basic grammar of Naxi—case, word order, transitivity, intransitivity, and structural topicalization in the triadic constructions and the recipient construction—together with their notional and grammatical characteristics.

Case will be treated first in section 2.1, where we will show that Naxi is an ergative language involving an "active case marking system" (Dixon 1994). In addition, certain major cases, such as genitive, dative, locative, instrumental, benefactive, and focus will be demonstrated. In this chapter, we will also discuss the canonical word order APV/SV (Comrie 1978) and the non-canonical word order PAV/SV of Naxi in section 2.2. Also included in this chapter will be a discussion of transitivity and intransitivity in sections 2.3 and 2.4, respectively. Finally, in section 2.5, we will discuss some grammatical characteristics of the structural topicalization in Naxi’s triadic constructions and the recipient construction.

2.1 Case

"Syntactic case" usually refers to a marking system which indicates NPs’ grammatical relation in a sentence. In contrast, “semantic case” is used to encode NPs’ thematic roles within the sentence. In this section we will focus on syntactic case. Naxi’s case system will be demonstrated in section 2.1.1; other major cases will be discussed in section 2.1.2.

---

10 A predicate that takes three arguments is called triadic.
11 We took William O’Grady’s advice and analyzed Naxi as an ergative language involving an active case marking system.
2.1.1 Case System

In order to analyze the possible systems for case marking, it is very common for linguistic typologists to adopt the framework of three basic “semantico-syntactic roles”, termed S, A, and P, where S refers to the subject of an intransitive verb, A refers to the subject of a transitive verb, and P refers to the direct object of a transitive verb (Comrie 1978). Given this distinction of S, A, and P, there are four systems for grouping case (Croft 2003: 355): I) the nominative/accusative system; II) the ergative/absolutive system; III) the “all distinction system”; and IV) the “no distinction” system\textsuperscript{12}. It should be noted that Croft’s classification is based on the logical possibility of the case system; therefore, it does not contain a few unusual case systems, such as active system and split ergativity\textsuperscript{13}.

In System I, S and A involve the same case marker, while a different marker is used for P. This system is usually referred to as a nominative/accusative system in which the case that marks both S and A can be termed the nominative case, while the case that marks P alone is called the accusative case. A language involving System I is defined as an accusative language. For example, in Japanese, both S and A referred to as nominative employ the same case marker –\text{ga}, while P referred to as accusative uses the case marker –\text{o}, as in (1).


\text{Yumiko-ga} sono \
\text{kodomo-o} sikat-ta.
\text{Yumiko-Nom} that \text{child-Acc} scold-Pst

‘Yumiko scolded that child.’

\textsuperscript{12} Comrie (1978: 331) points out that there are five logically possible case marking systems. One of these systems which involves the same marker for both A and P and a different marker for S, seems not to occur as an attested case marking system.

\textsuperscript{13} A case system combining the ergative/absolutive and nominative/accusative case marking is called “split ergativity (O’Grady 2004:75)”. 
b. Intransitive verb in Japanese
Kodomo-ga it-ta.
child-Nom go-Pst
'The child went.'

In System II, S and P involve the same case marker, while a different marker is used for A. This system is known as an ergative/absolutive system in which the case that marks both S and P can be called the absolutive case, while the case that marks only A is called the ergative case. A language involving System II is defined as an ergative language. The following sentences provide examples: in Tongan, the subject (S) of an intransitive verb and the direct object (P) of a transitive verb referred to as absolutive use the same case marker 'a-', while the subject (A) of a transitive verb is marked by the case marker 'e-', as in (2).

(2) a. Transitive verb in Tongan (data from O'Grady 2004: 73)
Na'e ma'u 'e Tevita 'a e me'a'ofa.
Pst receive Erg David Abs the gift
'David received the gift.'

b. Intransitive verb in Tongan
Na'e alu 'a Tevita ki Fisi.
Pst go Abs David to Fiji
'David went to Fiji.'

System III, with three different case markers for S, A, and P, respectively, is relatively rare among the languages of the world. This case marking system is referred to as a three-way (or tripartite) system in which any case that marks S is the nominative case, any case that marks A is the ergative case, and any case that marks P is the accusative case (O'Grady 2004: 80). It is illustrated by the following examples. In

---

Antekerrepenhe (an Arandic language in Central Australia), the ergative case –le marks the subject (A) of a transitive verb; the accusative case –nhe marks the direct object (P) of a transitive verb; and the case for the subject (S) of an intransitive verb is nominative, which is morphologically unmarked, as in (3). Note that Dixon (1994) and O’Grady (2004) classify the three-way system as a subcategory of the ergative/absolutive system (System II).

(3) a. Transitive verb in Antekerrepenhe (data from O’Grady 2004: 80)
   Arengke-le aye-nhe ke-ke.
   dog-Erg me-Acc bite-Pst
   ‘The dog bit me.’

   b. Intransitive verb in Antekerrepenhe
   Arengke-Ø nterre-ke.
   dog-Nom run-Pst
   ‘The dog ran.’

In System IV, a single case marker (usually absence of case marking) is used for all three semantico-syntactic roles, S, A, and P. This type can be illustrated by Mandarin. There is no case marker that morphologically distinguish S, A, and P; none phrases are unmarked whether S, A, or P, as in (4).

(4) a. Transitive verb in Mandarin
   Zhangsan qin le Lisi.
   Name kiss Pst Name
   ‘Zhangsan kissed Lisi.’

   b. Intransitive verb in Mandarin
   Zhangsan lai le.
   Name come Pst
   ‘Zhangsan came.’

Following Dixon’s (1994) investigation of ergativity, we find that there are at least four case marking systems applied in the ergative languages: the ergative/absolutive system (System II), the three-way system (System III), the active system, and split
ergativity (see footnote 13 above). Naxi is classified as an ergative language involving the active (or agentive) case system. In Naxi, the subject (A) of a transitive verb and the subject of an unergative\textsuperscript{15} verb take the same case marker \textit{nw} called the ergative case, as in (5a) and (5b), while the direct object (P) of a transitive verb and the subject of an unaccusative\textsuperscript{16} verb marked by a zero \textit{Ø} called the absolutive case, as in (5a) and (5c). Note that both subjects in (5a) and (5b) have in common the fact that their referent is agentive; the object in (5a) and the subject in (5c) are alike in that their referent is theme-like.

(5) a. Transitive construction in Naxi

\begin{verbatim}
æþbvæl nuæ theöyæuæ Ø soæ neæ zæl.
\end{verbatim}

brother Erg book Abs study Prog Pcl

‘Elder brother is reading a book.’

b. Unergative intransitive in Naxi

\begin{verbatim}
æþbvæl nuæ ziæ neæ zæl
\end{verbatim}

brother Erg sleep Prog Pcl

‘Elder brother is sleeping.’

c. Unaccusative intransitive in Naxi

\begin{verbatim}
Xnuæ Ø guæ neæ zæl.
\end{verbatim}

rain Abs rain(v) Prog Pcl

‘It is raining.’

Another example shows Naxi’s case system illustrated in (6). In sentence (6), the subject (A) of a transitive verb and the subject of an unergative verb take the same case marker \textit{nw}, as in (6a) and (6b), while the direct object (P) of a transitive verb and the subject of an unaccusative verb marked by a zero \textit{Ø}, as in (6a), (6c), and (6d). Note that the sentence (6c) shows the example of the unaccusative sentence with an animate/human

\textsuperscript{15} Unergative is a term referring to intransitive verbs which have agent-like subjects.

\textsuperscript{16} Unaccusative is a term referring to intransitive verbs which have theme-like subjects.
subject, while the sentence (6d) is the unaccusative sentence that involves an inanimate/non-human subject.

(6) a. Transitive construction in Naxi (data from He 1986: 81)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Khu-} & \text{nu-} & \text{ci-} & \emptyset & \text{tsha-} & \text{kv-}.
\end{array}
\]

\begin{array}{l}
dog \quad \text{Erg} \quad \text{people} \quad \text{Abs} \quad \text{bite} \quad \text{can}
\end{array}

'Dog can bite people.'

b. Unergative intransitive in Naxi

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Khu-} & \text{nu-} & \text{lv-} & \text{ne-} & \text{zai-}.
\end{array}
\]

\begin{array}{l}
dog \quad \text{Erg} \quad \text{bark} \quad \text{Prog} \quad \text{Pcl}
\end{array}

'A dog is barking.'

c. Unaccusative intransitive with an animate/human subject

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{e-} & \emptyset & \text{ndo-} & \text{se-}.
\end{array}
\]

\begin{array}{l}
brother \quad \text{Abs} \quad \text{fall} \quad \text{Perf}
\end{array}

'Elder brother fell.'

d. Unaccusative intransitive with an inanimate/non-human subject

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{lv-} & \emptyset & \text{pi-} & \text{li-}.
\end{array}
\]

\begin{array}{l}
\text{stone} \quad \text{Abs} \quad \text{fall}
\end{array}

'A stone fall.'

As displayed in the following Table 2.1, Naxi involves an active system in which the ergative case marker \(-\text{nu-}\) marks the subjects of unergative verbs and the subjects of transitive verbs; the absolutive case marker \(-\emptyset\) marks the subjects of unaccusative verbs and the direct object of transitive verbs.

Table 2.1. Case in Naxi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Relation</th>
<th>Case Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Transitive Verb</td>
<td>(-\text{nu-}) (Ergative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Unergative Verb</td>
<td>(-\text{nu-}) (Ergative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Unaccusative Verb</td>
<td>(-\emptyset) (Absolutive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Object of Transitive Verb</td>
<td>(-\emptyset) (Absolutive)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2 summarizes the five types of case marking system we have illustrated in section 2.1.2, including the nominative/accusative system, the ergative/absolutive system, the three-way system, the no distinction system, and the active system.

Table 2.2. Five Types of Case Marking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Relation</th>
<th>Nom/Acc</th>
<th>Erg/Abs</th>
<th>3-way</th>
<th>No dist.</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subj. of Trans. Verb</td>
<td>X (Nom.)</td>
<td>X (Erg.)</td>
<td>X (Erg.)</td>
<td>X/Ø</td>
<td>X (Erg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. of Unerg. Verb</td>
<td>X (Nom.)</td>
<td>Y (Abs.)</td>
<td>Y (Nom.)</td>
<td>X/Ø</td>
<td>X (Erg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. of Unacc. Verb</td>
<td>X (Nom.)</td>
<td>Y (Abs.)</td>
<td>Y (Nom.)</td>
<td>X/Ø</td>
<td>Y (Abs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Obj. of Trans. Verb</td>
<td>Y (Acc.)</td>
<td>Y (Abs.)</td>
<td>Z (Acc.)</td>
<td>X/Ø</td>
<td>Y (Abs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.2 Other Major Cases

In addition to the ergative and absolutive cases, there are some other case forms in Naxi. In this section, we will briefly consider the following cases: 1) genitive, 2) dative, 3) locative, 4) instrumental, 5) benefactive, and 6) focus.

The genitive case signals some kind of dependent relationship, such as possession, between the head noun and another nominal category in the NP. Naxi’s genitive case is marked by the possessive marker \(-g\). It appears that the genitive-marked NP is most commonly associated with the thematic role possessor, as in (7a); furthermore there are other possible genitive-marked NPs, including theme, location, or time, as shown in (7b) to (7d), respectively. Note that Naxi’s genitive case is also used to mark the modifier, as in (7e).

(7) a. Genitive case marking a possessor

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{thul} & \text{g} & \text{ku-lmu} \\
\text{he} & \text{Gen} & \text{cap} \\
\text{Poss} & & \\
\text{‘his cap’}
\end{array}
\]
b. Genitive case marking a theme

\[ xu\]l\[ l\]e\[ l\] g\[ o\] \[ s\]\[ w\]n\[ l\]e  \\
cat  Gen  death \\
Theme  \\
‘cat’s death’

c. Genitive case marking a location

\[ zi\]g\[ v\]d\[ y\]h\[ l\] g\[ o\] \[ d\]\[ i\]n\[ l\] \\
Lijiang  Gen  house \\
Location  \\
‘Lijiang’s house’

d. Genitive case marking a time

\[ o\]ni\[ l\] g\[ o\] \[ m\]b\[ e\]l\[ d\] \\
yesterday  Gen  snow \\
Time  \\
‘yesterday’s snow’

e. Genitive case marking a modifier (data from He 1985: 94)

\[ k\]a\[ t\]s\[ i\]l g\[ o\] \[ b\]\[ w\]l\[ a\]l\[ d\]u\[ l\] \[ l\]v\[ l\] \\
clean  Gen  clothes  one  Cl \\
Modifier  \\
‘a clean clothes’

The dative case typically expresses the grammatical relationship of indirect object.

Naxi applies two different dative markers: one is \(-to\); the other is \(-t\)\[ w\]\[ l\]. For example, the dative case \(-to\) marks the indirect object (usually associated with the recipient) in the dative construction, as in (8a). However, dative case also marks the oblique (usually theme or goal) in the intransitive construction, as in (8b), (8c). In (8b), the oblique is associated with the theme; however in (8c), the oblique is associated with the goal.

Notice that, the oblique in sentence (8d) is referred to as either the theme or the goal because the sentence has ambiguous meaning. When the translation is “Elder brother shot a rabbit”, the oblique refers to the theme; if the sentence is translated as “Elder brother shot at a rabbit”, the oblique refers to the goal.
(8) a. Dative construction
\[ \text{brother} \text{ Erg} \text{ book} \text{ sister} \text{ Dat} \text{ give} \]
'Brother gave a book to sister.'

b. Intransitive construction
\[ \text{mother} \text{ Erg} \text{ he} \text{ Dat} \text{ teach} \text{ Exp} \]
'Mother has taught him.'

c. Intransitive construction
\[ \text{he} \text{ Dat} \text{ say} \text{ must} \]
'(You) must talk to him.'

d. Intransitive construction\(^17\)
\[ \text{brother} \text{ Erg} \text{ rabbit} \text{ Dat} \text{ shoot} \]
'Elder brother shot a rabbit.'

The other dative case \(-\text{toy}\) is used to mark the recipient or the goal, as in (9a) and (9b), respectively. Sentence (9b) is only translated as "Elder brother shot at a rabbit".

Note that the dative cases \(-\text{to}\) and \(-\text{toy}\) are not always interchangeable. The differences between the two will be discussed in section 4.2.

\(^17\) William O'Grady comments that sentence (8d) and (9b) could be antipassive constructions. Antipassivization is "an operation that applies to a transitive verb to downgrade the argument that would otherwise be the direct object by converting it into an oblique (O'Grady 2004: 124)". In this case, \(\text{tholfe}\) 'rabbit' is referred to as an oblique rather than a theme or a goal.

\(^18\) The verb \(\text{kha}\) 'to shoot' also behaves as a transitive verb, as the follows. The sentence (i) involves an absolutive marker \(-\text{O}\) added to the theme \(\text{tholfe}\) 'rabbit' with the transitive verb \(\text{kha}\) 'shoot'.

(i) Transitive construction
\[ \text{brother} \text{ Erg} \text{ rabbit} \text{ Abs} \text{ shoot} \]
'Elder brother shot a rabbit.'
(9) a. Locative/dative case marking a recipient

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{əl} & \text{bv} & \text{nw} & \text{gu} & \text{me} & \text{t} & \text{t} & \text{me} & \text{li} & \text{shy} & \text{t} \\
\text{brother} & \text{Erg} & \text{sister} & \text{Dat} & \text{money} & \text{some} & \text{repay} \\
\end{array}
\]

Recipient

‘Elder brother repaid some money to little sister.’

b. Intransitive construction

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{əl} & \text{bv} & \text{nw} & \text{t} & \text{li} & \text{le} & \text{shy} & \text{t} & \text{ki} & \text{hal} & \\
\text{brother} & \text{Erg} & \text{rabbit} & \text{Dat} & \text{shoot} \\
\end{array}
\]

Goal

*‘Elder brother shot a rabbit.’

‘Elder brother shot at a rabbit.’

The locative case is “primarily concerned with the expression of location, destination, source, and path (O’Grady 2004: 85)”. Naxi employs at least three locative case markers, –nu₁, –tey, and –to₇, which have to do with static location, directional movement, and source.

Like some ergative languages, Naxi’s locative marker –nu₁ is homophonic\(^{20}\) with its ergative case marker. The locative marker –nu₁ is used to mark the location, as in (10a), or the inanimate source, as in (10b). Note that the locative marker –nu₁ cannot co-occur with the ergative case –nu₁, as in (10c).

(10) a. Locative case marking a location

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{əl} & \text{bv} & \text{nw} & \text{z ét} & \text{ky} & \text{nu} & \text{t} & \text{ly} & \\
\text{brother} & \text{home} & \text{Loc} & \text{book} & \text{see} \\
\end{array}
\]

Agent Location Theme

‘Big brother read a book at home.’

\(^{19}\) When the asterisk appears before a translated sentence, it means Naxi cannot be interpreted into the demonstrated sentence.

\(^{20}\) Homophonic is “a term used in semantic analysis to refer to words (i.e. lexemes) which have the same pronunciation, but differ in meaning (Crystal 2000: 185)”.
b. Locative case marking an inanimate source (data from He 1985: 81)

Thudi zišt̪u tsmu.
he Kunming Loc come

Source

‘He came from Kunming.’

c. Locative case -nur1 co-occurring with the ergative case -nur1

*əlvv nl zek0l nul theyul lyl.
brother Erg home Loc book see

‘Big brother read a book at home.’

The second locative case suffix -təyt commonly marks the goal or the direction.

To my knowledge, most of the locative case markers in other languages do not occur with an animate goal; however, there are a few cases where Naxi’s locative -təyt does occur with an animate goal. For example, the locative marker -təyt in (11a) is associated with an inanimate goal pašt̪i ‘Beijing’, while (11b) involves an animate goal guime ‘little sister’ marked by -təyt.

(11) a. Locative case marking an inanimate goal

əlvv pašt̪i təyt ndzi.
brother Beijing Loc walk

Goal

‘Elder brother walked toward Beijing.’

b. Locative case marking an animate goal

əlvv nul guime təyt dzə.
brother Erg sister Loc run

Goal

‘Elder brother ran toward little sister.’

The third locative case -to17 is used to mark the source, as in (12a) and (12b).

Note that the to17-marked source is usually an animate participant.
(12) a. Locative case marking an animate source (data from He 1985: 82)

\[ \text{Thur} \quad \eta \quad \text{to} \quad \text{the} \quad \text{yu} \quad \text{so}. \]

he \quad Loc \quad book \quad learn

Source

'He learned the knowledge from me.'

b. Locative case marking an animate source

\[ \text{bv} \quad \text{nur} \quad \text{gu} \quad \text{me} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{tc} \quad \text{du} \quad \text{phao} \quad \text{ngao}. \]

brother \quad Erg \quad sister \quad Loc \quad chess \quad one \quad Cl \quad win

Source

? 'Elder brother won a game of chess from little sister.'

* 'Elder brother won a game of chess with little sister.'

The instrumental case marks a tool by which an agent accomplishes an action. By most accounts, the instrument must be non-human. As in some ergative languages, Naxi's instrument case –nur is marked by the homophonic case as its ergative. For example, in sentence (13a), the instrumental marker –nur marks the instrument su\text{lkv} 'sickle'. Notice that the instrumental marker –nur cannot co-occur with the ergative case –nur, as in (13b).

(13) a. Instrumental case

\[ \text{bv} \quad \text{su} \quad \text{lkv} \quad \text{nur} \quad \text{dze} \quad \text{khv}. \]

brother \quad sickle \quad Inst \quad wheat \quad cut

Agent \quad Instrument \quad Theme

'Elder brother cut wheat with a sickle.'

b. Instrumental case –nur co-occurring with the ergative case –nur

*\[ \text{bv} \quad \text{nur} \quad \text{su} \quad \text{lkv} \quad \text{nur} \quad \text{dze} \quad \text{khv}. \]

brother \quad Erg \quad sickle \quad Inst \quad wheat \quad cut

'Elder brother cut wheat with a sickle.'

The benefactive case is used to express the notion "on behalf of" or "for the benefit of" (Crystal 2000: 41). Naxi employs a benefactive case marker –ndzu\text{libet} to

\[ ^{21} \text{When the interrogation mark appears before a translated sentence, it means the translated sentence may be ungrammatical in English; but it does show the correct meaning in Naxi.} \]
mark the benefactive, as in (14). The benefactive construction in Naxi has three types.

In the first type, the benefactive-object marked by the benefactive marker –ndzu\textsubscript{1}be\textsubscript{1} precedes the theme-object; in addition, the ergative case –nur\textsubscript{1} is overt, as in (14a). In the second type, the benefactive-object also precedes the theme-object, but the ergative case –nur\textsubscript{1} is not employed. In the third type, the theme-object precedes the benefactive-marked object, and the ergative case –nur\textsubscript{1} is obligatorily used for agentive subject, as in (14c).

(14) a. Benefactive construction
\[
\text{\texttt{\textasciitilde1}lv\texttt{\textasciitilde} \texttt{nur\textasciitilde} \texttt{g\textasciitilde}me\textasciitilde \texttt{ndzu\textasciitilde{1}be\textasciitilde} \texttt{the\textasciitilde}\textasciitilde \texttt{du\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} \texttt{tsha\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} \texttt{x\textasciitilde}}. \\
\text{brother} \text{Erg} \text{sister} \text{Ben} \text{book} \text{one} \text{CI\textsuperscript{22} buy} \\
\text{Benefactive Theme} \\
\text{\textquote{Elder brother bought a book for little sister.}}
\]

b. Benefactive construction
\[
\text{\texttt{\textasciitilde1}lv\texttt{\textasciitilde} \texttt{g\textasciitilde}me\textasciitilde \texttt{ndzu\textasciitilde{1}be\textasciitilde} \texttt{the\textasciitilde}\textasciitilde \texttt{du\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} \texttt{tsha\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} \texttt{x\textasciitilde}}. \\
\text{brother sister Ben book one CI buy} \\
\text{Benefactive Theme} \\
\text{\textquote{Elder brother bought a book for little sister.}}
\]

c. Benefactive construction
\[
\text{\texttt{\textasciitilde1}lv\texttt{\textasciitilde} \texttt{nur\textasciitilde} \texttt{the\textasciitilde}\textasciitilde \texttt{du\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} \texttt{tsha\textasciitilde\textasciitilde} \texttt{g\textasciitilde}me\textasciitilde \texttt{ndzu\textasciitilde{1}be\textasciitilde} \texttt{x\textasciitilde}}. \\
\text{brother Erg book one CI sister Ben buy} \\
\text{Theme Benefactive} \\
\text{\textquote{Elder brother bought a book for little sister.}}
\]

The focus case –nur\textsubscript{1} is used to mark an identificational\textsuperscript{23} and contrastive\textsuperscript{24} focus in Naxi. According to the data we collected so far, the focus marker –nur\textsubscript{1} occurs in several constructions, including the unergative construction, as in (15a) and (15b); the

\textsuperscript{22} Naxi employs a classifier in NPs which involve numbers.

\textsuperscript{23} Kiss (1998: 245) points out that “an identificational focus represents a subset of contextually or situationally given elements for which the predicate phrase can potentially hold; it is identified as the exhaustive subset of this set for which the predicate phrase actually holds”.

\textsuperscript{24} Lambrecht (1994: 213) mentions that the contrastive focus can be elicited by yes/no questions. In general, the contrastive focus occurs in the strongly exhaustive answer sentence.
unaccusative construction, as in (15c); the locative construction, as in (15d); and the instrumental construction, as in (15e). Note that the focus constructions in Naxi are usually translated into the cleft sentences\textsuperscript{25} in English.

\begin{enumerate}
\item Focus case \textit{–nur\textdagger} in the unergative construction

\begin{verbatim}
əlvəl nər\textdagger  zə\dagger  nel  zə\dagger.
brother  Foc  laugh  Prog  Pcl
Focus
'It's elder brother (as opposed to others) who is laughing.'
\end{verbatim}

\item Focus case \textit{–nur\textdagger} in the unergative construction

\begin{verbatim}
Khər\textdagger  nər\textdagger  zə\dagger  sel\dagger.
dog  Foc  sleep  Perf
Focus
'It's the dog (as opposed to others) that has slept.'
\end{verbatim}

\item Focus case \textit{–nur\textdagger} in the unaccusative construction

\begin{verbatim}
əlvəl nər\textdagger  ndə\dagger  sel\dagger.
brother  Foc  fall  Perf
Focus
'It's elder brother (as opposed to others) who fell.'
\end{verbatim}

\item Focus case \textit{–nur\textdagger} in the locative construction

\begin{verbatim}
əlvəl nər\textdagger  zə\dagger  ko\dagger  tə\dagger  lyə\dagger.
brother  Foc  home  book  see
Focus
'It's elder brother (as opposed to others) who read books at home.'
\end{verbatim}

\item Focus case \textit{–nur\textdagger} in the instrumental construction

\begin{verbatim}
Suətsər\textdagger  nər\textdagger  tə\dagger  piə\dagger  tə\dagger  pə\dagger.
teacher  Foc  pencil  word  write
Focus
'It's the teacher (as opposed to others) who writes words with a pencil.'
\end{verbatim}

\end{enumerate}

It should be noted that inanimate subjects cannot be marked by the focus marker \textit{–nur\textdagger}, as in (16).

\textsuperscript{25} Cleft sentence refers to "a construction where a single clause has been divided into two separate sections, each with its own verb (Crystal 2000: 63)".
(16)  a. Focus case –nu₄ cannot mark the inanimate subject

*Xɔr⁴ nu₄ thv⁴ ne⁴ zɔ⁴.
wind Foc blow Prog Pcl
‘It's wind which is blowing.’

b. Focus case –nu₄ cannot mark the inanimate subject

*Thaⁿ nu₄ khɔ⁴ se⁴
bottle Foc break Perf
‘It’s the bottle (as opposed to others) which was broken.’

2.2 Word Order

Traditionally, it has been very common to describe Naxi’s word order using expressions such as “Naxi is an SOV language,” where “S” represents “subject,” “O” represents “object,” and “V” represents “verb” (Greenberg 1963). Most of Greenberg’s implicational universals tied to this constituent order are valid for Naxi. For example: Naxi’s adposition (or case marker) tends to follow an NP, and a PP always precedes a verb, as in (17a). Furthermore, the possessor commonly precedes a noun, as in (17b). In addition, Naxi prefers to place a subordinating conjunction after the clause, as in (17c).

In clause (17c), the subordinating conjunction is tsuɾiγw₄nu₄ ‘because’.

(17)  a. NP-postposition & PP-verb

Thuⁿ ziɾiγv cherche tʃey⁴ buɾ⁴.
he Lijiang Loc go NP P V
‘He went to Lijiang.’

b. Possessor-noun

Thuⁿ ɡe⁴ kurimun
he Gen hat Poss N
‘his hat’
Within a more recent framework of "semantico-syntactic roles (Comrie 1978)", Naxi, like all other languages of the area, both Tibeto-Burman and Indo-Aryan, is an APV/SV language. The following examples, (18a) and (18b), illustrate the three-way distinction among S, A, and P in two independent clause types: transitive and intransitive. It is probably safe to assume that Naxi is a language involving a fixed word order, because when the theme ιllo ‘granddad’ moves to a position to the left of the agent lvibre ‘grandson’, the intended meaning “grandson hit granddad” is unavailable, as in (18c). A change in NPs’ order in (18a) does affect interpretation, as in (18c). Notice that, the ergative marker -nuv is not employed in example (18).

(18) a. Transitive clause

lvibre ιllo la.

grandson granddad hit

A P V

‘Grandson hit granddad.’

b. Intransitive clause

ιllo za ne.

granddad laugh Prog

S V Pcl

‘Granddad is laughing.’

---

26 In his book of Naxi Yu Jian Zhi (Naxi Grammar), He (1985: 86) defined mv as a sentence-final modal particle.

27 To determine the basic constituent order of a language, most linguists would consider certain pragmatically neutral clauses rather than sentences.

28 He (1985) defined za as a sentence-final modal particle.
The above examples in (18) suggest that Naxi seems to behave as an APV/SV language; however, it does not show all the possibilities of Naxi's word order. The fact that example (18) does not employ the case marker -nu1 may impose restrictions on scrambling; therefore, we must consider the sentences in which their case marker -nu1 are overt. In fact, certain examples show that Naxi could be a language involving free word order, because its constituent orders are organized according to some principle, such as scrambling, other than grammatical relations, as in (19) and (20) below. Perhaps since "case provides a reliable way to distinguish between subjects and direct objects, there is no need to rely on word order to fulfill this function (O'Grady 2004: 71)", as in other languages that permit scrambling such as Japanese and Korean.

We found that Naxi is a free word order language in that it also allows the constituent order PAV/SV when the ergative marker -nu1 or the focus marker -nu1 is employed. When employing the ergative marker -nu1, the agent with the ergative marker can be scrambled. The clause (19a) exemplifies the canonical word order APV/SV, and the second clause (19b) exemplifies the non-canonical word order PAV/SV. Clause (19b) is derived from clause (19a) by means of scrambling. Note that

---

29 Scrambling is a term employed in the literature for a phenomenon called free word order (sometimes "flexible word order").

30 Non-canonical word order, as we use the term here, is equivalent to the notion of a consequence referred to as clause-internal scrambling, excluding long-distance scrambling and VP-internal scrambling.
the existence of the ergative marker \(-nur\) is required due to scrambling, therefore,

without the overt ergative marker \(-nur\), the scrambled sentence would be ungrammatical.

(19) a. Canonical word order APV/SV
\(\text{llv-lbv} \quad \text{nur} \quad \text{lllo} \quad \text{lal}\).
grandson  Erg  granddad  hit
A  P  V
‘A grandson hit a granddad.’

b. Non-canonical word order PAV/SV
\(\text{lllo} \quad \text{llv-lbv} \quad \text{nur} \quad \text{lal}\).
granddad  grandson  Erg  hit
P  A  V
‘A grandson hit a granddad.’

In addition, when employing the focus marker \(-nur\), the agent with the focus marker can be scrambled, as in (20). The first clause (20a) exemplifies the canonical word order APV/SV, and the second clause (20b) exemplifies the non-canonical word order PAV/SV, which involves successful clause-internal scrambling. The example shows that when the subject of clause (20a) involves a focus marker \(-nur\), the theme \(\text{pha\text{khur}}\) ‘wolf’ can scramble to a position preceding the agent \(\text{llv-lbv}\) ‘elder brother’, as in (20b).

(20) a. Canonical word order APV/SV
\(\text{llv-lbv} \quad \text{nur} \quad \text{pha\text{khur}} \quad \text{lal}\).
brother  Foc  wolf  hit
A  P  V
‘It’s elder brother (as opposed to others) who hit a wolf.’

b. Non-canonical word order PAV/SV
\(\text{pha\text{khur}} \quad \text{llv-lbv} \quad \text{nur} \quad \text{lal}\).
wolf  brother  Foc  hit
P  A  V
‘It’s elder brother (as opposed to others) who hit a wolf.’
2.3 Transitivity

Syntactically, a transitive verb in Naxi, as in all languages, refers to a verb which can take a direct object (Crystal: 1997:397). Structurally, Naxi's transitive constructions can be divided along the constituent order by means of the canonical and non-canonical word orders. In the canonical word order (APV/SV constituent order), the subject of the transitive verb has three types, as in (21). In pattern (21a), it does not employ the ergative marker –nuř1 for the subject. In contrast, pattern (21b) employs the ergative marker –nuř1 for the subject. Note that though pattern (21a) and pattern (21b) differ from each other syntactically and structurally; they are identical in semantics. In pattern (21c), the subject is a focus because it co-occurs with the focus marker –nuř1. Note that pattern (21b) and pattern (21c) are different in semantics because the focus in pattern (21c) must be identificational and contrastive.

(21) Transitive constructions in APV/SV order

\begin{itemize}
  \item[a.] Ergative marker –nuř1 is not employed
    \begin{tabular}{l}
      Subj. \quad \text{Dir. Obj.} \\
      Agent
    \end{tabular} \quad V
  \item[b.] Ergative marker –nuř1 is employed
    \begin{tabular}{l}
      Subj. \quad \text{nuř1} \quad \text{Dir. Obj.} \\
      Agent \quad \text{Erg}
    \end{tabular} \quad V
  \item[c.] Focus marker –nuř1 is employed
    \begin{tabular}{l}
      Subj. \quad \text{nuř1} \quad \text{Dir. Obj.} \\
      Focus \quad \text{Foc}
    \end{tabular} \quad V
\end{itemize}

In the non-canonical word order (PAV/SV constituent order), the subject of the transitive verb has two types, as in (22). Pattern (22a) employs an ergative marker

\[\text{31} \quad \text{The term 'transitive verb' is equivalent to monotransitive verb, which excludes ditransitive verb.}\]

\[\text{32} \quad \text{See more details about identificational and contrastive in footnote 23 and 24 above.}\]
-\textit{nur\textdagger}. Pattern (22a) is derived from sentence (21b) by means of scrambling. In pattern 
(22b), the subject is marked by an identificational and contrastive focus marker -\textit{nur\textdagger}.

Pattern (22b) is derived from pattern (21c) by means of scrambling.

(22) Transitive constructions in PAV/SV order

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Ergative marker -\textit{nur\textdagger} is employed and can be dropped  
\begin{tabular}{lll}
Dir. Obj. & Subj. & \textit{nur\textdagger} & V \\
Agent & Erg & & \\
\end{tabular}

\item b. Ergative marker -\textit{nur\textdagger} is employed but cannot be dropped  
\begin{tabular}{lll}
Dir. Obj. & Subj. & \textit{nur\textdagger} & V \\
Focus & Foc & & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{enumerate}

Semantically, the transitive event in Naxi involves a participant, the agent, performing a deliberate action that brings about a direct change of state in the other participant, the theme\textsuperscript{33}. Both participants are associated with some aspect of the effect with which the transitive event takes place (Hopper and Thompson 1980). In general, transitive verbs are specified for an agent and a theme, as in (23). In sentence (23a), the agent role is assigned to the human subject \textit{\textordmasculine}{1}Ja~\textordmasculine}'1', and the theme to the direct object \textit{nif}'fish'. Sentence (23b) involves the non-human subject \textit{z\textordmasculine}ur}'horse' which takes the agent role, and the theme is assigned to the direct object \textit{\textordmasculine}{1}i~'people'.

(23) a. Transitive construction in Naxi

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
\textit{\textordmasculine}{1} & \textit{nur\textdagger} & \textit{nif} & \textit{dur\textdagger} & \textit{me\textdagger} & \textit{ndzur\textdagger} & \textit{se\textdagger} \\
I & Erg & fish & one & Cl & eat & Perf \\
\end{tabular}

Subj. & Dir. Obj. & Agent & Theme

'I have eaten a fish.'

\textsuperscript{33} O'Grady (2004) defines 'theme' as "the entity undergoing the effect of an action or change". Some linguists use 'patient' to mean 'affected theme', other linguists considers that 'patient' can define the subject of state verbs, the subject of process verbs (Chafe 1970), and the direct object of process-action verbs (Teng 1972) in the transitive constructions.
b. Transitive construction in Naxi

\[ \text{horse} \quad \text{Erg} \quad \text{people} \quad \text{kick} \quad \text{can} \]

Subj.     Dir. Obj.       Agent        Theme

‘Horse can kick people.’

Transitive verbs have been semantically categorized by many linguists. For example, Chafe (1970) classified three different sub-categories of transitive verbs: action verbs define activities, both physical and mental; state verbs define quality and condition, and process verbs define change of state. Tsao (1996) classified the typical Chinese transitive verbs into action, experiential, and capacity. In this thesis, we mainly follow Chu’s (1998) classification; Naxi’s transitive verbs can thus be classified into five semantic classes: i) state verb, ii) activity verb, iii) semelfactive verb, iv) achievement verb, and v) accomplishment verb. Note that this terminology is ultimately adopted from Vendler (1967).

(i) A state verb refers to “a state that simply exists over a duration of time with no change or result involved”. For example: \( d\!y\!l \) ‘to have; to exist’, \( su\!l \) ‘to know’, \( s\!a\!l \) ‘to like,’ … and so on.

(ii) An activity verb refers to “an event that happens and lasts for some time” without any change or result. For example: \( l\!y\!l \) ‘to look’, \( s\!a\!l \) ‘to tell’, \( n\!d\!z\!u\!l \) ‘to eat,’ … and so on.

(iii) A semelfactive verb refers to “an event that happens but does not last for any discernible stretch of time” without any change or result. For example: \( t\!s\!h\!u\!l \) ‘to kick’, \( t\!c\!i\!l \) ‘to put,’ … and so on.
(iv) An achievement verb refers to “an event that happens but does not last for any discernible stretch of time,” “The event itself involves some change or result”. For example: *khəl* ‘to break’, *xərl* ‘to cut’, ... and so on.

(v) An accomplishment verb refers to “an event that happens and lasts for some time” with some change or result involved. For example: *tse* ‘to build’, *tər* ‘to cook’, ... and so on.

All the examples provided so far, including those in section 2.2, demonstrate the transitive constructions which involve two overt arguments: agent and theme. In the following data, we will demonstrate the transitive construction in which either the subject (agent) or the direct object (theme) is covert.

Example (24a) is a transitive construction that contains a null (invisible) subject, represented as [agent e]. Example (24b) is a transitive construction that involves a null direct object, represented as [theme e].

(24)  

a. Null subject (agent) in transitive construction  

[agent e]  z̄u-thu-se.  

wine drink Perf  

‘(Someone) drank wine.’

b. Null direct object (theme) in transitive construction  

[theme e]  sù-34 ndzu-se.  

I raw Mod eat Perf  

‘I ate (something) raw.’

2.4 Intransitivity

As defined by Hartmann and Stork (1970:108), an intransitive verb can make complete sense on its own without a direct object. As might be expected, Naxi’s

---

34 He (1985) defined –be1 as a modifier marker.
intransitive verb occurs in the constituent order type SV, where S is defined as “the only nominal argument of a monadic\(^{35}\) clause,” and “V” is referred to as a verb (Comrie 1978), as in (25). In sentence (25a), it employs an ergative marker \(-nuɛ\), while sentence (25b) does not employ any case. In sentence (25c), the focus marker \(-nuɛ\) is marked to the subject. Note that Naxi does not employ a dummy\(^{36}\) subject as the only argument in the intransitive construction, as in (25d). In addition, inanimate subjects cannot bear the ergative marker \(-nuɛ\) or the focus marker \(-nuɛ\), as shown in (25e) and (25f), respectively.

(25) a. Intransitive clause with an ergative case

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{brother} & \text{Erg} & \text{come} & \text{Pcl} \\
\text{S} & \text{V} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Elder brother came.’

b. Intransitive clause with no case

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{brother} & \text{come} & \text{Pcl} \\
\text{S} & \text{V} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Elder brother came.’

c. Intransitive clause with a focus case

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{brother} & \text{Foc} & \text{come} & \text{Pcl} \\
\text{S} & \text{V} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘It’s elder brother (as opposed to others) who came.’

d. Intransitive clause

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{rain} & \text{Abs} & \text{rain(v)} & \text{Prog} \\
\text{S} & \text{V} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘It is raining.’

\(^{35}\) Sometimes the intransitive verb is called ‘monadic’ (or monovalent) because it takes just one argument.

\(^{36}\) ‘Dummy’ is referred to an element which is semantically empty, for example: there in ‘there were many people at the club’; it in ‘it is raining’ (Crystal 2000:127).

\(^{37}\) He (1985) defined \(sia\) as a sentence-final modal particle.
e. Inanimate subject with the ergative marker –nuɾ\`l

\( *X\nu\`n uɾ\`l qur\`l ne\`l zəɾ\`l. \)

\text{ rain Erg rain(v) Prog Pcl}

‘It is raining.’

g. Inanimate subject with the focus marker –nuɾ\`l

\( *X\nu\`n uɾ\`l qur\`l ne\`l zəɾ\`l. \)

\text{ rain Foc rain(v) Prog Pcl}

‘It’s rain which is raining.’

An intransitive verb usually describes a property, state, or situation involving only one participant. There are two major types of intransitive verbs classified according to the semantic role of the subject: unergative verb (or agentive verb) and unaccusative verb (or patientive verb). The unergative type takes an agent-like subject, and it is characterized by an action involving the participant’s volition, as in (26a), while the unaccusative type takes a theme-like subject, and it is characterized by the fact that the action is not caused by the participant (Kevelson\(^{38}\) 1976:14), as in (26b).

(26) a. Unergative verb

\( e:\`l b\`v\`l uɾ\`l zə\`l ne\`l zəɾ\`l. \) (data from He 1985:97)

\text{ brother Erg laugh Prog Pcl}

\text{ Subject}

\text{ Agent-like}

‘Elder brother is laughing.’

g. Unaccusative verb

\( Xəɾ\`l \quad 0 \quad th\`v\`l ne\`l zəɾ\`l. \)

\text{ wind Abs blow Prog Pcl}

\text{ Subject}

\text{ Theme-like}

‘Wind is blowing.’

An intransitive construction usually involves only one participant; however, it sometimes involves other optional participants called obliques. Obliques typically refer

\(^{38}\) Kevelson (1976) used the term ‘ergative style’ and ‘intransitive style’ to denote the unergative verb and the unaccusative verb, respectively.
to nominals that lack a grammatical relation and oblique phrases consist of several
collectors that are neither subjects nor objects (O’Grady 2004: 45). Obliques are likely
to express location, direction, setting, purpose, time, and manner. Some obliques in
Naxi’s intransitive constructions occur with adpositions (or case markers), as in (27).
Sentence (27a) involves a dative marker -to7 and another participant, thu1 ‘he’, to form
an oblique phrase; sentence (27b) involves a locative marker -tcy7 and a location, pa7tc7
‘Beijing’, to form the oblique phrase.

(27) a. Oblique in the intransitive construction
øø7 nuv1 thu1 to1 §ø1.
I Erg he Dat talk
‘I talk to him.’

b. Oblique in the intransitive construction
ølv1 nuv1 pa7tc7 tcy1 ndzi1.
brother Erg Beijing Loc walk
‘Elder brother walked to/toward Beijing.’

Recall from Kevelson’s definition that the semantic difference between the
unergative verbs and the unaccusative verbs lies in the semantic role of the subject—an
agent-like role for unergative verbs and a theme-like role for unaccusative verbs. In the
section that follows, we will further discuss the difference between the two types in terms
of surface structure and grammatical relations. In general, the ergative marker -nuv1 in
the unergative construction is overt, as in (28a) and (28b). However, the unergative
construction also allows the null ergative marker -nuv1, as in (28c) and (28d). In this case,
we cannot deny if anyone argues that sentence (28c) and sentence (28d) involve the
absolutive case -Ø (zero). Therefore, this argument is open to discussion.
In contrast, the unaccusative construction syntactically applies the absolutive case –Ø (zero) used for the subject, as in (29a) and (29b). Note that the unaccusative construction does not allow the ergative marker –nuːl, as in (29c) and (29d).

(29) a. Unaccusative construction
    Xɔːrɪ Ø thvɪ neɬ zɔːɬ.
    wind Abs blow Prog Pcl
    ‘Wind is blowing.’

b. Unaccusative construction
   Thɔː Ø khɔl seɬ
   bottle Abs break Perf
   ‘Bottle was broken.’

c. Unaccusative construction with the ergative marker –nuːl
*Xɔːrɪ nuːl mbɔɬ thvɪ neɬ zɔːɬ.
wind Erg Cl blow Prog Pcl
‘Wind is blowing.’
d. Unaccusative construction with the ergative marker -\textit{nur} \textit{l}

\textit{Tha\textdagger} \textit{nu\textdagger} \textit{ly\textdagger} \textit{ko\textdagger} \textit{se\textdagger}.

bottle Erg Cl break Perf

‘Bottle was broken.’

2.5 **Structural Topicalization**

There are two major types of structural topicalization. In one the topicalized constituent must occur at the beginning of the sentence. The following examples are from Mandarin and Lahu, as shown in (30a) and (30b), respectively.

(30) a. Mandarin (data from Li and Thompson 1975: 462)

\textit{Nei-chang huo\textdagger} xìngkùì xìafang-duì lai \textit{de kuai}.  
that-Cl fire fortunate fire-brigade come Perf\textdagger quick

‘That fire (topic), fortunately the fire-brigade came quickly.’

b. Lahu (data from Li and Thompson 1975: 462)

\textit{He chi té pé?} s\textdagger dâ? já.
field this one Cl rice very good

‘This field (topic), the rice is very good.’

In the other major type of structural topicalization, the topicalized constituent is marked by a particular grammatical marker. Examples are from Korean and Lahu, as shown in (31a) and (31b), respectively. In sentence (31a), the structural topic \textit{siban} ‘the present time’ is marked by the topic suffix -\textit{in}, and in sentence (31b), the structural topic \textit{ho} ‘elephant’ is marked by the topic suffix -\textdagger-\textit{5}.

---

39 O’Grady (2004: 46) mentions that structural (or grammatical) topicalization is not absolute in contrast to semantic topicalization, because structural topics may also be semantic topics. Semantic topics can “refer simply to what the sentence is about”. Structural topics “are grammatically linked in a way that distinguishes them from other grammatical relations—either by positioning or by a particular grammatical marker”.

40 The underlined constituent in each sentence is the syntactic topic.

41 Li and Thompson (1975) defined \textit{de} as an adverbial particle.
(31) a. Korean (data from Li and Thompson 1975: 462)

Siban-in hakkjo ga manso.
now-Top school Nom many
'The present time (topic), there are many schools.'

b. Lahu (data from Li and Thompson 1975: 462)

Ho ṣ naqḥo yī ve yō.
elephant Top nose long Pel Decl
'Elephants' (topic), noses are long.'

Gundel (1988: 211) points out that the topic consists of both a pragmatic property, such as 'definiteness', and a structural property, such as morphological marking. We find that structural topicalization in Naxi consists of three primary characteristics: 1) moving a topicalized constituent to the sentence-initial position (Li and Thompson 1975: 465); 2) the topicalized constituent must be definite42 (Chafe 1975: 39); and 3) structural topicalization occurs in the triadic construction (including instrumental construction and benefactive construction) and the recipient construction43.

For example, Naxi's instrumental construction involves three arguments: an agent, an instrument, and a theme, as in (32a). After structural topicalization, the definite instrument su̍lkv-ιšhu-tšu̍l ‘this sickle’ appears in sentence-initial position, as in (32b). The instrumental su̍lkv ‘sickle’ is definite because it is modified by a demonstrative pronoun, tšhu̍l ‘this’. If the instrument is indefinite, it cannot be topicalized, as in (32c). Notice that the theme in the instrumental construction cannot be topicalized whether or not definite, as in (32d) and (32e).

42 Chafe (1975) defined 'definiteness' as a notion for the particular referent in which speakers have this referent in mind and speakers think listeners already know and can identify the referent. Some researchers, such as Li and Thompson (1976) and Fuller (1985), observed various languages and concluded that topics are necessarily definite.
43 Syntactically, the GIVE serial verb construction is not the triadic construction, because the main verb of the GIVE serial verb pattern takes an argument as the direct object, and the serial verb 'GIVE' takes another argument as the direct object. There is no predicate that can take three arguments in the GIVE serial verb construction.
(32) a. Instrumental construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>father</th>
<th>Erg</th>
<th>sickle</th>
<th>wheat</th>
<th>cut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

‘Father cut the wheat with a sickle.’

b. Definite instrument functioning as a topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sickle</th>
<th>this</th>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>father</th>
<th>Erg</th>
<th>wheat</th>
<th>cut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

‘Speaking of this sickle, father cut the wheat.’

c. Indefinite instrument cannot function as a topic

* | sickle | one | Cl    | father | Erg  | wheat | cut  |
|----|-------|-----|-------|--------|------|-------|------|

‘Speaking of a sickle, father cut the wheat.’

d. Definite theme cannot function as a topic

* | wheat | that | Cl    | father | Erg  | sickle | cut  |
|----|-------|------|-------|--------|------|--------|------|

‘Speaking of that pile of wheat, father cut with a sickle.’

e. Indefinite theme cannot function as a topic

* | wheat | one | Cl    | father | Erg  | sickle | cut  |
|----|-------|-----|-------|--------|------|--------|------|

‘Speaking of a pile of wheat, father cut with a sickle.’

Structural topicalization is found in the benefactive construction as well. There are three arguments used in Naxi’s benefactive construction: an agent, a benefactive, and a theme, as in (33a). After topicalization, the definite theme thelywtshuitsahi ‘this book’ appears in sentence-initial position, as in (33b). If the theme is indefinite, it cannot be topicalized, as in (33c). Notice that the benefactive cannot be topicalized whether or not definite, as in (33d) and (33e).

(33) a. Benefactive construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>brother</th>
<th>Erg</th>
<th>sister</th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>book</th>
<th>one</th>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>seek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

‘Elder brother sought a book for little sister.’
b. Definite theme functioning as a topic

*The*yu\l tshu\l tsha\l alv\l nuu\l gu\l me\l ndzu\l be\l gu\l.
book this CI brother Erg sister Ben seek

Topic Agent Benefactive

'Speaking of this book, elder brother sought for little sister.'

c. Indefinite theme cannot function as a topic

*The*yu\l du\l tsha\l alv\l nuu\l gu\l me\l ndzu\l be\l gu\l.
book one CI brother Erg sister Ben seek

'Speaking of a book, elder brother sought for little sister.'

d. Definite benefactive cannot function as a topic

*Gu\l me\l tshu\l kv\l ndzu\l be\l alv\l nuu\l the\l yu\l du\l tsha\l gu\l.
sister this CI Ben brother Erg book one CI seek

'Speaking of this little sister, elder brother sought a book for (her).'

e. Indefinite benefactive cannot function as a topic

*Gu\l me\l du\l kv\l ndzu\l be\l alv\l nuu\l the\l yu\l du\l tsha\l gu\l.
sister one CI Ben brother Erg book one CI seek

'Speaking of a little sister, elder brother sought a book for (her).'

In addition to the instrumental and the benefactive construction, structural
topicalization is also found in the recipient construction. Both the recipient and the
definite theme can be topicalized in the recipient construction. In the following examples,
sentences (34a) and (35a) show the original constituent word order in the ditransitive
construction and the dative construction, respectively. Sentence (34b) is nearly
equivalent to sentence (35b) in that both involve the structural topicalization in which the
recipient alv\l 'elder brother' is moved to sentence-initial position. Notice that, the
recipient is usually semantically definite; therefore, it does not necessarily employ the
demonstrative pronoun thu\l 'that', or tshu\l 'this'. Sentences (34c) and (35c) show that
the definite theme the\l yu\l tshu\l tsha\l 'this book' can be topicalized. However, if the
theme is indefinite, it cannot be topicalized, as in (34d) and (35d).
(34)  a. Ditransitive construction
\[ \text{father} \text{ Erg} \text{ book one } \text{ Cl} \text{ brother } \text{ give} \]
Agent Theme Recipient
'Father gave elder brother a book.'

b. Apparent recipient functioning as topic
\[ \text{brother} \text{ father} \text{ Erg} \text{ book one } \text{ Cl} \text{ give} \]
Topic Agent Theme
'Speaking of elder brother, father gave (him) a book.'

c. Definite theme functioning as topic
\[ \text{book this} \text{ Cl} \text{ father} \text{ Erg} \text{ brother } \text{ give} \]
Topic Agent Recipient
'Speaking of this book, father gave (it) to elder brother.'

d. Indefinite theme cannot function as topic
\[ * \text{book one} \text{ Cl} \text{ father} \text{ Erg} \text{ brother } \text{ give} \]
Topic Agent Recipient
'Speaking of a book, father gave (it) to elder brother.'

(35)  a. Dative construction
\[ \text{father} \text{ Erg} \text{ brother Dat book one } \text{ Cl} \text{ give} \]
Agent Recipient Theme
'Father gave a book to elder brother.'

b. Apparent recipient functioning as topic
\[ \text{brother Dat} \text{ father} \text{ Erg} \text{ book one } \text{ Cl} \text{ give} \]
Topic Agent Theme
'Speaking of elder brother, father gave (him) a book.'

c. Definite theme functioning as topic
\[ \text{book this} \text{ Cl} \text{ father} \text{ Erg} \text{ brother Dat } \text{ give} \]
Topic Agent Recipient
'Speaking of this book, father gave (it) to elder brother.'
d. Indefinite theme cannot function as a topic

*The~yud~ du~ tsha~ a~bø~ nu~ bøv~ to~ a.

book one Cl father Erg brother Dat give

Topic Agent Recipient

'Speaking of a book, father gave (it) to elder brother.'

In Naxi's GIVE serial verb construction, the recipient and the theme can be topicalized. Sentence (36a) shows the usual word order in the GIVE serial verb construction; the recipient-object ø/bøv ‘elder brother’ is located between the main verb ni~l ‘to lend’ and the serial verb a~bø ‘to give’. In sentence (36b), the topicalized-recipient ø/bøv ‘elder brother’ has been moved to the sentence-initial position. Sentence (36c) shows that the definite theme the~yud~tshu~tsha ‘this book’ can be topicalized. Note that if the theme is indefinite, it cannot be topicalized, as in (36d).

(36) a. GIVE serial construction

ø/bøv~ ni~ bøv~ a~bø~ the~yud~ du~ tsha~ ni~ a~bøv~ a.

father Erg book one Cl lend brother give

Agent Theme Recipient

'Father lent a book (from somewhere) to elder brother.'

b. Apparent recipient functioning as topic

ø/bøv~ ø/bøv~ ni~ bøv~ the~yud~ du~ tsha~ ni~ a~bøv~ a.

brother father Erg book one Cl lend give

Topic Agent Theme

'Speaking of elder brother, father lent a book (from somewhere to him).'</n

c. Definite theme functioning as topic

The~yud~ tshu~ tsha~ ø/bøv~ ni~ bøv~ a~bøv~ a.

book this Cl father Erg lend brother give

Topic Agent Recipient

'Speaking of this book, father lent (from somewhere) to elder brother.'

The constituent ni~bø ‘lend give’ refers to a serial verb in this example. It should be noted that the constituent ni~bø may be referred to as a compound verb. This argument will be explicated in chapter 6.2.
d. Indefinite theme cannot function as a topic

*The book 1 Cl father Erg lend elder brother give

‘Speaking of a book, father lent (from somewhere) to elder brother.’

Observation of the above examples (32) to (36) reveals that Naxi’s triadic constructions and the recipient construction employ structural topicalization in the following two ways: 1) the instrumental or the benefactive construction only allows one participant to be topicalized, specifically, instrument and theme, respectively; and 2) the recipient construction allows two participants to be topicalized, specifically, recipient and theme.

In the following discussion, we will demonstrate a topic-like construction used in Naxi. It was probably O’Grady (2004) who gave the apt name topic-like to a construction in casual spoken English such as the following:

(37) Topic-like construction

Hawaii, it’s a great place to live.

In sentence (37), ‘Hawaii’ is arguably functioning as a structural topic-like constituent. Such constructions are most natural when a pronoun, such as it, inside the sentence refers to the topicalized constituent (O’Grady 2004: 46). In Naxi, the topic-like construction applies a demonstrative pronoun thu‘that’, or tshu‘this’ referring to the topicalized constituent, usually an NP, as in (38), or a clause, as in (39). The boldfaced constituent in each sentence is the syntactic topic-like constituent.

(38) a. Topic-like construction

Thu he this/that where Loc come Ques

‘He, where did this one come from?’
b. Topic-like construction

\[ \text{Thun} \ t\text{shur} \ t\text{shu} \ z\text{i-gv} \ t\text{dy} \ c\text{i} \ u\text{a}. \]

he/she this/that Lijiang people be

'He/she, this person, is a Lijiang man/woman.'

(39) Topic-like construction

\[ \text{nv} \ b\text{a-la} \ m\text{a} \ m\text{u} \ t\text{shu} \ t\text{shu} \ t\text{chil} \ m\text{a} \ z\text{ar} \ l\text{a}? \]

you clothes not wear that/this cold not fear Ques

'You are not wearing clothes, this fact, does it not make you fear cold?'

In this chapter, we introduce basic grammar of Naxi, including case, word order, transitivity, intransitivity, and structural topicalization in the instrumental construction, the benefactive construction, and the recipient construction. With sufficient background knowledge, we can further begin to discuss the recipient construction in Chapter 3, Chapter 4, and Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 3
DITRANSITIVE CONSTRUCTION IN NAXI

In this chapter we will consider primarily the syntactic and semantic characteristics of ditransitive construction (or double object construction), one of the recipient constructions in Naxi. There is morphological variation from language to language in the ditransitive construction in terms of the case marker assigned to the objects and the affix on the verb. Therefore, we will discuss the syntactic classification of ditransitive constructions in section 3.1.1. Furthermore, some universal features of the ditransitive construction will be demonstrated in section 3.1.2.

Also included in this chapter is a discussion of Naxi’s ditransitive construction concerning cross-linguistic comparison in section 3.2. The characteristics of Naxi’s ditransitive construction will be provided; some constraints on Naxi’s ditransitive construction will be discussed. In section 3.3, several semantic classifications of ditransitive verbs will be introduced. We will also classify Naxi’s ditransitive verbs into seven semantic classes.

3.1 Types of Ditransitive Construction

Ditransitive construction requires two objects—one is usually associated with the recipient\(^{*}\), and the other is associated with the theme. In addition, the subject of the ditransitive construction must be a volitional agent\(^{46}\) (Goldberg 1995:143). According to the case assigned to the recipient and theme, ditransitive constructions can be divided into

\(^{45}\) We use “recipient” instead of “goal” because the recipient-object/goal-object must be an animate being in the ditransitive construction in Naxi. In such case, “recipient” is clearly more accurate than “goal”.

\(^{46}\) Yuko Otsuka comments that the subject of the ditransitive construction can be a non-volitional causer, as the following example:

(i) Heat gives me fatigue.
at least four categories. We will discuss the syntactic classification of ditransitive construction in section 3.1.1. Some universal features of ditransitive construction will be provided in section 3.1.2.

### 3.1.1 Classification

Ditransitive predicates permit "two NPs to have the characteristic form and/or positioning of direct objects (O’Grady 2004: 61)". Ditransitive predicates in the languages around the world can be found in four common syntactic environments: 1) ditransitive construction involves two case markers for objects; 2) ditransitive construction involves no morphological case for objects; 3) ditransitive construction involves only one case marker for an object; and 4) ditransitive construction involves a special affix on the verb.

The first type of ditransitive construction consists of two case-marked objects, a recipient-object and a theme-object. Both objects receive a morphological accusative case, as in (1a) and (1b). Example (1a) and (1b) are referred to as the "double accusative construction". Sentence (1a) shows that Korean uses the accusative case marker –ul to mark the recipient *haksayng* ‘student’ and the theme *chayk* ‘book’. Sentence (1b) shows that Modern Greek utilizes the accusative case for both recipient and theme.

(1) a. Ditransitive construction in Korean (data from O’Grady 2004: 61)
Mary-ka haksayng-tul-ul chayk-ul cwu-ess-ta
Mary-Nom student-PI-Ace book-Ace give-Pst-Decl
‘Mary gave the student books.’

b. Ditransitive construction in Modern Greek (Anagnostopoulou 2003: 10)
Dhidhaksa ta pedhia ghramatiki.
taught-1Sg the children.Acc grammar.Acc
‘I taught the children grammar.’
Anagnostopoulou (2003: 9-10) points out that Modern Greek presents three different ditransitive patterns. The first pattern, which involves the accusative case, marks both theme and goal (or recipient) as accusative; in addition, the sentence also introduces the preposition $s(e)$ ‘to’. In the second pattern, the goal bears the genitive case, while the theme is marked by the accusative case. In the third pattern, both goal and theme surface with the accusative case. Notice that, in this thesis, we treat Anagnostopoulou’s first pattern of ditransitive construction as dative construction in that it involves a preposition.

The second type of ditransitive construction assigns no morphological case for the recipient-object and the theme-object. Examples are from Mandarin, Danish, Thai, and Manam, as in (2). Sentence (2a), (2b), and (2c) shows that Mandarin, Danish, and Thai, respectively, involve two bare postverbal NPs, a recipient-object and a theme-object, in the ditransitive construction. In sentence (2d), the preverbal recipient-object and theme-object do not involve any morphological case. Note that the recipient precedes the theme in sentence (2a) and (2b), while the theme precedes the recipient in sentence (2c) and (2d).

(2) a. Ditransitive construction in Mandarin

Zhangsan  song  Lisi  yi  ben  shu.
Name  send  Name  one  Cl  book
Recipient  Theme

'Zhangsan sent Lisi a book.'

47 For example: (data from Anagnostopoulou 2003: 9)

(i) O Gianis estile to grama s-tin Maria.
The John-Nom sent-3Sg the letter-Ace to-the Mary-Ace
'John sent the letter to Mary.'

48 The Manam language is a member of the Oceanic language branch of the Austronesian language family spoken in the north coast of Papua New Guinea.
b. Ditransitive construction in Danish (data from Herslund 1986: 125)

Han sendte sin sekretær blomster.
he sent his secretary flowers

‘He sent his secretary flowers.’

c. Ditransitive construction in Thai

coon hây traa mærfi.
John give stamp Mary

‘John gave Mary a stamp.’

d. Ditransitive construction in Manam (Lichtenberk 1982: 264-265)

Tamoata nátu-0 marau-0 i-ti?in-di.
man child-his sister-his 3Sg-show-3Pl

‘The man showed his sister his children.’

The third type of ditransitive construction involves only one case marker for an object, usually the recipient-object. In Kham, a West Tibetan dialect, it uses an objective case marker -lai49 to mark the recipient-object, while the theme-object is unmarked, as in (3a). Note that only two of the three arguments agree with the ditransitive verb of Kham Tibetan; the theme-object remains unmarked, while the subject and recipient-object are marked for agreement on the verb. In Khasi, a language belonging to the Mon-Khmer language branch spoken in Eastern India, the recipient-object bears the objective case prefix ya–50, while the theme-object is unmarked, as in (3b).

49 Watters (2002: 225) points out that the suffix -lai can be a dative case marker borrowed from Nepali, as shown in the following:

(i) Dative case -lai borrowed from Nepali

ña-lai na-maya lagi-zya.
me-Dat 2S-love feels-Cont.

‘I feel love for you.’

50 Rabel (1961: 76) mentioned that the prefix ya– is usually omitted. Only in the double object construction, one of the objects is always preceded by ya–.
(3) a. Ditransitive construction in Kham Tibetan (data from Watters 2002: 248)
No-e ŋa-lai o-bönduk loi-na-ke-o.
he-Erg me-OBJ 3Sg-gun loan-me-Perf-3Sg
‘He loaned me his gun.’

b. Ditransitive construction in Khasi (Rabel 1961: 77)
ʔun hiikoy ya-ŋa ka ktien pharelŋ.
he teach Af-1Sg the language English
‘He teaches me English.’

The fourth type of ditransitive construction involves a special affix to the verb to indicate that it is a ditransitive predicate. Note that NPs are unmarked in this type crosslinguistically. Examples are from Indonesian and Tzotzil, a Mayan language of Mexico, as shown in (4a) and (4b), respectively. Sentence (4a) shows that Indonesian uses a benefactive suffix –kan in the ditransitive construction. In Tzotzil, the suffix –be requires a third argument bearing a variety of thematic roles, including recipient, benefactive, malefactive, addressee, and target (or goal). Without the suffix –be, the predicate takes at most two arguments (Aissen 1987: 106). Therefore, the suffix –be in sentence (4b) is used to indicate the third argument—recipient.

(4) a. Ditransitive construction in Indonesian (data from Dryer 1986: 811)
Saja mem-bawa-kan Ali surat itu.
I Tr-bring-Ben Ali letter the
‘I brought Ali the letter.’

b. Ditransitive construction in Tzotzil (data from O’Grady 2004: 61)
ʔi-o-h-čon-be čitom li šune.
Asp-3Sg-1Sg-sell-Af pig the Name
‘I sold Xun (the) pigs.’

In general, a language only applies one of the ditransitive patterns as shown above; however, a few languages use another ditransitive pattern which is exclusive of the above four types. As mentioned before, Modern Greek applies more than one strategy in terms
of the case assigned to objects in the ditransitive construction. Some ditransitive verbs take the double accusative case, as in (1b) above; other ditransitive verbs take a genitive case for the recipient-object and an accusative case for the theme-object, as in (5). In sentence (5), the recipient-object *Marias* ‘Mary’ is marked by the genitive case \(^{51}\) and the theme-object *grama* ‘letter’ by the accusative.

(5) Ditransitive construction in Modern Greek (data from Anagnostopoulou 2003: 9)

```
O Gianis estile tis *Marias* to *grama*.
the John-Nom sent-3Sg the Mary-Gen to letter-Acc

‘John sent Mary the letter.’
```

In addition to Modern Greek, Kham Tibetan also employs another ditransitive pattern. In Kham Tibetan, the recipient-object of some ditransitive verbs \(^{53}\) is commonly marked by the objective marker *-lai*, as in (3a) above. With the other class of ditransitive verbs \(^{54}\), the recipient-object is also marked by *-lai*; moreover, the verb must take an additional benefactive affix *-y*, as in (6a). The point to be made from (6a) and (6b) is that the ditransitive verb *satal* ‘to show’ must employ the benefactive affix *-y*, as in (6a); without *-y*, the sentence is ungrammatical, as in (6b).

(6) a. Ditransitive construction in Kham Tibetan (Watters 2002: 248)

```
No-e *ŋa-lai* o-bonduk *satal*-d-\(\text{-}y\)-ā-ke-o.
he-Erg me-OBJ 3Sg-gun show-Nf-Ben-1Sg-Perf-3Sg

‘He showed me his gun.’
```

\(^{51}\) Anagnostopoulou (2003) points out that Modern Greek has lost the morphological distinction between genitive and dative case marker, therefore, it has generalized the use of genitive case.

\(^{52}\) Anagnostopoulou's (2003) data show that case in Modern Greek is marked on nominals; however, according to O'Grady's (2004: 87) example, case is marked on determiners, as follows:

(i) Ditransitive construction in Modern Greek

```
eyo estila tu ju mu to fakelo.
I sent the. Gen son my the. Acc envelope

‘I sent my son the envelope.’
```

\(^{53}\) Watters (2002) defined these ditransitive verbs as “inherent ditransitive”.

\(^{54}\) Watters (2002) defined these ditransitive verbs as “derived ditransitive”.
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b. Without benefactive affix -y (data from Watters 2002: 248)

*No-e ṇa-lai o-bənduk sətəi-na-ke-o.
he-Erg me-OBJ 3Sg-gun show-me-Perf-3Sg

‘He showed me his gun.’

3.1.2 Other Characteristics of Ditransitive Construction

In most languages, an animate object of a ditransitive construction bear the recipient role; however, in a few languages, such as Kham Tibetan, an animate object can be either the recipient or the source. For example, sentence (7a) and (7b) involve the animate object which is associated with the recipient, while both sentence (8a) and (8b) involve the animate object which is associated with the source.

(7) a. Recipient-object in Kham Tibetan (data from Dryer 1986: 817)
No-e ṇa-lai bxhtangji ya-na-ke-o.
3Sg-Erg 1Sg-OBJ potato give-1Sg-Past-3Sg
Recipent
‘He gave me a potato.’

b. Recipient-object in Kham Tibetan (data from Watters 2002: 248)
Gaola-e ge-lai gukhi tubu tubu ya-si-ke-o.
shepherd-Erg us-OBJ guard-dog one one give-1PI-Perf-3Sg
Recipent
‘The shepherd gave us each a watchdog.’

(8) a. Source-object in Kham Tibetan (data from Watters 2002: 248)
No-e ṇa-lai ṇa-sulpa nəi-na-ke-o.
he-Erg me-OBJ 1Sg-pipe snatch-1Sg-Perf-3Sg
Source
‘He snatched my pipe away from me.’

b. Source-object in Kham Tibetan (data from Watters 2002: 248)
No-e ṇa-lai ṇa-bənduk los-na-ke-o.
he-Erg me-OBJ 1Sg-gun borrow-1Sg-Perf-3Sg
Source
‘He borrowed my gun from me.’

55 Goldberg (1995) points out that the animate object is either the recipient or the possessor, excluding the source. Ying-che Li also advocates that the central sense of the ditransitive construction should not include the source-object.
Another example is found in English. Goldberg (1989, 1992, and 1995) points out that the animate object in the English ditransitive construction usually corresponding to the recipient; however, there are a few exceptions. The verb *ask* is exceptional in expressions as follows: in sentence (9a) and (9b), the object *Sam* can be referred to as the source.

(9) a. Source-object in English
   Mary *asked Sam* his name.

   b. Source-object in English
   Mary *asked Sam* a favor.

Furthermore, within the Construction Grammar framework, Goldberg illustrates that the animate object can be the possessor in the ditransitive construction of English, as in (10a) and (10b).

(10) a. Possessor-object in English (data from Goldberg 1989: 81)
    She permitted *her students* one page of notes.

   b. Possessor-object in English (data from Goldberg 1989: 81)
    The doctor allowed *him* his voices.

Ditransitive construction generally has a “thematic paraphrase built around a transitive verb, with a single direct object and a dative or oblique NP” (O’Grady 2004: 61), as in (11). Sentence (11b) involves a preposition *to* to indicate the recipient-object, while sentence (11a) does not.

(11) a. English ditransitive construction
    John mailed Mary the letter.

   b. English dative construction
    John mailed the letter *to* Mary.

---

56 Notice that Goldberg only uses the term “source” for the subject but not for the object in the ditransitive construction. She advocates that the animate object in the ditransitive construction must be either the recipient or the possessor. The animate object *Sam* in sentence (9) refers to the possessor.

57 This is not always so. For example, Kham Tibetan has ditransitive construction; however, we cannot find a comparable synonymous dative construction.
Traditionally, generative linguists have suggested that the ditransitive construction and the dative construction share an underlying form, and that the former construction is syntactically derived from the latter one by a movement transformation (Chomsky 1955, 1975; Larson 1988). This operation is called “dative shift” or “dative alternation”. In this thesis, we do not use the term “dative shift” or “dative alternation” in that we do not want to support or reject their assumption that the ditransitive construction is syntactically derived from the dative construction.

It is probably safe to say that ditransitive constructions usually have a comparable synonymous dative construction, as shown in the following Korean examples:

(12) a. Ditransitive construction in Korean (repeat from (1a))
Mary-ka haksayng-tul-ul chayk-ul cwu-ess-ta
Mary-Nom student-Pl-Acc book-Acc give-Pst-Decl
‘Mary gave the student books.’

Mary-ka haksayng-tul-eykey chayk-ul cwu-ess-ta
Mary-Nom student-Pl-Dat book-Acc give-Pst-Decl
‘Mary gave books to the student.’

Sentence (12a) is semantically equivalent to sentence (12b)—in both, “the agent gives the theme to the recipient”. The difference between the two is that sentence (12a) employs an accusative marker –ul for the recipient, while sentence (12b) uses a dative marker –eykey to indicate the recipient. Among all of the examples provided so far, Kham Tibetan is the only exception in that its ditransitive constructions do not have comparable synonymous dative constructions.

Cross-linguistically, it has been observed that ditransitive constructions are relatively rare in two senses. First, they occur in comparatively few languages. They

58 They are from eleven languages: Danish, English, Indonesian, Khasi, Kham Tibetan, Korean, Manam, Mandarin, Modern Greek, Thai, and Tzotzil.
occur “in English but not in French\(^{59}\); in Korean but not in Japanese; and in Indonesian but not in Hawaiian (O’Grady 2004:62)”. Second, even in languages that permit ditransitive construction, only “relatively few verbs” can occur in the ditransitive construction (O’Grady 2004:62). For example, the verb *teach* in English can occur in the ditransitive construction, as in (13a); however, the verb *explain* cannot, as in (13b); the verb *explain* can only occur in the dative construction, as in (13c).

(13) a. ‘teach’ in ditransitive construction of English
I taught John Calculus.

b. ‘explain’ in ditransitive construction of English
*I explained* John Calculus.

c. ‘explain’ in dative construction of English
I explained Calculus to John.

In Mandarin, the verb *song* ‘to give as a present’ can occur in the ditransitive construction, as in (14a), while the verb *ji* ‘to send’ cannot, as in (14b). The verb *ji* ‘to send’ only occurs in the dative construction, as in (14c).

(14) a. *song* ‘give as a present’ in ditransitive construction of Mandarin
Zhangsan *song* Lisi yi ben shu.
Name give Name one Cl book
‘Zhangsan gave Lisi a book (as a present).’

b. *ji* ‘send’ in ditransitive construction of Mandarin
*Zhangsan *ji* Lisi yi ben shu.
Name send Name one Cl book
‘Zhangsan sent Lisi a book.’

c. *ji* ‘send’ in dative construction of Mandarin
Zhangsan *ji* yi ben shu gei Lisi.
Name send one Cl book to Name
‘Zhangsan sent a book to Lisi.’

\(^{59}\) Johnson (1980) argues that a few French verbs occur in the ditransitive construction under varying discourse circumstances.
### 3.2 Ditransitive Construction in Naxi

According to the classifications provided in section 3.1.1, Naxi’s ditransitive construction, like that in Mandarin, Danish, Thai, and Manam, involves no morphological case for objects\(^60\), as in (15).

(15) **Ditransitive construction in Naxi with no case marker**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Erg</th>
<th>Flower</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Perf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So-l ci-l nu-l ba-lba-l su-ltsu-l sie-l sel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>Erg</td>
<td>flower</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>Perf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'The student gave the teacher flowers (as a present).'

Cross-linguistic comparison makes it clear that Naxi’s ditransitive construction exhibits three distinct features in the surface structure and grammatical case marking: 1) the ergative case is used for agentive subject obligatorily; 2) two objects involve nonmorphological case; and 3) theme-object usually precedes recipient-object\(^61\). An example is shown in (16a). In a few cases, the recipient-object can precede the theme-object, as in (16b). In Naxi, a semantic constraint establishes a different between the recipient and the theme in the ditransitive construction; that is, the recipient is always a human-like argument, while the theme is usually non-human\(^62\).

(16) **a. The recipient-object follows the theme-object**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Erg</th>
<th>Flower</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Give</th>
<th>Perf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So-l ci-l nu-l ba-lba-l su-ltsu-l zo-l sel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Erg</td>
<td>Flower</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Give</td>
<td>Perf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'The student gave the teacher flowers.'

---

\(^60\) Someone may suggest that Naxi’s ditransitive construction is the double absolutive pattern in which both objects are marked by the absolutive case –Ø (zero).

\(^61\) In a few cases, the recipient-object can precede the theme-object.

\(^62\) In some languages, such as English, the theme can be a human-like object in the ditransitive construction, as in (i). Yuko Otsuka comments that the recipient can be a non-human object in English, as in (ii).

(i) John introduced my uncle *Mary*.

(ii) Someone gave the *book* a title.
b. The recipient-object precedes the theme-object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Primary Obj.</th>
<th>Secondary Obj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The student gave the teacher flowers.’

In Naxi’s ditransitive construction either object—or both—can be omitted under certain discourse conditions. However, the agentive subject must remain overt. Consider the following examples: sentence (17a) illustrates a null theme-object, represented here as [theme e], while sentence (17b) contains a null recipient-object, represented as [recipient e]. In sentence (17c), both recipient-object and theme-object are omitted. The agentive subject cannot be omitted, as in (17d). Note that the null agentive subject is represented as [agent e].

(17) a. A null theme-object

brother Erg sister give Perf
‘Elder brother gave little sister (something).’

b. A null recipient-object

brother Erg chicken one Cl give Perf
‘Elder brother gave (someone) a chicken.’

c. Both recipient-object and theme-object are null

brother Erg give Perf
‘Elder brother gave (someone) (something).’

d. A null agentive subject

* [agent e] chicken that/one Cl sister give Perf
‘(Someone) gave little sister that/one chicken.’

As mentioned before, the word order of ditransitive construction in Naxi has two types: one involves two overt objects in which the theme-object precedes the recipient-
object, and the other involves two overt objects in which the recipient-object precedes the theme-object. The first type is shown in examples (18a) and (18b), where the theme

*the-liyu* ‘book’ precedes the recipient *gu-lme* ‘little sister’, or *a-libv* ‘elder brother’. All

of Naxi’s ditransitive verbs can occur in this word order type.

(18) a. Word order: agent-theme-recipient

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{\textit{a-libv}} & \text{\textit{nu}} & \text{\textit{the-liyu}} & \text{\textit{du}} & \text{\textit{tsha}} & \text{\textit{gu-lme}} \ni.
\end{array}
\]

brother  Erg  book  one  Cl  sister  give

Agent  Theme  Recipient

‘Elder brother gave little sister a book.’

b. Word order: agent-theme-recipient

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{\textit{stu}} & \text{\textit{tsu}} & \text{\textit{the-liyu}} & \text{\textit{du}} & \text{\textit{tsha}} & \text{\textit{a-libv}} & \text{\textit{ni}} \ni.
\end{array}
\]

teacher  Erg  book  one  Cl  brother  lend

Agent  Recipient  Theme

‘The teacher lent elder brother a book.’

The second type occurs in two fixed syntactic conditions. In one condition, the recipient-object precedes the theme-object when the agentive subject is the first-person singular pronoun *\$e\$* ‘I’, as in (19a) and (19b). Note that it is still an unexplained puzzle why the ergative marker *-nu* can be covert when the subject of the ditransitive construction is first person singular *\$e\$* ‘I’, as in (19c) and (19d).

(19) a. Word order: agent-recipient-theme

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{\textit{\$e\$}} & \text{\textit{nu}} & \text{\textit{so\$e\$i}} & \text{\textit{the-liyu}} & \text{\textit{du}} & \text{\textit{tsha}} & \text{\textit{pu}} \ni.
\end{array}
\]

I  Erg  student  book  one  Cl  give

Agent  Recipient  Theme

‘I gave the student a book (as a present).’

b. Word order: agent-recipient-theme

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{\textit{\$e\$}} & \text{\textit{nu}} & \text{\textit{a-libv}} & \text{\textit{the-liyu}} & \text{\textit{du}} & \text{\textit{tsha}} & \text{\textit{ni}} \ni.
\end{array}
\]

I  Erg  brother  book  one  Cl  lend

Agent  Recipient  Theme

‘I lent elder brother a book.’
c. Word order: agent-recipient-theme

\[ \text{I gave the student a book.} \]

\[ \text{I gave the student a book (as a present).} \]

\[ \text{I lent elder brother a book.} \]

In the other condition, the recipient-object is allowed to precede the theme-object when the predicate is \( \text{zəl 'to give'} \), as in (20a) and (20b). It should be noted that the verb \( \text{zəl 'to give'} \) also occurs in the first word order type in which the theme-object precedes the recipient-object, as in (20c).

\[ (20) \]

a. Word order: agent-recipient-theme

\[ \text{brother Erg sister book one Cl give 'Elder brother gave little sister a book.'} \]

b. Word order: agent-recipient-theme

\[ \text{brother Erg I fish one Cl give 'Elder brother gave me a fish.'} \]

c. Word order: agent-theme-recipient (repeat from (18a))

\[ \text{brother Erg book one Cl sister give 'Elder brother gave little sister a book.'} \]

As already mentioned in Chapter 2, either the recipient or the definite theme can be topicalized in Naxi's ditransitive construction; see examples (32b) and (32c) in section.
2.5. Notice that the theme-topicalized sentence occurs with certain discourse settings in
that it needs to be definite when topicalized.

3.2.1 Constraints on Naxi’s Ditransitive Construction

There are at least one impossible situation and two constraints on Naxi’s
ditransitive constructions. First, Naxi’s ditransitive constructions cannot be passivized.
Second, Naxi’s ditransitive constructions do not allow a source-object. Third, Naxi’s
ditransitive constructions do not allow a benefactive-object.

Passivization is absent in Naxi; therefore, its ditransitive constructions cannot be
passivized. Some languages, such as English, apply passivization in the ditransitive
construction. For example, the passive sentence (21b) is derived from the ditransitive
sentence (21a). In sentence (21b), it downgrades the agent Harry and upgrades the
recipient Sam. Though passivization can be applied in the ditransitive constructions, it is
seldom used.

(21) a. Ditransitive construction in English
Harry sent Sam a note.

b. Passivization in English
Sam was sent a note by Harry.

As alluded to previously, ditransitive constructions in some languages, such as
Kham Tibetan and English, permit the animate object to refer to either the source or the
recipient. However, Naxi only allows a recipient-object, as in (22a); the source-object
only occurs in the oblique construction in which it carries a locative marker –to7 or
–tɛyv\(^{63}\) to indicate the source, as in (22b) and (22c), respectively.

\(^{63}\) As mentioned in section 2.1.2, Naxi applies two dative markers: –to7 and –tɛyv, which also function as
locative markers.
(22) a. Recipient-object in Naxi's ditransitive construction

\[ \text{bvt} \text{ tswt} \text{ hw} \text{ yw} \text{ tsha} \text{ dw} \text{ ni} \text{ tswt} \text{ nH} \text{ Erg} \text{ book one Cl teacher lend} \]

‘Elder brother lent the teacher a book.’

b. Source-object in Naxi's oblique construction (data from He 1985: 82)

\[ \text{to} \text{ stw} \text{ yw} \text{ so} \text{ loc} \text{ book learn} \text{ Source} \]

‘He learned the knowledge from me.’

c. Source-object in Naxi's oblique construction

\[ \text{bvt} \text{ tswt} \text{ t} \text{ yw} \text{ tshawt} \text{ yw} \text{ dm} \text{ tsha} \text{ ni} \text{ tswt} \text{ nH} \text{ Erg} \text{ teacher loc book one Cl lend} \]

‘Elder brother lent a book from the teacher.’

Finally, “benefactive double object construction (benefactive DOC)” (Levin 1993) involves the animate object corresponding to the benefactive. English, but not Naxi, does contain a number of verbs, such as bake, build, buy, and sing, which allow the benefactive DOC, as shown in (23a-d). In Naxi, it uses the marker -ndzwibel for the benefactive, as in (24).

(23) Benefactive DOC in English

a. Mary baked John a cake.

b. Uncle Joe built his son a treehouse.

c. My father bought me a toy.

d. Mary sang us an aria.

(24) Benefactive construction in Naxi

\[ \text{bvt} \text{ tswt} \text{ yw} \text{ tsha} \text{ dw} \text{ ndzwibel xae} \text{ Erg book one Cl teacher Ben buy} \]

‘Elder brother bought a book for the teacher.’
3.3 Ditransitive Verbs in Naxi

Several researchers have tried to list the major semantic verb classes allowing the ditransitive construction and/or dative alternation in English (Gropen et al. 1989, Levin 1993, Goldberg 1995). According to Gropen's (1989: 213) analyses, ditransitive verbs which occur in children's speech can be classified into nine subcategories: 1) giving; 2) type of communication; 3) creation; 4) obtaining; 5) directed accompanied motion; 6) sending; 7) ballistic motion; 8) manner of accompanied motion; and 9) other benefactive. Note that Gropen's data show that some subcategories do not contain ditransitive examples because those ditransitive verbs do not emerge in children's speech.

Levin (1993) proposes that three-place predicates, including ditransitive, dative, and benefactive predicates, in English can be classified into twenty-eight major semantic classes, providing a semantic explanation for the differences between predicates “allowing dative alternation”, those “allowing only dative construction”, and those “allowing only double object constructions”, as shown in Table 3.1. Levin's classification of ditransitive verbs is based upon two assumptions: 1) ditransitive verbs involve ditransitive predicates and benefactive predicates, and 2) some ditransitive verbs permit dative alternation.

Table 3.1 Levin's Classification for Ditransitive, Dative, and Benefactive Predicates

a. Ditransitive predicates permitting dative alternation:
   - Give verb: feed, give, lease, lend, pay, refund, repay, sell..., etc.
   - Verb of future having: allot, offer, promise..., etc.
   - Bring and take: bring, and take.
   - Send verb: forward, mail, send..., etc.
   - Slide verb: bounce, float, roll, and slide.

---

Gropen (1989) use the term “double-object dative construction” to refer the ditransitive construction.
Carry verb: carry, kick, pull, push..., etc.
Verb of throwing: hit, pass, pitch, throw..., etc.
Verb of transfer of a message: ask, cite, read, show, teach, tell..., etc.
Verb of instrument of communication: email, fax, sign, wire..., etc.

b. Dative predicates which do not permit dative alternation:
   Primarily Latinate verb: recommend, reimburse, return, submit..., etc.
   Say verb: report, reveal, say..., etc.
   Verb of manner of speaking: call, hiss, moan, mutter, yell..., etc.
   Verb of putting with a specified direction: drop, lift, lower, raise..., etc.
   Verb of fulfilling: issue, provide, supply, trust..., etc.

c. Ditransitive predicates which do not permit dative alternation:
   Bill verb: bill, charge, save, tax, tip..., etc.
   Appoint verb: appoint, consider, crown, nominate, report, want..., etc.
   Dub verb: baptize, call, crow, dub, name, pronounce..., etc.
   Declare verb: believe, confess, find, prove..., etc.
   Others: ask, cost, deny, forbid, forgive, wish, write..., etc.

d. Benefactive predicates permitting dative alternation:
   Build verb: build, cut, develop, make, sew..., etc.
   Create verb: design, dig, mint..., etc.
   Prepare verb: bake, cook, toast, wash..., etc.
   Verb of performance: dance, paint, sing..., etc.
   Get verb: buy, catch, cash, choose, keep, order, vote, reserve, win..., etc.

e. Benefactive predicates which do not permit dative alternation:
   Obtain verb: accept, borrow, select, obtain..., etc.
   Verb of selection: designate, favor, indicate, prefer, select..., etc.
   Create verb: create, invent, form..., etc.
   Steal verb: capture, kidnap, steal..., etc.

Working within the Construction Grammar framework, Goldberg (1995) provides a description of English ditransitive verbs and shows that ditransitive verbs can interact with some systematic metaphors, including a central sense and five major classes of extensions, as shown in Table 3.2. Her hypothesis is that English ditransitive constructions can be viewed as a case of “constructional polysemy”; that is, the same
syntactic form, “Subj. Verb Obj1 Obj2”, is paired with different but related semantic senses.

Table 3.2 Goldberg’s Classification for Ditransitive Predicates

a. Central Sense: Subj. (successfully) causes Obj1 to receive Obj2
   Subject: agent, causer, source
   Object1: recipient (prototypically willing)
   Object2: theme
   Example: Joe gave Bill an apple.
   Joe handed Bill a slip.
   Joe took Bill a package.
   Sample verbs: feed, award, issue, pay, serve, loan, bring, leave, sell..., etc.

b. Metaphor 1: Subj. intends to cause Obj1 to receive Obj2
   Subject: agent, causer, source
   Object1: potential (willing) recipient
   Object2: potential theme
   Example: Joe baked Sam a cake.
   Joe knitted Sam a sweater.
   Joe got Sam flowers.
   Sample verbs: draw, paint, save, grab..., etc.

c. Metaphor 2: satisfaction condition implied: Subj. causes Obj1 to receive Obj2
   Subject: agent, causer
   Object1: potential (willing) recipient
   Object2: potential theme
   Example: Pat promised Chris a car.
   Pat guaranteed Chris the prize.
   Pat ordered Chris a sandwich.
   Sample verbs: promise, guarantee, order, owe, wish..., etc.

d. Metaphor 3: Subj. enables Obj1 to receive Obj2
   Subject: agent, enabler
   Object1: potential (willing) recipient
   Object2: potential theme
   Example: She permitted Billy one candy bar.
   He allowed his daughter a Popsicle.
   He offered her an apple.
   Sample verbs: permit, allow, offer..., etc.

e. Metaphor 4: Subj. enables Obj1 to have Obj2
   Subject: agent, enabler
   Object1: willing possessor
Object2: possessed entity
Example: She permitted her students one page of notes.
The doctor allowed him his voices.
Sample verbs: permit, allow..., etc.

f. Metaphor 5: Subject causes Obj1 not to receive Obj2
Subject: agent, causer
Object1: potential (willing) recipient
Object2: potential theme
Example: Harry refused Bob a raise in salary.
His mother denied Billy a birthday cake.
Sample verbs: refuse, deny..., etc.

Some Chinese scholars, such as Ma (1992) and Tsao (1996), classified ditransitive verbs in Mandarin. Tsao’s classification consists of three major categories: 1) verb of transaction, 2) verb of communication, and 3) idiomatic expression. The category of “verb of transaction” can be divided into three subcategories: “give verb”, “take verb”, and “bi-directional verb”, as shown in Table 3.3. Tsao’s assumption does not distinguish between ditransitive construction and dative construction. According to Tsao’s definition, the triadic construction involving the preposition gei ‘to’ is also referred to as the ditransitive construction.

Table 3.3 Tsao’s Classification for Mandarin Ditransitives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Verb of transaction:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (i) Give verb: song ‘give as a present’, gongji ‘provide’, gei ‘give’, huan ‘return’…. etc. | Wo song ni yi-ben shu.
I give you one-CI book
‘I gave you a book (as a present).’ |
he rob-Pst you very much money |
‘He robbed you of a lot of money.’

(iii) Bi-directional verb: zu ‘rent’, jie ‘borrow/lend’, fen ‘share’..., etc.
Example:
Ta zu wo fangzi.
he rent I house
‘He rented me a house.’ or ‘He rented a house from me.’

Example:
Ta jiao wo Riwen.
he teach I Japanese
‘He teaches me Japanese.’

c. Idiomatic expression: bang...mang ‘help’, kai...wanxiao ‘play joke with’, fang...yima ‘let someone off’..., etc.
Example:
Wo bang-le ta hen duo mang.
I help-Pst he very much trouble
‘I helped him a great deal.’

Naxi has 41 ditransitive verbs, as shown in Table 3.4. Among these verbs, 11 are borrowed from modern Mandarin: bo ‘to appropriate funds for’; fa ‘to hand out’; po ‘to wrap up’; pa ‘tka ‘to report’; pv ‘to change money’; sie ‘to present to higher level’; thue ‘to turn back; return’; te ‘to pay; to hand in’; thue ‘to inform; to notify’; thue ‘to recommend’; and zu ‘to count; to measure’ (Nos. 31-41).

Table 3.4 Ditransitive verbs in Naxi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ditransitive verbs</th>
<th>English glossary</th>
<th>Mandarin glossary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>kua↓</td>
<td>to cheat; to lie</td>
<td>pian↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>ku↓</td>
<td>to hand over</td>
<td>jiao↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>ku↑</td>
<td>to deliver</td>
<td>chuan↓di↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>kua↓</td>
<td>to slander</td>
<td>gao↓zhuang↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>ku↓ku↓</td>
<td>to bribe</td>
<td>hu↓lu↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
06 ka1 to rent out zu1
07 ka1ka1 to conceal man1
08 ko to spoon up liquid yao65
09 khu:idu1 to praise cheng6zan1
10 le:ku to return huan1
11 le:tshy1 to repay a debt huan1zai1
12 mby1 to allot fen1; fen1pe1 jiao1
13 mel to teach wen1
14 mildo1 to ask jie1
15 ni1 to lend be1
16 ni1 to wire money dian4hui1
17 o1 to pour liquid dao1
18 pul to give as a gift song1
19 phi1 to lose (a game) shu1
20 pa:pa1 to carry on the shoulder be1
21 sa1 to tell; to answer gao1su1
22 shu1 to seek zhao
23 sa1 to bestow (money) shang (qian1)
24 tsyl to save (money); to keep liu1
25 tshyl to repay (money) pe1
26 tshur1 to kick (a ball) ti1
27 tchi1 to sell mai1
28 æ1 to owe qian1
29 ñu1 to buy/sell on credit she1
30 zol to give gei
31 bol to appropriate funds for bol (kuan)
32 fa1 to hand out fa1
33 po1 to wrap up bao1
34 pa1ka1 to report bao1gao1
35 pv1 to give change bu (ling1)
36 sie1 to present to higher level xian4gei
37 thue1 to turn back; return tui1
38 tca1 to hand in; to pay jiao
39 tho:tshu1 to inform; to notify tong1zhi1
40 thue:tcen1 to recommend tui1ju; tui1jian1
41 zha1 to count; to measure suan1

65 The pitch of the unmarked tone in Mandarin is 324.
We found that the four different approaches provided above are unsuitable for classifying Naxi's ditransitives. For example, Gropen's classification only focuses on children's speech; Levin’s classification contains benefactive-object; Goldberg's classification includes possessor-object; and Tsao’s classification has no distinction between ditransitive construction and dative construction. In this case, we only select suitable ideas from them; most terms are adopted from Levin, but the term 'take verbs' is from Tsao. Naxi’s ditransitive verbs are thus classified as the following eight semantic classes: 1) give verbs; 2) take verbs; 3) verbs of future having; 4) verbs of transfer of a message; 5) say verbs; 6) carry verbs; 7) prepare verbs, and 8) other verbs, as shown in Table 3.5. Note that the following semantic definition in each class is based mainly on Anagnostopoulou (2003:12).

Table 3.5 Classification of Naxi’s Ditransitive Verbs

1. Give verbs: “verbs that inherently signify acts of giving”; ‘outward’ motion

   - bo| ‘to appropriate funds for’
   - ku| ‘to hand over’
   - za ‘to give’
   - ku‘kum ‘to bribe’
   - ka ‘to rent out’
   - le‘kum ‘to return’
   - pu ‘to give as a gift’
   - le‘shy ‘to repay a debt’
   - ni ‘to lend’
   - ni ‘to wire money’
   - pu ‘to give change’
   - sie ‘to present to higher level’
   - trphi ‘to sell’
   - Sce ‘to bestow (money)’
   - thue ‘to turn back; return’
   - tshy ‘to repay (money)’
   - trpa ‘to hand in; to pay’
   - UgU ‘to buy/sell on credit’
   - phil ‘to lose (a game)’

2. Take verbs: verbs of causation of accompanied motion in an ‘inward’ direction

   - kua ‘to cheat; to lie’
   - ka‘ka ‘to conceal’
   - a ‘to owe’
   - mi‘do ‘to ask’
   - tshy ‘to save (money); to keep’

3. Verbs of future having: “verbs denoting a commitment that a person will have something at some later point”

   - fa ‘to hand out’
   - mby ‘to allot’

---

66 Though take verbs occur in Naxi’s ditransitive construction syntactically; the take verbs, in fact, cannot involve the recipient role semantically. If we continue this research, we will define a semantic field to filter them out.
4. Verbs of transfer of a message: “verbs of communicated message”
   *meɺ* ‘to teach’; *thueɺteɺw* ‘to recommend’; *thoɺςuɺ* ‘to inform; to notify’;

5. Say verbs: “verbs of communication of propositions and propositional attitudes”
   *kuav* ‘to slander’; *khurɺdaw* ‘to praise’; *paɺkaɺ* ‘to report’;
   *ɺɺɺ* ‘to tell; to answer’;

6. Carry verbs: verbs of delivery
   *paɺpaɺ* ‘to carry on the shoulder’; *kuɺ* ‘to deliver’;

7. Prepare verbs: verbs of cooking and meal
   *koɺ* ‘to spoon up liquid’; *oɺ* ‘to pour liquid’; *poɺ* ‘to wrap up’;

8. Other verbs: verbs from various classes
   *suɺ* ‘to seek’; *tshur* ‘to kick (a ball)’; *zuɺ* ‘to count; to measure’;
CHAPTER 4

DATIVE CONSTRUCTION IN NAXI

In this chapter we will discuss some syntactic and semantic features in dative constructions. Section 4.1 proposes a definition of the dative construction. Syntactically, the dative construction involves a dative marker or adposition (the latter consists of a preposition or a postposition) to mark the indirect object.

Section 4.2 is devoted to the dative construction in Naxi. The characteristics of Naxi’s dative construction will be demonstrated. Section 4.3 provides Naxi’s dative verbs and their semantic classifications.

Finally, section 4.4 briefly introduces formalist approaches and functionalist approaches to the relation between ditransitive constructions and their comparable synonymous dative constructions. According to this relation, some of Naxi’s triadics can be categorized into three groups. The comparison between dative verbs and ditransitive verbs will also be provided in this section.

4.1 Definition of Dative Construction

Dative construction involves a dative marker or adposition to mark the indirect object. The dative marker or adposition used in the dative construction usually denotes the meaning ‘direction toward’. For example, the preposition to in sentence (1) fulfills this function in English (O’Grady 2004: 44).

(1) Dative construction in English (data from O’Grady 2004: 44)
Harvey mailed the letter to Mary.
Subject Direct object Indirect object
Some languages use dative markers to mark the indirect objects in the dative constructions, as in (2). Examples (2a-c) are from Turkish, Warlbiri\(^{67}\) (or Warlpiri), and Chamorro\(^{68}\), respectively. Turkish uses a dative marker –a; Warlbiri uses –ku; and Chamorro uses –ni.

(2)  

a. Dative construction in Turkish (data from Comrie 1981: 169)  
Mübür Has-

an-

a mektub-

u göster-

di.  
director.Nom Hasan-Dat letter-Acc show-Pst  
‘The director showed the letter to Hasan.’

b. Dative construction in Warlbiri (data from Hale 1973: 333)  
Ngajulu-

rlu ka-

ma-

ngku karli-ø yi-

nyi nyuntu-

ku.  
1Sg-Erg Prs-

1Sg.Nom-2Sg.Acc boomerang-Abs give-Nonpst you-Dat  
‘I am giving you a boomerang.’

c. Dative construction in Chamorro (data from Topping 1973: 241)  
Ha na'i i patgon ni leche.  
3Sg.Erg give Abs child Dat milk  
‘He gave the milk to the child.’

Other languages use adpositions to mark the indirect objects in the dative constructions, as in (3). The following examples (3a-c) involving prepositions for the indirect object are from French, Taiwanese\(^{69}\), and Pero\(^{70}\), respectively. French uses a preposition à; Taiwanese uses ho; and Pero uses tī.

(3)  

a. Dative construction in French (data from Dryer 1986: 811)  
Jean a donné le livre à Marie.  
John Perf give the book to Mary  
‘John gave the book to Mary.’

b. Dative construction in Taiwanese  
Papa saŋ chit pun an-

a chhe ho siomue.  
father give one CI picture book to sister  
‘The father gave a comic book to little sister (as a present).’

---

\(^{67}\) Warlbiri is an indigenous language spoken in Australia’s Northern Territory.

\(^{68}\) Chamorro is an Austronesian language of the Western Malayo-Polynesian branch spoken in Guam.

\(^{69}\) Taiwanese is classified as one of the Chinese dialects spoken in Taiwan.

\(^{70}\) Pero belongs to the West Chadic language branch of the Chadic language family spoken in Nigeria.
c. Dative construction in Pero (data from Frajzyngier 1989: 167)
Músà mún-kò júrâ tî Dìllà.
Musa give-Comp peanut to Dilla
‘Musa gave peanuts to Dilla.’

Notice that, in some languages, such as Latin, and German, which use morphological case systems, indirect objects are marked by case inflections in the dative constructions, as in (4a) and (4b). In these cases, the inflectional dative markers do not have independent meanings, such as ‘to’, ‘toward’... , and so on.

(4) a. Dative construction in Latin (data from O’Grady 2004: 44)
Pater fili-ae pecūni-am da-t.
father.Nom daughter-Dat money-Acc give-Prs.3Sg
‘The father gives money to his daughter.’

b. Dative construction in German
Mein Freund zeigte mir sein Fahrrad.
My.Nom friend show.Pst me.Dat his.Acc bicycle
‘My friend showed me his bicycle.’

Some constructions that involve a dative marker are not limited to use in dative constructions. As already mentioned in section 2.4, the dative marker (or adposition) can occur with an oblique71, as in (5). The following examples (5a-b) are from Tamang72 and Yagua73, respectively.

(5) a. Oblique construction in Tamang (data from Taylor 1973)
Mam-se kol-kat-ta pañ-pa.
Grandma-Erg child-PI-Dat scold-Imp
‘Grandma is scolding the children.’

71 Dative-marked oblique also occurs in the passive construction, for example:
(i) Dative marking the oblique agent in Japanese (O’Grady 2002: 114)
Taroo-ga kёisatu-ni taihos-are-ta.
Taroo-Nom police-Dat arrest-Pass-Pst
‘Taroo was arrested by the police.’
(ii) Dative marking the oblique agent in Korean (O’Grady 2002: 114)
Chelswu-ka kay-eykey mwul-li-ess-ta.
Chelswu-Nom dog-Dat bite-Pass-Pst-Decl
‘Chelswu was bitten by a dog.’

72 Tamang is one of the Bodish languages spoken in central Nepal belonging to the Tibeto-Burman language family.
73 Yagua is an indigenous language spoken in the northeastern Amazon River region.
b. Oblique construction in Yagua (data from Payne 1997: 101)
Sa-dify nuruf-iva.
3Sg-see alligator-Dat
‘He saw an alligator.’ (or ‘His vision rested on an alligator.’)

The dative-marked oblique also expresses several types of roles, such as a destination, a source, and a possessor, as in (6a), (6b), and (6c), respectively. Note that, in our treatment, these examples, including (5) and (6), are not dative constructions in that they do not involve indirect objects.

John-ga Tokyo-ni it-ta.
John-Nom Tokyo-Dat go-Pst
‘John went to Tokyo.’

b. Dative marking a source in Japanese (O’Grady 2002: 81)
Watashi-wa Tanaka-san-ni jisho-o kari-ta.
I-Top Tanaka-Mr.-Dat dictionary-Acc borrow-Pst
‘I borrowed a dictionary from Mr. Tanaka.’

c. Dative marking a possessor in Japanese (O’Grady 2002: 81)
John-ni kodomo-ga i-ru koto.
John-Dat children-Nom exist-Pst fact
‘the fact that John has children’

Moreover, the dative marker also signals subjects in some languages; the dative-marked subject usually corresponds to the experiencer, as in (7). The verb that takes the dative-experiencer is usually the predicate of feeling or experience. The following examples (7a-b) are from Nepali and Hindi. Note that these examples are also not defined as dative constructions in this thesis.

(7) a. Dative marking an experiencer in Nepali (data from Bandhu 1973)
Ma-lai bhok lag-io.
me-Dat hunger attach-Perf.
‘I am hungry.’
b. Dative marking an experiencer in Hindi (data from Woolford 1997:193)

Siitaa-ko larke Pasand the.
’Sita likes the boys.’

4.2 Dative Construction in Naxi

According to the discussion provided in section 4.1, Naxi’s dative construction involves a dative marker -to for the indirect object, as in (8).

(8) a. Triadic-dative construction in Naxi

\[ \text{brother} \quad \text{Erg} \quad \text{teacher} \quad \text{Dat} \quad \text{money} \quad \text{some} \quad \text{give} \quad \text{Perf} \]

‘Elder brother gave some money to the teacher.’

Naxi’s dative construction exhibits three distinct features: 1) the indirect object is marked by a dative marker; 2) the subject is located in the sentence-initial position; and 3) the direct object can either precede or follow the indirect object. Note that the direct object usually refers to a non-human entity corresponding to the theme, while the indirect object usually refers to a human entity, which usually corresponds to the recipient.

The word order of dative constructions in Naxi is of two types—one involves two overt objects in which the indirect object precedes the direct object, and the other involves two overt objects in which the direct object precedes the indirect object. When the indirect object precedes the direct object, the ergative case -mu can be overt, as in (9a) and (9b); also the ergative case -nu can be covert, as in (9c) and (9d).

\[ \text{The "two constituent order type" is usual in some Tibeto-Burman languages. Givón (1979) provides the following examples from Sherpa, one of the Bodish languages spoken in Nepal. The word orders of two objects in the examples are reversed.} \]

(i) Tiki kitabi coxts-i-kha-la zax-sung.
he-Erg book table-Gen-on-Dat put-Aux
‘He put the book on the table.’

(ii) Tiki coxts-i-kha-la kitabi zax-sung.
he-Erg table-Gen-on-Dat book put-Aux
‘He put the book on the table.’
When the direct object precedes the indirect object, the ergative case marker \(-nu1\) must remain overt, as in (10a) and (10b).

(10) a. Word order: subject—direct object—indirect object

\[\text{ə-bv\l nu1 the\-yu1 du1 f\v\l khu1l.}\]

brother Erg letter one Cl send

Dir. Obj. Indir. Obj.

‘Elder brother sent a letter to the teacher.’

b. Word order: subject—direct object—indirect object

\[\text{ə-bv\l nu1 tei\-lia1 du1\-xu1 tshy1l.}\]

brother Erg money some repay

‘Elder brother repaid some money to the teacher.’

Naxi’s dative construction allows for the omission of either subject or direct object, or even both, in specialized discourse settings. Note that the indirect object must remain overt. Consider the following examples: sentence (11a) shows that there is a null direct object, represented here as [theme e], while sentence (11b) contains a null subject,
represented as [agent e]. In sentence (11c), both the direct object and the subject are omitted.

(11) a. A null direct object

\[ \text{brother} \rightarrow \text{Erg} \rightarrow \text{give} \rightarrow \text{Pst} \]

‘Elder brother gave (something) to little sister.’

b. A null subject

\[ \text{[agent e]} \rightarrow \text{brother} \rightarrow \text{give} \rightarrow \text{Pst} \]

‘(Someone) gave elder brother a chicken.’

c. Both direct object and subject are null

\[ \text{[agent e]} \rightarrow \text{brother} \rightarrow \text{give} \rightarrow \text{Pst} \]

‘(Someone) gave elder brother (something).’

The dative case marker in Naxi’s dative construction has two types. All of the dative constructions allow the dative marker –to7, as in (12a). In some dative constructions, they also allow the other dative marker –tsey1. Sentence (12b) shows that the dative verb tshy1 ‘to repay’ allows either –tsey1 or –to7 to mark the indirect object; however, in sentence (12a), the dative verb za7 ‘to give’ only allows –to7.

(12) a. Dative construction in Naxi

\[ \text{brother} \rightarrow \text{Erg} \rightarrow \text{teacher} \rightarrow \text{Dat} \rightarrow \text{money} \rightarrow \text{give} \rightarrow \text{Perf} \]

‘Elder brother gave some money to the teacher.’

b. Dative construction in Naxi

\[ \text{brother} \rightarrow \text{Erg} \rightarrow \text{teacher} \rightarrow \text{Dat} \rightarrow \text{money} \rightarrow \text{repay} \rightarrow \text{Perf} \]

‘Elder brother repaid some money to the teacher.’

Unlike the dative marker –to7, the use of the other dative marker –tsey1 is relatively limited. For example, –to7 is permitted when the dative verb is tshi1 ‘to sell’,
as in (13a); however, –t\emph{ey}v is prohibited in this regard, as in (13b). Further examples are shown in (13c) and (13d). Sentence (13c) involving a dative verb \emph{tshu}r ‘to kick’ allows the dative marker –to\emph{\textbar}v, while sentence (13d) involving the same verb does not allow the dative marker –t\emph{ey}v.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{a.} to\emph{\textbar}v is permitted in dative construction

\begin{verbatim}
Thu\textbar n\textbar nu\textbar the\textbar y\textbar d\textbar tsha\textbar n\textbar to\textbar t\textbar tshu\textbar .
\end{verbatim}

he erg book one Cl I Dat sell

‘He sold a book to me.’

\item \textbf{b.} t\emph{ey}v is prohibited in dative construction

\begin{verbatim}
*Thu\textbar n\textbar nu\textbar the\textbar y\textbar d\textbar tsha\textbar n\textbar t\textbar tshu\textbar .
\end{verbatim}

he erg book one Cl I Dat sell

‘He sold a book to me.’

\item \textbf{c.} to\emph{\textbar}v is permitted in dative construction

\begin{verbatim}
Thu\textbar n\textbar nu\textbar phi\textbar t\textbar ly\textbar n\textbar to\textbar t\textbar tshu\textbar .
\end{verbatim}

he erg ball one Cl I Dat kick

‘He kicked a ball to me.’

\item \textbf{d.} t\emph{ey}v is prohibited in dative construction

\begin{verbatim}
*Thu\textbar n\textbar nu\textbar phi\textbar t\textbar ly\textbar n\textbar t\textbar tshu\textbar .
\end{verbatim}

he erg ball one Cl I Dat kick

‘He kicked a ball to me.’

\end{enumerate}

It should be noticed that there is a generation distinction in the dative markers.

Though Naxi’s second generation (between 18 and 59 years old) tends to use –to\emph{\textbar}v in all of the dative constructions, elder native speakers (over 60 years old) do not allow –to\emph{\textbar}v in a few dative constructions, as in (14). Example (14) shows that when the dative verb is \emph{ku}v ‘to pay’, the elder generation prohibits using –to\emph{\textbar}v, as in (14a), but permits using –t\emph{ey}v, as in (14b).
(14)  
a. $to\bar{7}$ is prohibited in the elder generation

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{brother} & \text{Erg} & \text{teacher} & \text{Dat} & \text{money} & \text{some} & \text{pay} \\
\end{array}
\]

\text{‘Elder brother paid some money to the teacher.’}

b. $\text{t}ch\text{yl}$ is permitted in the elder generation

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{brother} & \text{Erg} & \text{teacher} & \text{Dat} & \text{money} & \text{some} & \text{pay} \\
\end{array}
\]

\text{‘Elder brother paid some money to the teacher.’}

There is at least one constraint that occurs in the dative construction. Naxi’s dative construction does not allow an inanimate indirect object, as in (15a). Some languages do not have this constraint; the sentence “He sent a letter to Beijing.” is grammatical in English. In order to express the meaning of “he sent a letter to Beijing”, Naxi’s younger generation creates a particularly puzzling and intriguing use of $-\text{t}ch\text{yl}$ as illustrated in (15b), which involves a locative case $-\text{t}ch\text{yl}$ to mark the location $p\text{a}l\text{tei}$ ‘Beijing’. The elder generation does not allow the sentence like (15b). Note that in normal situations, Naxi’s case markers tend to follow an NP, as in (15c).

(15)  
a. Inanimate indirect object

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{he} & \text{Erg} & \text{Beijing} & \text{Dat} & \text{letter} & \text{one} & \text{Cl} & \text{send} \\
\end{array}
\]

\text{‘He sent a letter to Beijing.’}

b. Locative case prefix $t\text{chyl}$

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{he} & \text{Erg} & \text{letter} & \text{one} & \text{Cl} & \text{Loc} & \text{Beijing} & \text{send} \\
\end{array}
\]

\text{‘He sent a letter to Beijing.’}

C. Locative case marking an inanimate destination

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{brother} & \text{Beijing} & \text{Loc} & \text{walk} \\
\end{array}
\]

\text{‘Elder brother walked toward Beijing.’}
4.3 Dative Verbs in Naxi

Dative verbs are predicates which occur in dative constructions. According to the data I gathered in the field, Naxi contains at least 65 dative verbs, as shown in Table 4.1. There are a number of modern Mandarin loan words used as dative verbs in Naxi. As can be seen in Table 4.1, we find 17 verbs (No. 27-43) borrowed from modern Mandarin: "bol ‘to appropriate funds for’; fal ‘to hand out’; kua ‘to make a complaint’; po ‘to wrap up’; pa ‘to report’; pv ‘to change money’; sie ‘to present to higher level’; thu ‘to turn back; return’; tea ‘to pay; to hand in’; "tsul ‘to inform; to notify’; thu ‘to recommend’; fal ‘to punish’; fai ‘to disagree’; phi ‘to criticize’; t ‘to pluck (flowers); t ‘to take care of; to treat’; tho ‘to entrust’; and ts ‘to throw’.

Table 4.1 Dative Verbs in Naxi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ditransitive verbs</th>
<th>English glossary</th>
<th>Mandarin glossary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>kua</td>
<td>to cheat; to lie</td>
<td>pian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>to hand over</td>
<td>jiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>to deliver</td>
<td>chuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>kua</td>
<td>to slander</td>
<td>gao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>to rent out</td>
<td>zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>to conceal</td>
<td>man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>to spoon up liquid</td>
<td>yao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>kwh</td>
<td>to praise</td>
<td>cheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>to return</td>
<td>huan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>to repay a debt</td>
<td>huan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>mby</td>
<td>to allocate</td>
<td>fen; fen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ml</td>
<td>to ask</td>
<td>wen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>to lend</td>
<td>jie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>to wire money</td>
<td>dian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75 The pitch of the unmarked tone in Mandarin is 324.
Naxi's dative verbs can be classified into the following twelve semantic classes: 1) give verbs; 2) take verbs; 3) verbs of future having; 4) verbs of transfer of a message; 5) say verbs; 6) prepare verbs; 7) carry verbs; 8) verbs of throwing; 9) build/create verbs; 10) send verbs; 11) verbs of fulfilling; and 12) other verbs, as shown in Table 4.2. Note that the following semantic definition in each class (if applicable) is based mainly on Anagnostopoulou (2003:12).

### Table 4.2 Classification of Naxi's dative verbs

1. Give verbs: “verbs that inherently signify acts of giving”; ‘outward’ motion
   - *boi* ‘to appropriate funds for’
   - *ku* ‘to hand over’
   - *ηγου* ‘to buy/sell on credit’
   - *κα* ‘to rent out’
   - *λετςη* ‘to return’
   - *με* ‘to feed’
   - *ζο* ‘to give’
   - *λετςθυ* ‘to repay a debt’
   - *νι* ‘to lend’
   - *νι* ‘to wire money’
   - *προ* ‘to give change’
   - *σιε* ‘to present to higher level’
   - *τσηθι* ‘to sell’
   - *σκ* ‘to bestow (money)’
   - *θυθι* ‘to turn back; return’
   - *θυθι* ‘to repay (money)’
   - *ητσ* ‘to hand in; to pay’

2. Take verbs: verbs of causation of accompanied motion in an inward

---

76 As mentioned in footnote 66, take verbs cannot involve the recipient role semantically. We cannot deny if anyone argues that take verbs do not belong to the recipient construction.
direction

kua‘l ‘to cheat; to lie’; kal‘ka‘l ‘to conceal’; æe‘l ‘to owe’; mldor‘l ‘to ask’
fa‘l ‘to punish’; su‘l ‘to request’; tcev‘l ‘to cheat’; xeæ‘l ‘to buy’;
zv‘l ‘to take’; ñgæa‘l ‘to win’; sœl ‘to learn’;

3. Verbs of future having: “verbs denoting a commitment that a person will have something at some later point”
fa‘l ‘to hand out’; mby‘l ‘to allot’;

4. Verbs of transfer of a message: “verbs of communicated message”
thue‘ltcëv‘l ‘to recommend’; thol‘tshur‘l ‘to inform; to notify’;

5. Say verbs: “verbs of communication of propositions and propositional attitudes”
kua‘l ‘to slander’; khudw‘l ‘to praise’; pa‘lkæl ‘to report’; phi‘phi‘l ‘to criticize’;
sœl ‘to tell; to answer’; lœl ‘to call’; pha‘lbeil ‘to flatter’;

6. Prepare verbs: verbs of cooking and meal
ko‘l ‘to spoon up (liquid)’; o‘l ‘to pour (liquid)’; po‘l ‘to wrap up’;
khuk‘l ‘to fill (rice in a bowl)’; mu‘l ‘to cure with smoke’; tse‘ltse‘l ‘to cut (meat)’;
tshur‘l ‘to cook (food)’; u‘l ‘to scoop (water)’;

7. Carry verbs: verbs of delivery
pa‘lpa‘l ‘to carry on the shoulder’; ku‘l ‘to deliver’;

8. Verbs of throwing: “verbs instantaneously causing ballistic motion”
tshur‘l ‘to kick (a ball)’; tsœl ‘to throw’;

9. Build/Create verbs: verbs of creation and building
la‘l ‘to nail’; pœl ‘to paint; to write’; tçærl ‘to cut (cloth)’;

10. Send verbs: “verbs of sending”
khul‘l ‘to send (a letter)’; le‘lkhur‘l ‘to reply (to a letter)’;

11. Verbs of fulfilling:
tçærlxur‘l ‘to take care of’; kua‘l ‘to invite’;

12. Other verbs: verbs from various classes
feetwel ‘to oppose’; khæel ‘to make change’; tsœl ‘to give an amount’;
thol ‘to entrust’; tçærl ‘to pluck (flowers); su‘l ‘to seek’
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4.4 Comparison between Dative and Ditransitive

As already pointed out in section 3.1.2, ditransitive constructions occur in comparatively few languages. Cross-linguistically, many languages do not exhibit the ditransitive construction, but instead employ a dative construction. Japanese and French are two such languages, as in (16a) and (16b). Japanese uses a dative case -ni to mark the indirect object; and French uses a preposition à. Note that Johnson (1980) argues that a few French verbs occur in the ditransitive construction under varying discourse circumstances.

John-ga Mary-ni hon-o age-ta.
‘John gave the book to Mary.’

b. Dative construction in French (Dryer 1986: 811)
Jean a donné le livre à Marie.
‘John gave the book to Mary.’

As already alluded to, most ditransitive constructions have respective synonymous dative constructions. The formalists (Chomsky 1955, 1975; Larson 1988) define the relation between the ditransitive construction and its comparable synonymous dative construction as “dative shift”—the ditransitive construction is syntactically derived from the dative construction. The functionalists (Givón 1979, 1990; Erteschik-Shir 1979) suggest that the relation between the two is best accounted for not in syntax but in terms of discourse function. Givón (1979: 161) mentions that the most common function between the two constructions is changing the “relative topicality” of the two objects. This concerns the universal word order principle and the rule of topicalization—the left-
most constituent is the more topical one. Givón provides the following English examples, (17) and (18), to support his assumption:

(17) a. When he found it, John gave the book to Mary.

b. *When he found it, John gave Mary the book.*

(18) a. When he found her, John gave Mary the book.

b. *When he found her, John gave the book to Mary.*

Givón also examines data from a variety of languages; he proposes two distinctions between the ditransitive construction and its comparable synonymous dative construction. First, the indirect object in the latter involves a dative marker or an adposition. Second, the constituent orders of the two objects in the two constructions are reversed.

Givón’s analysis is reasonable at least in both AVP/SV languages and PAV/SV languages. The following are sentences selected from AVP/SV languages, specifically Danish, Taiwanese, and Indonesian. Examples (19a), (20a), and (21a) involve prepositions for their indirect objects (recipients) which follow the direct objects (themes). On the contrary, the recipient-object is followed by the theme-object in the ditransitive construction, as in (19b), (20b), and (21b). These examples appear to support Givón’s assumption.

(19) a. Dative construction in Danish (data from Herslund 1986: 125)

Han sendte blomster til sin sekretær.

he sent flowers to his secretary

‘He sent flowers to his secretary.’

---

77 When the interrogation mark appears before a translated sentence, it means the translated sentence may be ungrammatical in English.

78 We do not provide examples from VAP/VS languages in this thesis.
b. Ditransitive construction in Danish (data from Herslund 1986: 125)
Han sendte sin sekretær blomster.
he sent his secretary flowers
‘He sent his secretary flowers.’

(20) a. Dative construction in Taiwanese
Papa san chit pun an-a chhe ho siomue.
father give one Cl picture book to sister
‘The father gave a comic book to little sister (as a present).’

b. Ditransitive construction in Taiwanese
Papa san siomue chit bun an-a chhe.
father give sister one Cl picture book
‘The father gave little sister a comic book (as a present)

(21) a. Dative construction in Indonesian (data from Dryer 1986: 811)
Saja mem-bawa surat itu kepada Ali.
I Tr-bring letter the to Ali
‘I brought the letter to Ali.’

b. Ditransitive construction in Indonesian (data from Dryer 1986: 811)
Saja mem-bawa-kan Ali surat itu.
I Tr-bring-Ben Ali letter the
‘I brought Ali the letter.’

The following are from the APV/SV languages, Korean and Naxi. In Korean, sentence (22a) involves a dative case marker for the indirect object (recipient) which precedes the direct object (theme). In sentence (22b), the theme-object precedes the recipient-object in the ditransitive construction. Notice that both dative construction and ditransitive construction in Korean involve two word order types, therefore, we also find another pair, as in (23). The direct object precedes the indirect object, as in (23a); while the recipient-object precedes the theme-object, as in (23b).

(22) a. Dative construction in Korean (data from O’Grady 2004: 62)
Mary-ka haksayng-tul-eykey chayk-ul cwu-ess-ta
Mary-Nom student-Pl-Dat book-Acc give-Pst-Decl
Recipient Theme
‘Mary gave books to the student.’

b. Ditransitive construction in Korean

Mary-ka **chayk-ul** **haksayng-tul-ul** cwu-ess-ta  
Mary-Nom book-Acc student-PI-Ace give-Pst-Decl  
Theme Recipient

‘Mary gave the student books.’

(23) a. Dative construction in Korean

Mary-ka **chayk-ul** **haksayng-tul-eykey** cwu-ess-ta  
Mary-Nom book-Acc student-PI-Dat give-Pst-Decl  
Theme Recipient

‘Mary gave books to the student.’

b. Ditransitive construction in Korean (data from O’Grady 2004: 61)

Mary-ka **haksayng-tul-ul** **chayk-ul** cwu-ess-ta  
Mary-Nom student-PI-Ace book-Ace give-Pst-Decl  
Recipient Theme

‘Mary gave the student books.’

In Naxi, the indirect object precedes the direct object in the dative construction, as in (24a); while the theme-object precedes the recipient-object in the ditransitive construction, as in (24b). Note that Naxi’s dative construction involves another word order type in which the direct object precedes the indirect object, as in (24c). Both Korean and Naxi’s examples support Givón’s analyses.

(24) a. Dative construction in Naxi

\[ \text{ælvv} \text{ nu} \text{ gu} \text{me} \text{ to} \text{ the\(\text{i}y\text{u}\)} \text{ du} \text{ tsha} \text{ gu} \text{me} \text{ zo} \text{l}. \]

brother Erg sister Dat book one Cl give  
Recipient Theme

‘Elder brother gave a book to little sister.’

b. Ditransitive construction in Naxi

\[ \text{ælvv} \text{ nu} \text{ the\(\text{i}y\text{u}\)} \text{ du} \text{ tsha} \text{ gu} \text{me} \text{ zo} \text{l}. \]

brother Erg book one Cl sister give  
Theme Recipient

‘Elder brother gave little sister a book.’

c. Dative construction in Naxi

\[ \text{ælvv} \text{ nu} \text{ the\(\text{i}y\text{u}\)} \text{ du} \text{ tsha} \text{ gu} \text{me} \text{ to} \text{ zo} \text{l}. \]

brother Erg book one Cl sister Dat give  
Theme Recipient

‘Elder brother gave a book to little sister.’
4.4.1 Datives vs. Ditransitives in Naxi

Naxi has no semantic difference between the dative construction and the ditransitive construction. However, in some languages, such as English, the two constructions differ from each other semantically. Green (1974) points out that the ditransitive construction usually involves a semantic sense of “completion”; in contrast, the dative construction may lack this sense. For example, Sentence (25a) suggests that Mary really learned French. However, sentence (25b) suggests that Mary might not learn French.

(25) a. Ditransitive construction in English
   John taught Mary French.

   b. Dative construction in English
   John taught French to Mary

In Naxi, the dative verb and the ditransitive verb differ from each other syntactically and lexically. Comparing Table 3.4 (ditransitive verbs in Naxi) and Table 4.1 (dative verbs in Naxi), we find that Naxi verbs that occur in the dative construction and the ditransitive construction can be classified into three categories: 1) verbs occurring in both ditransitive constructions and dative constructions; 2) verbs occurring only in ditransitive constructions; and 3) verbs occurring only in dative constructions.

In the first category, the verbs can occur in both the dative construction and the ditransitive construction, as in (26) and (27). Examples (26) and (27) show that the verbs mi7do4 ‘to ask’ and thue~htely4 ‘to recommend’ occur not only in the dative construction but also in the ditransitive construction.
(26) a. Dative construction in Naxi

\[\text{bv} \ n\text{r} \ \text{gu} \text{m}e \ \text{thi} \ \text{du} \ \text{thi} \ \text{mi} \text{ldo} \].

brother Erg sister Dat question one Cl ask

'Elder brother asked little sister a question.'

b. Ditransitive construction in Naxi

\[\text{bv} \ n\text{r} \ \text{thi} \ \text{du} \ \text{thi} \ \text{gu} \text{m}e \text{mi} \text{ldo} \].

brother Erg question one Cl sister ask

'Elder brother asked little sister a question.'

(27) a. Dative construction in Naxi

\[\text{tsw} \text{tsw} \ n\text{r} \ \text{gu} \text{m}e \ \text{to} \ \text{the} \text{yw} \ \text{tshu} \ \text{tsha} \ \text{thu} \text{e} \text{ty} \].

teacher Erg sister Dat book this Cl recommend

'The teacher recommended this book to little sister.'

b. Ditransitive construction in Naxi

\[\text{tsw} \text{tsw} \ n\text{r} \ \text{the} \text{yw} \ \text{tshu} \ \text{tsha} \ \text{gu} \text{m}e \ \text{thu} \text{e} \text{ty} \].

teacher Erg book this Cl sister recommend

'The teacher recommended little sister this book.'

We find 36 verbs belonging to the first category as follows:

- bol 'to appropriate funds for'
- ku' to hand over'
- ku' to deliver'
- ka' to rent out'
- le'ku' to return'
- le'tshy' to repay a debt'
- ni' to lend'
- ni' to wire money'
- phi' to lose'
- pv' to give change'
- sie' to present to higher level'
- tshi' to sell'
- sae' to bestow (money)'
- thu'e' to turn back; return'
- tshy' to repay (money)'
- tca' to hand in; to pay'
- ygu' to buy/sell on credit'
- za' to give'
- kua' to cheat; to lie'
- ka'ka' to conceal'
- a' to owe'
- fa' to hand out'
- mby' to allot'
- mi'ldo' to ask'
- thu'e'ty' to recommend'
- kuav' to slander'
- khu'ldud' to praise'
- pa'ka' to report'
- sze' to tell; to answer'
- thu'e'tswu' to inform; to notify'
- ko' to spoon up (liquid)'
- o' to pour liquid'
- po' to wrap up'
- pa'pav' to carry on the shoulder'
- su' to seek'
- and tshw' to kick (a ball)'.
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The verbs in the second category occur only in the ditransitive construction, as in (28) and (29). Examples (28) and (29) show that the verbs *tsy*7 ‘to save (money); to keep’ and *me*7 ‘to teach’ can be used in the ditransitive construction; however, they are not used in the dative construction.

(28) a. Dative construction in Naxi

*a*bv1  nu1  gu1-me1  to1  tc1-lia1  du1-xu1  tsy1.
brother  Erg  sister  Dat  money  some  save
‘Elder brother saved some money to little sister.’
* ‘Elder brother saved some money for little sister.’

b. Ditransitive construction in Naxi

*a*bv1  nu1  tc1-lia1  du1-xu1  gu1-me1  tsy1.
brother  Erg  money  some  sister  save
‘Elder brother saved some money to little sister.’
* ‘Elder brother saved some money for little sister.’

We only find five verbs so far that behave this way: *ku-lku*7 ‘to bribe’, *me*7 ‘to teach’, *pu*l ‘to give as a present’, *tsy*l ‘to save (money); to keep’, and *zuav*l ‘to count; to measure’.

The verbs belonging to the third category occur only in the dative construction, as in (30) and (31). The verbs *kuu*l ‘to send’ and *nga*l ‘to win’ can occur in the dative construction, as in (30a) and (31a); however, they cannot occur in the ditransitive construction, as in (30b) and (31b).
There are at least 28 verbs that occur in the third category as follows: \textit{faa} ‘to punish’; \textit{fa-tue} ‘to oppose’; \textit{phi/phi} ‘to criticize’; \textit{tshar} ‘to pluck (flowers)’; \textit{tza-xl} ‘to take care of’; \textit{tho} ‘to entrust’; \textit{tsa} ‘to throw’; \textit{ba} ‘to feed’; \textit{khua} ‘to make change’; \textit{khua} ‘to send (a letter)’; \textit{ku} ‘to fill (rice in a bowl)’; \textit{kua} ‘to invite’; \textit{la} ‘to nail’; \textit{le-khua} ‘to reply (to a letter)’; \textit{khar} ‘to call’; \textit{mu} ‘to cure with smoke’; \textit{par} ‘to paint; to write’; \textit{pha} ‘to fall’; \textit{su} ‘to request’; \textit{tsu} ‘to give an amount’; \textit{tc} ‘to cheat’; \textit{tshar} ‘to make a dress’; \textit{tsel} ‘to cut (meat)’; \textit{tsu} ‘to cook (food)’; \textit{u} ‘to scoop (water)’; \textit{xel} ‘to buy’; \textit{zy} ‘to take’; and \textit{gga} ‘to win’.

Comparing Table 3.5 (classification of Naxi’s ditransitive verbs) and Table 4.2 (classification of Naxi’s dative verbs), we find that there are more dative verb classes.
than ditransitive verb classes; there are some verb classes that allow the ditransitive construction, and others that do not.

The comparison also shows that dative verbs and ditransitive verbs share seven verb classes (excluding 'other verbs'): 1) give verbs; 2) take verbs; 3) verbs of future having; 4) verbs of transfer of a message; 5) say verbs; 6) carry verbs; and 7) prepare verbs. Moreover, there are four verb classes that permit the dative construction but do not permit the ditransitive construction, as follows: 1) verbs of throwing; 2) build/create verbs; 3) send verbs; and 4) verbs of fulfilling.
CHAPTER 5

GIVE SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTION IN NAXI

A serial verb construction (SVC) consists of “two or more verb roots that are neither compounded nor members of separate clauses” (Payne 1997: 307). Semantically, each verb in the serial verb construction denotes “various facets of a single complex event” (Payne 1997: 307). The serial verb construction can be classified into at least five different categories: 1) TAKE serial verb construction; 2) GIVE serial verb construction; 3) SURPASS serial verb construction; 4) SAY serial verb construction; and 5) GO/COME serial verb construction (Seuren 2001: 438). In this study, we only investigate the GIVE serial verb construction because it involves the semantic role of the recipient.

In this chapter, we will give a comprehensive account of Naxi’s GIVE serial verb constructions, including their nature, syntax, and semantics. In section 5.1, we will discuss examples of the various types of GIVE serial verb constructions; some defining features related to the GIVE serial verb construction are also included in this section. Section 5.2 is intended to demonstrate the details of the syntax and semantics of Naxi’s GIVE serial verb construction. In section 5.3, we will list Naxi’s GIVE serial verbs and provide the semantic classifications of the main verbs in the GIVE serial verb construction. Finally, the comparison between ditransitive verbs and the main verbs of the GIVE serial verb construction will be discussed in section 5.4.

5.1 Types of GIVE Serial Verb Construction

The GIVE serial verb construction is widespread in serializing languages. GIVE
SVC usually involves two verb roots: one is defined as the serial verb, which is transparently related to the verb meaning “to give”; the other is the main verb, which typically occurs before the serial verb “to give”. In the following discussion, we will use “GIVE” to indicate the serial verb ‘to give’, and use “MAIN verb” to indicate the main verb in the GIVE serial verb construction.

5.1.1 Classification

The GIVE serial verb construction (GIVE SVC) can be used to express a variety of semantic relations, including recipient, benefactive, and goal. According to the thematic role co-occurring with GIVE, the GIVE SVC can be divided into at least three categories: 1) the GIVE accompanying a recipient; 2) the GIVE accompanying a benefactive; and 3) the GIVE accompanying a goal. In our treatment, only the first type belongs to the recipient construction.

The first type of the GIVE SVC involves a recipient role co-occurring with the GIVE, as in (1). The following examples are from Sranan, Saramaccan, and Thai.

Each of the GIVEs in example (1) is a full verb followed by the recipient role.

(1) a. GIVE SVC in Sranan (data from Sebba 1987: 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kownu</th>
<th>seni</th>
<th>wan</th>
<th>boskopu</th>
<th>qi</th>
<th>Tigri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>send</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>message</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>Tiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recipient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘King sent a message to Tiger.’

---

79 In some languages, the GIVE serial construction involves the third verb root, as in the following example:

(i) Three-verb GIVE serial construction in Sranan (sited by Sebba 1987: 51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ala</th>
<th>dey</th>
<th>mi</th>
<th>be</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>tyari</th>
<th>nyanyan</th>
<th>go</th>
<th>gi</th>
<th>den.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all day</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>T/A</td>
<td>T/A</td>
<td>carry</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Every day I brought food to them.’

80 Sranan is a Creole language spoken in Suriname.

81 Saramaccan is an English-based creole language spoken in Suriname.
b. GIVE SVC in Saramaccan (Byrne 1987:189)
Magdá kóndá dí ótó dà dí básì.
Magda tell the story give the boss Recipient

'Magda told the story to the boss.'

C. GIVE SVC in Thai (cited by O'Grady 2004:202)
Dék khin nansii háy krhuu.
boy return book give teacher Recipient

'The boy returned the book to the teacher.'

The second type of the GIVE SVC involves a benefactive role co-occurring with GIVE, as in (2). The following examples are from Korean, Mandarin, and Saramaccan. Example (2a) can be described as having a benefactive which is the addresser, the first-person singular pronoun ‘I’. Note that the GIVE in examples (2a) and (2b) behaves very much like for, the benefactive preposition in English. Historically, the GIVE can be a source for adpositions if it undergoes grammaticalization. O'Grady (2004: 203) points out that the Korean morpheme -cwu ‘to give’ in example (2a) “can become grammaticalized—that is, it can lose its literal meaning and come to function as a grammatical marker”. Tsao (1988: 167) even advocates that the serial verb gei ‘to give’ in example (2b) functions as a benefactive marker; it can be used interchangeably with other benefactive markers, such as wei or ti. In this case, we cannot deny if someone defines (2a) and (2b) as benefactive constructions. However, the GIVE in (2c) is unambiguous because the serial verb dá ‘to give’ does not undergo grammaticalization.

(2) a. GIVE SVC in Korean (data from O'Grady 2004:203)
Mwun-ul tat-a-cwu-sey-yo
doors-Ac close-Af-give-Hon-Level

'Please close the door for me.'

---

82 Hopper and Traugott (1993: xv) define “grammaticalization” as “the process whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions, and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions.”
b. GIVE SVC in Mandarin (Li & Thompson 1974:271)
Wo gei ni zuo cha fan.
I give you make fried rice
Benefactive
‘I’ll make fried rice for you.’

c. GIVE SVC in Saramaccan (Byrne 1987:180)
Kófi bay sóni dá di mujée.
Kofi buy something give the woman
Benefactive
‘Kofi bought something for the woman.’

The third type of the GIVE SVC involves a goal co-occurring with the GIVE, as
in (3). Note that Sebba (1987) defines en ‘him’ in sentence (3) as a location, while we
define it as a goal. Note, too, that in Sebba’s analyses qi ‘to give’ in the different types of
serial verb constructions can be translated by a variety of prepositions in English. In fact,
Sebba does not consider the possibility of grammaticalization of the serial verb qi ‘to
give’.

(3) GIVE SVC in Sranan (cited by Sebba 1987: 51)
Dagu piri en tifi qi en.
dog peel his teeth give him
Goal
‘Dog bared his teeth at him.’

In the following discussion, we will demonstrate some criteria for the GIVE SVC
which are also proposed by several linguists (Welmers 1973; Sebba 1987; and O’Grady
2004) to define the “serial verb construction”. The GIVE SVC has the following
defining features (O’Grady 2004: 202):

First of all, the GIVE SVC contains no markers of coordination or subordination;
on the other hand, there is “no conjunction or complementizer” in the GIVE SVC.

Secondly, the GIVE SVC contains “at least one shared argument”—either the
theme or the agent. For example, boskopu ‘message’ in (1a) is the theme argument of
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both *seni* 'to send' and *qi* 'to give', while *Kofi* 'Kofi' in (2c) is the agent argument of both *báy* 'to buy' and *dá* 'to give'.

Thirdly, the verbs in the GIVE SVC share “the same tense and aspect, which is usually expressed on only one of the verbs”. For example, the aspect and/or tense markers (or inflectional affixes) in Ijo\(^{83}\) and Akan\(^{84}\) are carried by the GIVE, as in (4a) and (4b), respectively.

(4) a. GIVE SVC in Ijo (cited by Seuren 2001: 451)

\[ \text{Eri opûn-mo } \text{áki } \text{tobô } \text{piri-mi.} \]

'He took a crayfish to the boy.'

b. GIVE SVC in Akan (cited by Sebba 1987: 174)

\[ \text{áde seka } \text{no } \text{mâa } \text{me.} \]

'He gave me the knife'

Some languages, such as Mandarin and Sranan, express the aspect and/or tense markers on the MAIN verbs, as in (5a) and (5b).

(5) a. GIVE SVC in Mandarin

\[ \text{Zhangsan ti-le yi-ge qi } \text{gei Lisi.} \]

'Zhangsan kicked a ball to Lisi,'

b. GIVE SVC in Sranan (data from Sebba 1987: 50)

\[ \text{Mi } \text{e } \text{prani a karu gi } \text{yu.} \]

'I am planting the corn give you

'He gave me the knife'

However, some languages, such as Akan, express the aspect and/or tense markers (or inflectional affixes) on both verbs, as in (6). Notice that the shared agent *me* 'I'

---

\(^{83}\) Ijo belongs to the Kwa languages spoken in parts of West Africa.

\(^{84}\) Akan is a creole language belonging to the Twi languages spoken in Ghana.
occurs twice in sentence (6)\(^{85}\).

(6) GIVE SVC in Akan (data from Schachter 1974: 260)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Me} & \text{yéé} \quad \text{advuma} \quad \text{me} \quad \text{máá} \quad \text{Amma.} \\
\text{I} & \text{do-Pst} \quad \text{work} \quad \text{I} & \text{give-Pst} \quad \text{Amma}
\end{array}
\]

'I worked for Amma.'

Finally, the negative marker (if applicable) is usually assigned to the MAIN verb, as in (7a). However, a few languages, such as Akan, express the negation marker on both verbs, as in (7b).

(7) a. GIVE SVC in Sranan (data from Sebba 1987: 51)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Fu} & \text{gowtu} \quad \text{no} \quad \text{fadon} \quad \text{gi} \quad \text{gron.} \\
\text{for} & \text{gold} \quad \text{Neg} \quad \text{fall} \quad \text{give} \quad \text{ground}
\end{array}
\]

'\text{so that the gold would not fall to the ground.}'

b. GIVE SVC in Akan (data from Schachter 1974: 266)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Kofi} & \text{n-ye} \quad \text{advuma} \quad \text{m-ma} \quad \text{Amma.} \\
\text{Kofi} & \text{Neg-do} \quad \text{work} \quad \text{Neg-give} \quad \text{Amma}
\end{array}
\]

'\text{Kofi does not work for Amma.}'

5.2 GIVE Serial Verb Construction in Naxi

According to the classifications provided in section 5.1.1, Naxi's GIVE serial verb construction involves a recipient co-occurring with the GIVE, as in (8). Notice that the serial verb \text{vəl} to 'give' seems not to co-occur with the benefactive\(^{86}\) or goal (or direction) because we cannot find any convincing example of these so far.

(8) GIVE SVC in Naxi

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{vavl} & \text{nul} \quad \text{tsho-kv} \quad \text{dur} \quad \text{pol} \quad \text{gul} \quad \text{thv} \quad \text{tol} \quad \text{zəl}. \\
\text{brother} & \text{Erg} \quad \text{hoe} \quad \text{one} \quad \text{Cl} \quad \text{seek} \quad \text{he} \quad \text{Dat} \quad \text{give} \quad \text{Recipient}
\end{array}
\]

'\text{Elder brother sought a hoe (to give it) to him.}'

---

\(^{85}\) In (i), both aspect-marked verbs in the TAKE serial construction share a subject which occur once.

(i) TAKE serial construction in Akan (cited in O'Grady 2004: 202)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Mi} & \text{a} \quad \text{fa} \quad \text{sekan} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{twa.} \\
\text{I} & \text{Perf} \quad \text{take} \quad \text{knife} \quad \text{Perf} \quad \text{cut}
\end{array}
\]

'\text{I have cut with a knife.}'

\(^{86}\) Benefactive also does not occur in the ditransitive construction and the dative construction.
The traditional analysis shows that the GIVE SVC can be derived from two or more underlying sentences (Lord 1973, and Bamgbose 1974). For example, the GIVE SVC (8a) above is derived from the following two sentences (9a) and (9b). This hypothesis explains why Naxi’s GIVE SVC involves a dative marker -to7.

(9) a. Transitive construction in Naxi
\[ \text{\textasciitilde lbv} \text{\textasciitilde nmr} t\text{\textasciitilde tv} \text{\textasciitilde dtn} \text{\textasciitilde p} \text{\textasciitilde su}. \]
brother Erg hoe one Cl seek
‘Elder brother sought a hoe.’

b. Dative construction involving a null subject
\[ \text{\textasciitilde thv} \text{\textasciitilde to} t\text{\textasciitilde tv} \text{\textasciitilde dtn} \text{\textasciitilde p} \text{\textasciitilde z\textasciitilde v}. \]
he Dat hoe one Cl give
‘(Someone) gave him a hoe.’

Cross-linguistic comparison shows that Naxi’s GIVE SVC exhibits the following properties: 1) it contains two verb roots without any conjunction or complementizer; 2) it contains a shared theme argument of both verbs; 3) the recipient-object occurs between the MAIN verb and the GIVE; the MAIN verb precedes the GIVE, and 4) the dative marker -to7 in the GIVE SVC is seldom employed. The example can be demonstrated as in (10). In sentence (10), t\text{\textasciitilde tv} 'hoe' is the theme argument of both su 'to seek' and z\text{\textasciitilde v} 'to give'. The recipient-object th\text{\textasciitilde v} 'he' is located between su 'to seek' and z\text{\textasciitilde v} 'to give'. Comparing sentence (10) with sentence (8) above, the dative marker -to7 is not employed in the former, while in the latter it remains overt. It should be noted that Naxi speakers prefer to not employ the dative marker -to7 associated with the GIVE SVC.

(10) GIVE SVC in Naxi
\[ \text{\textasciitilde lbv} \text{\textasciitilde nmr} t\text{\textasciitilde tv} \text{\textasciitilde dtn} \text{\textasciitilde p} \text{\textasciitilde su} \text{\textasciitilde thv} \text{\textasciitilde z\textasciitilde v}. \]
brother Erg hoe one Cl seek he give
Recipient
‘Elder brother sought a hoe (to give it) to him.’
In addition, two additional syntactic features in the GIVE SVC must be considered. First, the aspect and/or tense marker (if applicable) is assigned to the GIVE, as in (11a); however, if the aspect and/or tense marker is assigned to the MAIN verb, the result is ungrammatical, as in (11b). Second, the negative marker mo-l- (if applicable) is assigned to the MAIN verb, as in (12a); however, the negative marker cannot mark the GIVE, as in (12b).

(11) a. GIVE SVC in Naxi
\[ \text{father Erg book this CI Neg buy sister give} \]
\[ \text{'Father did not buy this book (to give it) to little sister.'} \]

b. GIVE SVC in Naxi
\[ \text{father Erg book one CI seek Perf I give} \]
\[ \text{'Elder brother sought a book (to give it) to me.'} \]

(12) a. GIVE SVC in Naxi
\[ \text{father Erg money some take} \]
\[ \text{'Father took some money (to give it) to him.'} \]

Naxi's GIVE SVC must involve either of two semantic properties. The first is that the recipient must have possession of the theme after the action is completed. In other words, when receiving the theme from the agent, the recipient becomes not only a receiver but also a possessor of the theme, as in (13a-d).

(13) a. GIVE SVC in Naxi
\[ \text{father Erg money some take he give} \]
\[ \text{'Father took some money (to give it) to him.'} \]
b. GIVE SVC in Naxi

> bvt nw tsho kvl dw pa su su tsu zol.

brother Erg hoe one Cl seek teacher give

‘Elder brother sought a hoe (to give it) to the teacher.’

c. GIVE SVC in Naxi

> mo nw za zu dw trol ze thu zol.

mother Erg potato one Cl peel he give

‘Mother peeled a potato (to give it) to him.’

d. GIVE SVC in Naxi

> mo nw tlti khual xal thu zol.

mother Erg gruel one Cl cook he give

‘Mother cooked a bowl of gruel (to give it) to him.’

However, some verbs, such as ka ‘to rent out’ and mildo ‘to ask’, cannot fulfill this property in terms of possession transfer because the recipient does not possess the theme after all, as in (14a) and (14b).

(14) a. Violation of possession transfer

> bvt nw theyu dw tsha ka thu zol.

brother Erg book one Cl rent he give

‘Elder brother rent a book (to give it) to him.’

b. Violation of possession transfer

> bvt nw thi thi mildo gu me zol.

brother Erg question one Cl ask sister give

‘Elder brother ask a question (to give it) to little sister.’

The other property is that the theme in the GIVE SVC must come from an unknown source (usually a person). In other words, the theme cannot transfer from the agent or the recipient of the construction, as in (15a-c).

(15) a. GIVE SVC in Naxi

> nd mby thu zol.

I Erg flower one Cl allot he give

‘I allotted a flower (from someone) to him.’
b. GIVE SVC in Naxi

\[
\text{brother Erg dog one CI carry he give}
\]

'Elder brother carried a dog (from someone) to him.'

c. GIVE SVC in Naxi

\[
\text{I Erg money some exchange he give}
\]

'I made some change (from someone) to him.'

Some verbs, such as \( \eta\nu\uv \) 'to buy/sell on credit' and \( \teh\uv \) 'to sell', cannot occur in the GIVE SVC, because when using these verbs, the theme is exactly from the agent, as in (16a) and (16b).

(16) a. The theme from the agent

\[
\text{he Erg cigarette sell on credit brother give}
\]

'He sold cigarettes (from himself) to elder brother on credit.'

b. The theme from the agent

\[
\text{he Erg pillow sell brother give}
\]

'He sold a pillow (from himself) to elder brother'

Note that the MAIN verb \( xa\uv \) 'to buy' is the only exception which involves both semantic properties, as in (17). In sentence (17), the recipient \( yu\fme\f \) 'little sister' does possess the theme \( \fme\f \) 'book', which is bought from the unknown source.

(17) GIVE SVC in Naxi

\[
\text{father Erg book this CI buy sister give}
\]

'Father bought this book (from someone) (to give it) to little sister.'

Sometimes, a verb cannot occur in the GIVE SVC because it brings about violation of both semantic properties—that is, the recipient cannot possess the theme, and the theme does not come from the unknown source. Example is demonstrated in (18).
The verb *me7 'to teach' in sentence (18) involves the theme *xaipakwutsul 'Han language' which comes from the agent suwitsul 'teacher', and the abstract theme cannot be possessed by the recipient thu1 'he'.

(18) Violation of both possession transfer and unknown source of theme

\*Suwitsul nu1 xaipak wutsul me7 thu1 zo1.

teacher Erg Han language teach he give

'Teacher taught him Han language (Chinese).'

### 5.3 GIVE Serial Verbs in Naxi

Naxi’s GIVE serial verb consists of two verb roots: the MAIN verb and the GIVE.

In this study, we find 47 GIVE serial verb patterns; their MAIN verbs are shown in Table 5.1. Among these verbs, three are borrowed from modern Mandarin: bo1 'to appropriate funds for'; po1 'to wrap up'; and da7 'to gather (firewood)'.

#### Table 5.1 Main Verbs of Naxi’s GIVE Serial Verb Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Main verbs in GIVE serial</th>
<th>English glossary</th>
<th>Mandarin glossary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>bo1</td>
<td>to appropriate funds for</td>
<td>bo1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>ko1</td>
<td>to spoon up liquid</td>
<td>yao87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>mby1</td>
<td>to allot</td>
<td>fen1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>po1</td>
<td>to wrap up</td>
<td>bao1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>paipo1</td>
<td>to carry on the shoulder</td>
<td>be1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>sju1</td>
<td>to seek</td>
<td>zhao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>zhu1</td>
<td>to count; to measure</td>
<td>suan1; liang1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>bo1</td>
<td>to feed</td>
<td>wei1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>khæ1</td>
<td>to make change</td>
<td>huan1 (qian1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>khui1</td>
<td>to fill (rice in a bowl)</td>
<td>cheng1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>gvi1</td>
<td>to receive</td>
<td>ling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>tocyl</td>
<td>to cheat</td>
<td>pian1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>tochor1</td>
<td>to pluck (flowers)</td>
<td>zhail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

87 The pitch of the unmarked tone in Mandarin is 324.
| 14 | tshor | to make a dress | cai1 |
| 15 | tse-itsel | to cut (meat) | duo1 |
| 16 | tshul | to cook (food) | chao |
| 17 | u | to scoop (water) | yao |
| 18 | xae | to buy | mai |
| 19 | zy | to take | na1 |
| 20 | bu | to carry on the shoulder | kang1 |
| 21 | bi | to rub | chuol |
| 22 | dv | to dig out | waj |
| 23 | dzor | to grab | zhuaj |
| 24 | da | to gather (firewood) | da (chaj1) |
| 25 | da | to weave | zhi1 |
| 26 | dzoro | to rob | qiang |
| 27 | fvi | to cut with a saw | juj |
| 28 | go | to boil for a long time | ao1 |
| 29 | kuv | to measure (with a scale) | cheng1 |
| 30 | khv | to steal | tou1 |
| 31 | lv | to hold (a plate) | duan1 |
| 32 | pel | to angle (fish) | diaov |
| 33 | par | to uproot | ba1 |
| 34 | phi | to knit | bian1 |
| 35 | piw | to move; to carry | ban1 |
| 36 | svi | to haul | tuo1 |
| 37 | swi | to pick up | jian |
| 38 | svi-sun | to select | tiao1xuan |
| 39 | tecil | to cook | zhu |
| 40 | xar | to cut (food) | qie1 |
| 41 | zei | to peel | xiao1 |
| 42 | yon | to net (fish) | lao1 |
| 43 | ngæn | to clip (food) | jia1 |
| 44 | svi | to tear off | si1 |
| 45 | svun | to keep | shou1 |
| 46 | svun | to earn money | zhuan1 |
| 47 | zuni | to sew | feng1 |
Naxi’s main verbs appearing with ʂəl ‘to give’ can be classified into the following seven semantic classes: 1) give verbs; 2) take verbs; 3) verbs of future having; 4) prepare verbs; 5) carry verbs; 6) build/create verbs; and 7) other verbs, as shown in Table 5.2. Note that the following semantic definition in each class (if applicable) is based mainly on Anagnostopoulou (2003:12).

### Table 5.2 Classification of Main Verbs of Naxi’s GIVE Serial Verb Construction

1. Give verbs: “verbs that inherently signify acts of giving”
   - *bəl* ‘to appropriate funds for’; *bəl* ‘to feed’;

2. Take verbs: verbs of causation of accompanied motion in an ‘inward’ direction
   - *səl* ‘to receive’; *təl* ‘to cheat’; *xəl* ‘to buy’; *zəl* ‘to take’; *səl* ‘to keep’
   - *bəl* ‘to rub’; *dəxəl* ‘to grab’; *dəl* ‘to gather (firewood)’; *dəxəl* ‘to rob’;
   - *kəl* ‘to steal’; *pəl* ‘to angle (fish)’; *səl* ‘to pick up’; *pəl* ‘to net (fish)’;
   - *səl* ‘to earn money’; *səl/səl* ‘to select’

3. Verbs of future having: “verbs denoting a commitment that a person will have something at some later point”
   - *məl* ‘to allot’;

4. Prepare verbs: verbs of cooking and meal
   - *kəl* ‘to spoon up (liquid)’; *pəl* ‘to wrap up’; *khul* ‘to fill (rice in a bowl)’;
   - *kəl* ‘to cut (meat)’; *tsəl* ‘to cut (cloth)’; *təl* ‘to stir-fry’; *səl* ‘to scoop (water)’;
   - *gəl* ‘to boil for a long time’; *ləl* ‘to hold (a plate)’; *təl* ‘to cook’;
   - *zəl* ‘to peel’; *gəl* ‘to clip (food)’; *zəl* ‘to cut (food)’;

5. Carry verbs: verbs of delivery
   - *pəl/pəl* ‘to carry on the shoulder’; *bəl* ‘to carry on the shoulder’;
   - *pəl* ‘to move, to carry’; *səl* ‘to haul’;

6. Build/Create verbs: verbs of creation and building
   - *təl* ‘to cut (cloth)’; *dəl* ‘to dig out’; *dəl* ‘to weave’; *fəl* ‘to cut with a saw’;
   - *pəl* ‘to knit’; *səl* ‘to sew’;
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7. Other verbs: verbs from various classes
   tswv ‘to give an amount’; khæv ‘to make change’; tchærl ‘to pluck (flowers);
   kæv ‘to measure (with a scale)’; pærl ‘to uproot, to pull’; suv ‘to seek’
   səv ‘to tear off’;

5.4 Comparison between Main Verbs in GIVE Serial Verb Construction and Ditransitives

As already alluded to, Naxi’s GIVE serial verbs must involve at least one
semantic property—either the recipient possessing the theme or the theme transferring
from a unknown source. These two properties make the semantic difference between the
GIVE serial verbs and the ditransitive verbs. The following examples demonstrate the
reasons.

In some cases, the ditransitive verb takes a recipient referring to a receiver but not
a possessor, as in (19a). The recipient thw1 ‘he’ in sentence (19a) does not have to be the
possessor. However, the GIVE serial verb takes a recipient referring to a receiver and
also to a possessor, as in (19b).

(19) a. The recipient referring to a receiver:

   ñælv1 nũ1 tsho-ìkv1 ëu1 pà1 thu1 su1.
   brother Erg hoe one Cl he seek
   ‘Elder brother sought a hoe to him.’
   *‘Elder brother sought a hoe for him.’

   b. The recipient referring to a receiver and a possessor

   ñælv1 nũ1 tsho-ìkv1 ëu1 pà1 su1 thu1 sə1.
   brother Erg hoe one Cl seek he give
   ‘Elder brother sought a hoe (to give it) to him.’

In other cases, the ditransitive verb takes a theme, which comes from the agent, as
in (20a). However, the GIVE serial verb takes a theme, which comes from an unknown
source, as in (20b).
(20) a. The theme from the agent

\[ \text{brother} \varepsilon \text{rg} \ \text{flower} \ \text{one} \ \text{Cl} \ \text{he} \ \text{allot} \]

'Elder brother allotted a flower to him.'

b. The theme from an unknown source

\[ \text{brother} \varepsilon \text{rg} \ \text{flower} \ \text{one} \ \text{Cl} \ \text{allot} \ \text{he} \ \text{give} \]

'Elder brother allotted a flower (from someone) to him.'

As mentioned in section 5.2, some verbs that violate these semantic properties cannot occur in the GIVE serial verb construction. However, some of those verbs are permitted in the ditransitive construction. For example, the MAIN verb \( k\)7 'to rent out' in (21a) violates the possession transfer requirement, while \( k\)7 'to rent out' in ditransitive construction (21b) is grammatical.

(21) a. Violation of possession transfer (repeat from (14a))

\[ \text{*brother} \varepsilon \text{rg} \ \text{book} \ \text{one} \ \text{Cl} \ \text{rent} \ \text{he} \ \text{give} \]

'Elder brother rented a book (to give it) to him.'

b. Ditransitive construction in Naxi

\[ \text{brother} \varepsilon \text{rg} \ \text{book} \ \text{one} \ \text{Cl} \ \text{rent} \]

'Elder brother rented him a book.'

Furthermore, the MAIN verb \( \eta\guv \) 'to buy/sell on credit' is not permitted in the GIVE SVC, as in (22a); however, the ditransitive verb \( \eta\guv \) 'to buy/sell on credit' does occur in the ditransitive construction, as in (22b).

(22) a. Violation of unknown source of theme (repeat from (16a))

\[ \text{*brother} \varepsilon \text{rg} \ \text{cigarette} \ \text{sell on credit} \ \text{he} \ \text{give} \]

'Elder brother sold cigarettes (from someone) to him on credit.'
b. Ditransitive construction in Naxi
\[ \text{brother} \quad \text{Erg} \quad \text{cigarette} \quad \text{sell on credit} \quad \text{he} \quad \text{sell on credit} \]

'Elder brother sold cigarettes to him on credit.'

Moreover, the MAIN verb \( me\) 'to teach' which violates 'possession transfer' and 'unknown source of the theme' is prohibited in the GIVE SVC, as in (23a); however, the ditransitive verb \( me\) 'to teach' is allowed in the ditransitive construction, as in (23b).

(23) a. Violation of 'possession transfer' and 'unknown source' (repeat from (18a))
\[ *\text{Sw~tsw~ nw~ XQ~PQ~ kw~t~w~ me} \quad \text{thw~} \quad \text{1. teacher Erg Han language teach he give} \]

'The teacher taught him the Han language (Chinese).'

b. Ditransitive construction in Naxi
\[ \text{Sw~tsw~ nw~ XQ~PQ~ kw~t~w~ thw~ me} \]

'teacher Erg Han language he teach'

'The teacher taught him the Han language (Chinese).'

Comparing Table 3.4 (ditransitive verbs in Naxi) and Table 5.1 (main verbs of Naxi’s GIVE serial verb construction), we find that only seven verbs occur in both the ditransitive construction and the GIVE serial verb construction, as follows: \( bol\) 'to appropriate funds for'; \( ko\) 'to spoon up liquid'; \( mby\) 'to allot'; \( po\) 'to wrap up'; \( pa\)' 'to carry on the shoulder'; \( su\) 'to seek'; and \( zua\) 'to count; to measure'.

Comparing Table 3.5 (classification of Naxi’s ditransitive verbs) and Table 5.2 (classification of main Verbs of Naxi’s GIVE serial verb construction), we find that the ditransitive verbs and the MAIN verbs share five verb classes (excluding 'other verbs'): 1) give verbs; 2) take verbs; 3) verbs of future having; 4) carry verbs; and 5) prepare verbs.

Note that these five verb classes consist of only seven verbs, as listed in the preceding paragraph.
There are some differences between the two verb classes. The ditransitive verbs include verb of transfer of a message and say verbs, while the MAIN verbs do not. In addition, the MAIN verbs include build/create verbs, while the ditransitive verbs do not.
CHAPTER 6
Conclusion

In this thesis, we note that the recipient construction in Naxi consists of three different sub-constructions: 1) the ditransitive construction (or double object construction); 2) the dative construction; and 3) the GIVE serial verb construction. In this chapter, we will summarize the findings about Naxi's recipient construction in section 6.1. Some questions of Naxi's recipient construction useful for further study will be provided in section 6.2.

6.1 Findings about Recipient Construction in Naxi

Section 6.1 summarizes findings pertaining to the ditransitive construction, the dative constructions, and the GIVE serial verb constructions.

6.1.1 Findings about Ditransitive Construction in Naxi

(i) Cross-linguistic comparison makes it clear that Naxi's ditransitive construction exhibits three distinct features in the surface structure and grammatical case marking: 1) the ergative case is used for agentive subject obligatorily; 2) two objects involve no morphological case; and 3) theme-object usually precedes recipient-object. In Naxi, a semantic constraint establishes a different between the recipient and the theme in the ditransitive construction; that is, the recipient is always a human-like argument, while the theme is always non-human.

(ii) In Naxi's ditransitive construction either object—or both—can be omitted under certain discourse conditions. However, the agentive subject must remain overt.
(iii) The word order of ditransitive construction in Naxi has two types: one involves two overt objects in which the theme-object precedes the recipient-object, and the other involves two overt objects in which the recipient-object precedes the theme-object. All of Naxi’s ditransitive verbs can occur in the first word order type. In contrast, the second type occurs in two fixed syntactic conditions. In one condition, the recipient-object precedes the theme-object when the agentive subject is the first-person singular pronoun ɲaɬ ‘I’. In the other condition, the recipient-object is allowed to precede the theme-object when the predicate is 2ɬ7 ‘to give’.

(iv) There are at least one impossible situation and two constraints on Naxi’s ditransitive constructions. First, Naxi’s ditransitive constructions cannot be passivized because passivization is absent in Naxi. Second, Naxi’s ditransitive constructions do not allow a source-object. Third, Naxi’s ditransitive constructions do not allow a benefactive-object.

(v) In Naxi’s ditransitive construction, either the recipient or the definite theme can be topicalized. Notice that the theme-topicalized sentence occurs with certain discourse settings in that the theme needs to be definite when topicalized.

6.1.2 Findings about Dative Construction in Naxi

(i) Naxi’s dative construction exhibits three distinct features: 1) the indirect object is marked by a dative marker; 2) the subject is located in the sentence-initial position; and 3) the direct object can either precede or follow the indirect object. Note that the direct object usually refers to a non-human entity corresponding to the theme, while the indirect object usually refers to a human entity, which often corresponds to the recipient.
(ii) The word order of dative constructions in Naxi is of two types—one involves two overt objects in which the indirect object precedes the direct object, and the other involves two overt objects in which the direct object precedes the indirect object. When the indirect object precedes the direct object, the ergative case -nuəl can be employed or not be employed. When the direct object precedes the indirect object, the ergative case marker -nuəl must remain overt.

(iii) Naxi’s dative construction allows for the omission of either subject or direct object, or even both, in specialized discourse settings. Note that the indirect object must remain overt. In addition, in Naxi’s dative construction, either the recipient or the definite theme can be topicalized.

(iv) The dative case marker in Naxi’s dative construction has two types. All of the dative constructions allow the dative marker -to ɬ. Some dative constructions also allow the other dative marker -tcvɬ. Unlike the dative marker -to ɬ, the use of the other dative marker -tcvɬ is relatively limited. For example, -to ɬ is permitted when the dative verb is tɛɦiɬ ‘to sell’; however, -tcvɬ is prohibited in this regard.

(v) There is a generation distinction in the use of dative markers. Though Naxi’s second generation (between 18 and 59 years old) tends to use -to ɬ in all of the dative constructions, elder native speakers (over 60 years old) do not allow -to ɬ in a few dative constructions. For example, when the dative verb is kʊɬ ‘to pay’, the elder generation prohibits using -to ɬ, but permits using -tɛcvɬ.
(vi) There is at least one constraint that occurs in the dative construction—that is Naxi's dative construction does not allow an inanimate indirect object.

6.1.3 Findings about GIVE Serial Verb Construction in Naxi

(i) Naxi's GIVE serial verb construction involves a recipient co-occurring with the GIVE. The serial verb əə́t ‘to give’ seems not to co-occur with the benefactive or goal because we cannot find any convincing example of these so far.

(ii) The traditional analysis shows that the GIVE SVC can be derived from two or more underlying sentences. This hypothesis explains why Naxi's GIVE SVC involves a dative marker –tój.

(iii) Cross-linguistic comparison shows that Naxi's GIVE SVC exhibits the following properties: 1) it contains two verb roots without any conjunction or complementizer; 2) it contains a shared theme argument of both verbs; 3) the recipient-object occurs between the MAIN verb and the GIVE; the MAIN verb precedes the GIVE, and 4) the dative marker –tój in the GIVE SVC is seldom employed.

(iv) Two additional syntactic features in the GIVE SVC must be considered. First, the aspect and/or tense marker (if applicable) is assigned to the GIVE. Second, the negative marker màl– (if applicable) is assigned to the MAIN verb.

(v) Naxi's GIVE SVC involves either of two semantic properties. The first is that the recipient must have possession of the theme after the action is completed. In other words, when receiving the theme from the agent, the recipient becomes not only a receiver but also a possessor of the theme. The other property is that the theme in the GIVE SVC must come from an unknown source (usually a person). In other words, the
theme cannot transfer from the agent or the recipient of the construction. Note that the
MAIN verb *xa* ‘to buy’ is the only exception which involves both semantic properties.

(vi) Naxi’s GIVE serial verb construction allows either the recipient or the
definite theme to be topicalized.

Ditransitive verbs in Naxi occur much less frequently than do dative verbs or
GIVE serial verbs. Naxi has 41 ditransitive verbs, at least 65 dative verbs, and at least 47
GIVE serial verbs, as shown in Table 6.1.

### Table 6.1 Ditransitive Verbs, Dative Verbs, and the Main Verbs of the GIVE Serial Verb Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Naxi Verb</th>
<th>Glossary</th>
<th>Ditransitive</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>MAIN Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td><em>bo</em> 1</td>
<td>to appropriate funds for</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td><em>fa</em> 1</td>
<td>to hand out</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td><em>ku</em> 1</td>
<td>to slander</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td><em>ku</em> 1</td>
<td>to cheat; to lie</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td><em>ku</em> 1</td>
<td>to hand over</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td><em>ku</em> 1</td>
<td>to deliver</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td><em>ku</em> 1<em>ku</em></td>
<td>to bribe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td><em>ka</em> 1</td>
<td>to rent out</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td><em>ka</em> 1<em>ka</em></td>
<td>to conceal</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>ko</em> 1</td>
<td>to spoon up liquid</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>ku</em> 1<em>dul</em></td>
<td>to praise</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>le</em> 1<em>ku</em></td>
<td>to return</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>le</em> 1<em>tsyl</em></td>
<td>to repay a debt</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>mbu</em> 1</td>
<td>to allot</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>me</em> 1</td>
<td>to teach</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><em>mi</em> 1<em>di</em></td>
<td>to ask</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><em>ni</em> 1</td>
<td>to lend</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><em>ni</em> 1</td>
<td>to wire money</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>ol</em> 1</td>
<td>to pour liquid</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><em>pu</em> 1</td>
<td>to give as a gift</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the sign ‘√’ marks here, it means the verb *bo* 1 ‘to appropriate funds for’ can occur in the
ditransitive construction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lexeme</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>po±</td>
<td>to wrap up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>phi±</td>
<td>to lose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>pv±</td>
<td>to give change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>p±k±a±</td>
<td>to report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>p±l±p±</td>
<td>to carry on the shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>s±l±</td>
<td>to tell; to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>s±u±</td>
<td>to seek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>sie±</td>
<td>to present to higher level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>s±l±</td>
<td>to bestow (money)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>t±l±</td>
<td>to save (money); to keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>thu±l±</td>
<td>to turn back; return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>t±hy±l</td>
<td>to repay (money)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>t±n±u±</td>
<td>to kick (a ball)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>t±hi±l</td>
<td>to sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>t±o±</td>
<td>to hand in; to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>tho±t±u±</td>
<td>to inform; to notify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>thu±t±c±y±</td>
<td>to recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>z±u±l±</td>
<td>to count; to measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>s±l±</td>
<td>to owe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ng±u±l±</td>
<td>to buy/sell on credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>z±o±</td>
<td>to give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>b±o±</td>
<td>to feed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>f±a±l±</td>
<td>to fine (money)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>f±e±t±u±</td>
<td>to oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>kh±a±l±</td>
<td>to make change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>kh±u±l±</td>
<td>to send (a letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>kh±u±l±</td>
<td>to fill (rice in a bowl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>k±u±l±</td>
<td>to invite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>l±a±</td>
<td>to nail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>le±k±h±u±</td>
<td>to reply (a letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>l±a±r±l±</td>
<td>to call (one’s name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>m±u±l±</td>
<td>to cure with smoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>p±o±r±l±</td>
<td>to paint; to write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>phi±phi±</td>
<td>to criticize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>ph±a±b±ei±</td>
<td>to flatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>s±u±l±</td>
<td>to request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>t±s±u±l±</td>
<td>to give an amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>t±c±y±l±</td>
<td>to cheat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
59  tchɔɬ̂ - to pluck (flowers)  
60  tʃhɔɬ̂ - to make a dress  
61  tʃgɔɬxuɬ - to take care of  
62  tʃɛtʃeɬ - to cut (meat)  
63  thoɬ - to entrust  
64  tsɤɬ - to throw  
65  tʃhʊɬ - to cook (food)  
66  uɬ - to scoop (water)  
67  xæɬ - to buy  
68  zyɬ - to take  
69  ngaɬ - to win  
70  ʂvɬ - to receive  
71  buɬ - to carry on the shoulder  
72  bɪɬ - to rub  
73  dɪɬ - to dig out  
74  dzɑɬ - to grab  
75  dɑɬ - to gather (firewood)  
76  dɑɬ - to weave  
77  dzɛɬ - to rob  
78  fʊɬ - to cut with a saw  
79  goɬ - to boil for a long time  
80  kwɬ - to measure (with a scale)  
81  khvɬ - to steal  
82  lɪɬ - to hold (a plate)  
83  pel - to angle (fish)  
84  pɔɬ - to uproot; to pull  
85  phɪɬ - to knit  
86  piɬ - to move; to carry  
87  suɬ - to haul  
88  suɬ - to pick up  
89  suɬ - to select  
90  tʃɪɬ - to cook  
91  xɔɬ - to cut  
92  zeɬ - to peel  
93  yɔɬ - to net (fish)  
94  ngæɬ - to clip (food)  
95  şeɬ - to tear off  
96  şuɬ - to keep
The verb classes among the ditransitive construction, the dative construction, and the GIVE serial verb construction differ from one another. Naxi's ditransitive verbs are classified into the following eight semantic classes: 1) give verbs; 2) take verbs; 3) verbs of future having; 4) verbs of transfer of a message; 5) say verbs; 6) carry verbs; 7) prepare verbs, and 8) other verbs.

We find that dative verbs and ditransitive verbs share seven verb classes (excluding 'other verbs'): 1) give verbs; 2) take verbs; 3) verbs of future having; 4) verbs of transfer of a message; 5) say verbs; and 6) carry verbs, and 7) prepare verbs. However, there are four verb classes that permit the dative construction but do not permit the ditransitive construction, as follows: 1) verbs of throwing; 2) build/create verbs; 3) send verbs; and 4) verbs of fulfilling.

We also find that ditransitive verbs and MAIN verbs share five verb classes (excluding 'other verbs'): 1) give verbs; 2) take verbs; 3) verbs of future having; 4) carry verbs, and 5) prepare verbs. However, ditransitive verbs include verb of transfer of a message and say verbs, while MAIN verbs do not; MAIN verbs include build/create verbs, while ditransitive verbs do not.

6.2 Questions and Possibilities for Further Study

An important question in Naxi's recipient construction is concerned with the dispute about "verb-zê sequences" in the ditransitive and dative constructions. It is generally agreed that the verb-zê sequence involves a 'compound verb'. The
‘compound verb’ in the verb-verbs sequence consists of two free morphemes, a verb and verbs ‘to give’, in which the verbs ‘to give’ functions as a verbal affix. For example, sentence (1a) shows a ditransitive construction involving a predicate thue ‘to refund’, while sentence (1b) is a ditransitive construction in which the verb-verbs sequence thue-verbs ‘refund-give’ is referred to as a compound verb.

(1) a. Ditransitive construction in Naxi

Sul~tsul~ nul~ tui~liu~ dui~xu~ gu~tzu~l thue ~ se1.
teacher Erg money some brother refund Perf

‘The teacher refunded little brother some money.’

b. Ditransitive Verb-verbs sequence in Naxi

Sul~tsul~ nul~ tui~liu~ dui~xu~ gu~tzu~l thue ~ zol.
teacher Erg money some brother refund give

‘The teacher refunded little brother some money.’

In sentence (2b), the verb-verbs sequence thue-verbs ‘refund-give’ is referred to as a compound verb in the dative construction.

(2) a. Dative construction in Naxi

Sul~tsul~ nul~ gu~tzu~l tol tui~liu~ dui~xu~l thue1.
teacher Erg brother Dat money some refund

‘The teacher refunded some money to little brother.’

b. Dative Verb-verbs sequence in Naxi

Sul~tsul~ nul~ gu~tzu~l tol tui~liu~ dui~xu~l thue1 zol.
teacher Erg brother Dat money some refund give

‘The teacher refunded some money to little brother.’

Note that the predicate thue ‘to refund’ also occurs in the dative construction, as in (2a).

Note that the predicate thue ‘to refund’ cannot occur in the GIVE serial verb construction behaving as the MAIN verb due to violation of unknown source, as in (3).
(3) GIVE SVC in Naxi

\[ *\text{Sw-\{sur\}} \text{ nu\{-\} t\text{\{i\}o\{-\}i\} d\text{\{i\}u\{-\}xu\{-\} thue\{-\} gu\{-\}zu\{-\} (to\{-\}) z\text{\{a\}}. \]

\begin{align*}
\text{teacher} & \quad \text{Erg} & \text{money} & \text{some} & \text{refund} & \text{brother} & \text{Dat} & \text{give} \\
\text{The teacher refunded some money to little brother.} & \\
\end{align*}

Those who argue that the verb-\text{%a7} sequence is a compound verb do so for the following reasons: first, the verb-\text{%a7} sequence and the GIVE serial verb differ from each other in semantics. For example, sentence (4a) and (4b) involve the verb-\text{%a7} sequence \text{mby-l-\text{%a7}} ‘allot-give’; in addition, the theme \text{ba \{l\}ba \{i\}} ‘flower’ comes from the agent \text{gu\{-\}zu\{-\}} ‘little brother’. However, in the GIVE serial verb construction (4c), the theme \text{ba \{l\}ba \{i\}} ‘flower’ is from an unknown source.

(4) a. Ditransitive Verb-\text{%a7} sequence in Naxi

\[ \text{Gur\{-\}zu\{-\} nu\{-\} b\text{\{i\}a\{-\}ba\{-\} d\text{\{i\}u\{-\} ndz\{-\}ar\{-\} gu\{-\}me\{-\} mby\{-\} z\text{\{a\}. \]

\begin{align*}
\text{brother} & \quad \text{Erg} & \text{flower} & \text{one} & \text{Cl} & \text{sister} & \text{allot} & \text{give} \\
\text{Little brother allotted little sister a flower.} & \\
\end{align*}

b. Dative Verb-\text{%a7} sequence in Naxi

\[ \text{Gur\{-\}zu\{-\} nu\{-\} gu\{-\}me\{-\} to\{-\} b\text{\{i\}a\{-\}ba\{-\} d\text{\{i\}u\{-\} ndz\{-\}ar\{-\} mby\{-\} z\text{\{a\}. \]

\begin{align*}
\text{brother} & \quad \text{Erg} & \text{sister} & \text{Dat} & \text{flower} & \text{one} & \text{Cl} & \text{allot} & \text{give} \\
\text{Little brother allotted a flower to little sister.} & \\
\end{align*}

c. GIVE SVC in Naxi

\[ \text{Gur\{-\}zu\{-\} nu\{-\} b\text{\{i\}a\{-\}ba\{-\} d\text{\{i\}u\{-\} ndz\{-\}ar\{-\} mby\{-\} gu\{-\}me\{-\} z\text{\{a\}. \]

\begin{align*}
\text{brother} & \quad \text{Erg} & \text{flower} & \text{one} & \text{Cl} & \text{allot} & \text{sister} & \text{give} \\
\text{Little brother allotted a flower (from someone) to little sister.} & \\
\end{align*}

Secondly, no constituent can intervene in the verb-\text{%a7} sequence (Huang and Ahrens 1999: 7). Example (5a) demonstrates that the aspect suffix -\text{se\{\}} takes verb-\text{%a7} sequence as an entire unit, while example (5b) does not allow the aspect marker -\text{se\{\}} to intervene between \text{\{t\}\text{\{e\}hi\{-\}} ‘to sell’ and \text{%a7} ‘to give’. This fact shows that the postverbal \text{%a7}
‘to give’ is a verbal affix that exhibits the property of lexical integrity in the verb-za sequence.

(5) a. Aspect marker following the verb-za sequence

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gur-
\text{zu}-\text{t} & \text{ nu}-t \text{ kha-dze}-t \text{ ne} \text{ ci}-t \text{ thu}-t \text{ tchi-t za} \text{ sel.} \\
\text{brother} & \text{ Erg corn and rice he sell give Perf} \\
\text{‘Little brother has sold him corn and rice.’}
\end{align*}
\]

b. Aspect marker intervene into the verb-za sequence

\[
\begin{align*}
* \text{Gur-
\text{zu}-\text{t} & \text{ nu} \text{ kha-dze} \text{ ne} \text{ ci} \text{ thu} \text{ tchi} \text{ sel} \text{ za} \text{.} \\
\text{brother} & \text{ Erg corn and rice he sell Perf give} \\
\text{‘Little brother has sold him corn and rice.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, the postverbal za ‘to give’ involves the typical affix property selecting the grammatical category of its host (Huang and Ahrens 1999: 6). For example, sentence (6a) shows that the postverbal za ‘to give’ can occur with the transitive verb (including the ditransitive verb). However, the postverbal za cannot attach to the intransitive verb, as in (6b).

(6) a. za occurring with the transitive verb

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{nu} & \text{ the-yu-t shu-t sha \text{ leku-zu za sel.} } \\
\text{I} & \text{ Erg book this Cl return give Perf} \\
\text{‘I have returned this book.’}
\end{align*}
\]

b. za occurring with the intransitive verb

\[
\begin{align*}
* \text{nu} & \text{ ni \text{ k}o\text{ ndzi} \text{ za} \text{.} } \\
\text{I} & \text{ Erg day half walk give} \\
\text{‘I walked half a day.’}
\end{align*}
\]

However, one might also assume that the verb-za sequence is a type of GIVE serial verb constructions. According to this hypothesis, the GIVE serial verb construction in Naxi would involve two types. The first type involves the verb-za sequence, as in (1b), (2b), (4a), and (4b) above. The second type involves the verb-recipient-za.
sequence, as in (4c) above. All examples of the GIVE serial verb construction provided in Chapter 5 belong to the second type.

The verb-\textit{\texttt{to}}\textit{l} sequence type can be divided into two subcategories. The first one involves the dative marker \textit{\texttt{to}}\textit{l}, while the second does not. The two categories of the verb-\textit{\texttt{to}}\textit{l} sequences in Naxi are provided in Table 6.2.

**Table 6.2 Verb-GIVE Sequence in Naxi's Recipient Construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Verb-\textit{\texttt{to}}\textit{l} sequence</th>
<th>Glossary</th>
<th>\textit{\texttt{to}}\textit{l} involved</th>
<th>\textit{\texttt{to}}\textit{l} not involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{bo}}\textit{l}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to appropriate funds for</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{fo}}\textit{l}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to hand out</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{ku}}\textit{l}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to hand over</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{ku}}\textit{l}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to deliver</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{ko}}\textit{l}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to rent out</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{le}}\texttt{\texttt{ku}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to return</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{le}}\texttt{\texttt{tsh}}\texttt{\texttt{y}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to repay a debt</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{mby}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to allot</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{me}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to teach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{ni}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to lend</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{ni}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to wire money</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{pv}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to give change</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{s}}\texttt{\texttt{e}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to tell; to answer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{si}}\texttt{\texttt{e}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to present to higher level</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{sae}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to bestow (money)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{tsyl}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to save (money); to keep</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{thue}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to turn back; return</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{tshy}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to repay (money)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{thi}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to sell</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{thot}}\texttt{\texttt{tstu}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to inform; to notify</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>\textit{\texttt{thue}}\texttt{\texttt{tcey}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l}</td>
<td>to recommend</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{89} When the sign "✓" marks here, it means the verb-\textit{\texttt{to}}\textit{l} sequence \textit{\texttt{bo}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l} 'to appropriate funds for' can occur in the construction which involves the dative marker \textit{\texttt{to}}\textit{l}.

\textsuperscript{90} When the sign "✓" marks here, it means the verb-\textit{\texttt{to}}\textit{l} sequence \textit{\texttt{bo}}\texttt{\texttt{z}\textit{l}}\textit{l} 'to appropriate funds for' can occur in the construction which does not involve the dative marker \textit{\texttt{to}}\textit{l}.
<p>| 22 | Ṵguːtʃeːl | to buy/sell on credit | ✓ | ✓ |
| 23 | tswːtʃeːl | to give an amount | ✓ | ✓ |
| 24 | thɔːtʃeːl | to entrust | ✓ | ✓ |
| 25 | daːtʃeːl | to gather (firewood) | ✓ | ✓ |
| 26 | gɔːtʃeːl | to boil for a long time | ✓ | ✓ |
| 27 | kхаːtʃeːl | to exchange | ✓ | ✓ |
| 28 | palkɔːtʃeːl | to report | ✓ | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>bĩlżeř</td>
<td>to rub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>dãlžeł</td>
<td>to weave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>kułżeł</td>
<td>to measure (with a scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>pełżeł</td>
<td>to angle (fish)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>pəržěł</td>
<td>to uproot; to pull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>sušsůnžeł</td>
<td>to select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>tɕiołžeł</td>
<td>to cook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>xəržəł</td>
<td>to cut (food)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>zełžeł</td>
<td>to peel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>yəłžeł</td>
<td>to net (fish)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>ngænžeł</td>
<td>to clip (food)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>sənžeł</td>
<td>to tear off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>pułžeł</td>
<td>to bring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>phołžeł</td>
<td>to make a cup of tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>bəłkhʉl</td>
<td>to embroider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>kho̱tʰhʉl</td>
<td>to promise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is doubtless that the verb-ζəł sequence could be identified as either a serial verb pattern or a compound verb. No matter which one it turns out to be the truth, the verb-ζəł sequence must occur in the recipient construction.
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