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In Chinese languages, when a direct object occurs in a non-canonical position preceding the main verb, this SOV structure can be morphologically marked by a preposition whose source comes largely from verbs or deverbal prepositions. For example, markers such as 逵 共 in Southern Min are ultimately derived from the verb ‘to accompany’, pau11 帮 in many Huizhou and Wu dialects is derived from the verb ‘to help’ and 把 bǎ from the verb ‘to hold’ in standard Mandarin and the Jin dialects. In general, these markers are used to highlight an explicit change of state affecting a referential object, located in this preverbal position. This analysis sets out to address the issue of diversity in such object-marking constructions in order to examine the question of whether areal patterns exist within Sinitic languages on the basis of the main lexical fields of the object markers, if not the construction types. The possibility of establishing four major linguistic zones in China is thus explored with respect to grammaticalization pathways.
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1. Background to the issue

In the case of transitive verbs, it is uncontroversial to state that a common word order in Sinitic languages is for direct objects to follow the main verb without any overt morphological marking:

* This is a “cross-straits” paper as earlier versions were presented in turn at both the Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica, during the joint 14th Annual Conference of the International Association of Chinese Linguistics and 10th International Symposium on Chinese Languages and Linguistics, held in Taipei in May 25-29, 2006 and also at an invited seminar at the Institute of Linguistics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing on 23rd October 2006. I would like to express my thanks to both audiences for their comments and suggestions, and in particular, Cao Guangshun, Hung-nin Samuel Cheung, Dong Kun, Lai Huei-ling, Li Lan, Li Ming, Chinfa Lien, Meng Pengsheng, Patricia Müller-Liu, Alain Peyraube, Qin Xiongyuan, Yang Yonglong and Zhao Changcai, as well as the two anonymous reviewers for this volume.
Subject – Verb\textsubscript{transitive} – Object

Thus, when a direct object occurs in a non-canonical position preceding the main verb, this can be signalled by a special marker generally preposed to it, for example, bable in standard Mandarin.\footnote{Note, however, that preposed direct object arguments are not required by the grammar to take such marking—morphologically unmarked OV constructions are common in Chinese languages, where the direct object noun has given information content (but is not necessarily an affected patient).} An example from a spoken narrative follows.

Subject – [Marker – Object] – Verb\textsubscript{transitive}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Standard Mandarin object marking construction with bable\footnote{Abbreviations used in the glossing of examples are as follows: ACC = accusative marker preceding affected object noun, ACH = achievement aspect marker, ADV = marker of adverb formation, AGT = agentive marker, ASST = assertive modality particle, CLF = classifier, COMP = completive aspect marker, COMPR = comparative marker, CONT = continuative aspect marker, COP = copula, CRS = sentence-final marker of a currently relevant state of affairs, DEM = demonstrative, DIMN = diminutive suffix, DIR = directional aspect marker encliticized to verbs, EXT = extent, marker of a postverbal complement indicating the extent of an action or its result state: ‘so X that’, GEN = genitive marker, INC = inchoative aspect marker, LIG = marker of ligature and dependency for attributive phrases, also for relative clauses, LOC = locative, NAME = proper name, NEG = negative adverb, NEG : IMP = negative imperative modal verb, NOM = nominalizer, PFV = perfective aspect marker, PL = plural, PRT = modal or discourse particle, Q = quantifier, SG = singular.} (NP\textsubscript{cause/sbj}) – [OBJECT MARKER\{bable\}] + NP\textsubscript{direct obj} – VP
\end{enumerate}

\begin{verbatim}
天黑了,我就能把帽子摘了, tiān hēi le, wǒ jiù néng bǎ màizi zhāi le
sky dark INC 1SG then able OM cap doff INC

把辫子放在兜裡... bǎ biànzi fàng-zài dōu-lǐ
OM plait place-at pocket-in
\end{verbatim}

‘When night falls, I can take off my cap and put my plait in my pocket.’
(Zhang & Sang 1987:488 Shijie zhi zui 世界之最)

I would also like to acknowledge that research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Community’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013): ERC Advanced Grant agreement No. 230388: ‘The hybrid syntactic typology of Sinitic languages’ (2009-2012).
Due to its highly transitive nature, this type of syntactic construction is known as the ‘disposal construction’ or *chūzhìshì* 處置式 in Chinese linguistics. It has been well-studied for standard Mandarin, in particular with regard to its semantic and syntactic constraints which can be summarized as follows:

(i) the requirement of a referential direct object
(ii) the constraint that the direct object code a semantic patient that undergoes an explicit change of state (also described as a causativity feature; cf. Chappell 1992a, Bisang 1992)

The direct object often codes referents that represent given or old information (cf. Chafe 1987) in the sense that they have already been mentioned earlier in the conversation or text. In fact, this constraint is often described less precisely in terms of ‘definiteness’ of the direct object. In example (1), the narrator’s very long, luxuriant hair is in fact the topic of the story—and how it has made her famous—while another fact mentioned earlier in the narrative, that she hides her plait under her cap during the day while at work, means that both ‘hair’ or related terms such as ‘plait’ and ‘cap’ (coreferential for their possessor) can all be potential candidates for morphological marking.

The second causativity constraint is realized in the complexity of the predicate: completive types of aspect marking, resultative verbs and postposed locative prepositional phrases all represent ways of expressing this change of state. The variety of syntactic means available is described in Liu (1997). Again, in example (1), the predicate *fàng-zai dōu-li* ‘to put in my pocket’ codes explicit displacement for the object ‘plait’ as too does *zhāi* ‘take off’. Note that such constraints may not necessarily be in operation for all Sinitic languages, as much variation has already been observed in specific dialectal studies. This is an important task for future research in this area, but remains outside the scope of the present discussion.³

The present study represents an enlargement of an earlier survey of this construction type which used a single representative variety for seven Sinitic languages (see Chappell 2006) to ten Chinese dialect groups and an expanded database of secondary reference materials numbering over 200 dialects. It is possible to identify the basic syntactic configuration for the *bā* 把 construction in standard Mandarin as the most common kind of disposal construction cross-linguistically in Sinitic, being attested in all ten main dialect groups, (though note that it may not be the native strategy in all of these). For example, the same syntactic configuration, but often with quite different sources for the object marker, is found in Xiang, Gan, Hui, Wu, Min, Yue, Jin, Pinghua and Hakka

³ See Teng (1982) for a detailed discussion of these constraints in Southern Min, or Lai (2003a, 2003b) for a variety of Hakka spoken in Taiwan.
dialects, not to mention in the unclassified Waxiang language (Wu & Chappell 2008). Here is an example from the Xiang dialect of Chenxi, whose object marker is also used synchronically as the lexical verb ‘to help’:

(2) Chenxi Xiang basic disposal construction with pau⁴⁴ ‘help’:
(NP_SUBJECT) – [MARKEROM + NP_DIRECT_OBJECT] – VERB PHRASE
我 幫 月毛毛 放 噜 床 上 好 嗎?
ŋo³³ pau⁴⁴ nye⁴³ mau⁴³ mau⁴³ fau⁴³ fau⁴³ ta³¹ dzau⁴³ sa³¹ xau³¹ ma⁴⁴
1SG OM baby put at bed on OK Q
‘May I put the baby to bed?’ (Wu 2005:204)

In terms of diachronic syntax, this construction type evolves from a serial verb construction found in vernacular texts of the Late Medieval Chinese period (7th-13th centuries) which have the following form:

\[(NP_{SUBJECT}) – VERB_1 – NP_{DIRECT_OBJECT} – VERB_2 (– Pro_{DIRECT_OBJECT}) > (NP_{SUBJECT}) – [PREPOSITION – NP_{DIRECT_OBJECT}] – VERB_2 (– Pro_{DIRECT_OBJECT})\]

In this construction type, the first verb is reanalyzed as a preposition signalling that the following noun or pronoun is the direct object (Peyraube 1989, 1996). Depending on the Chinese dialect, the redundant coreferential pronoun in clause-final position may eventually be omitted (see §4 on Cantonese and Hakka for retention of this pronoun).

In contrast to the historical evolution of the object-marking construction, at least five types of “disposal” construction are identified in this present synchronic study combined with three main semantic domains as the sources for the object markers. In terms of structural types, several southern Sinitic languages use more than one strategy for coding affected objects, including configurations with clause-initial objects followed by their object marker, as in certain Min and Wu dialects, not to mention hybridized forms, with double marking, as in Southern Min. It is shown that verbs of taking such as Bǐ 把 and Ná 拿, well-described for Mandarin, are far from being the sole source of object markers in Chinese languages. In addition, two new lexical sources are uncovered which involve respectively (i) comitatives and (ii) verbs of giving and helping. This is the

---

4 Small capitals, for example, Ná 拿, with the standard Mandarin pīnyīn romanization are used for quoting an ‘archimorpheme’ or ‘allofam’ (to use the term coined by James Matisoff) adopted here as a way of citing a morpheme in terms of its general usage, in the case where I am referring to a large number of cognate morphemes found widely distributed across Sinitic languages with the same function.
first treatment of this particular cluster of construction types from within a pan-Sinitic
typological perspective. The analysis explores the possibility of establishing four major
linguistic zones in China on the basis of preferred grammaticalization pathways.

In the following section, I examine linguistic diversity from the angle of the principal
lexical fields for the sources of these object markers in Sinitic languages.

2. Sources for object markers

There are three main sources for object markers in Sinitic languages, broadly defined
as (i) verbs of taking and holding, (ii) verbs of giving and helping and (iii) comitatives
(Chappell 2006). Importantly, the classification of object markers in this survey was
carried out according to lexical field, uncovering quite a large number of different verb
forms in these three semantic domains (see Table 1 and Appendix 1).

Take verbs superficially appear to be the most common source in Sinitic languages
and also crosslinguistically, as is the case in many West African Benue-Kwa languages of
the Niger-Congo family (see Lord 1993, Heine & Kuteva 2002) and also in many creoles
(Muysken & Veenstra 1995:298):5 A sample of principal exponents for this category in
Sinitic follows:

2.1 Verbs of taking and holding

- cognates and synonyms of
  
  * bā 把 ‘to take’
  
  as in Standard Mandarin, Zhongyuan Mandarin; the Jin dialects (N.B. the verbal use has been lost
  in Mandarin)

- jiāng 將 ‘to take, lead’
  
  as evidenced in more formal registers of the
  Southern Sinitic languages, Hakka, Min and Cantonese

---

5 I use the pīnyīn romanization system for the Mandarin examples, a system adopted in 1958 for
transcription and language pedagogy purposes by the Chinese government. Chinese characters
in traditional jiànlì form are provided, and where feasible, also for the other Sinitic languages
treated in this study. Where a demotic character is not known or attested, the use of an empty box,
thus □, is conventional practice in Chinese linguistics. Tone marks are indicated on all syllables, apart from unstressed ones, and without indicating
tone sandhi. For the Southern Min examples, I use the Church Romanization system, as
exemplified in the Carstairs Douglas dictionary (1990). Meixian Hakka examples follow the
romanization devised by MacIver (1991), unless examples from Rey (1988) are being quoted
which use a francophone system. The Cantonese examples from Cheung (1992) use the Yale
system while my own data employs the Sidney Lau system. The Shanghainese, Xiang, Huizhou,
and Gan examples are rendered in the International Phonetic Alphabet.
• *nâ 拿* ‘to take, hold’ in the central Wu, Xiang and Gan dialects; e.g. nɔ⁵³ in Shanghainese
• *laq⁷撘* ‘to take’ in Gan dialects; also *pa³把* as a borrowed form from Mandarin
• *tæ⁴⁴撟* ‘to carry, take’ in Xiang dialects (e.g. Dongkou)

A second frequent source is represented by verbs of giving, which appears to be extremely unusual in the languages of the world as a source for object markers. For example, this possibility is neither identified nor discussed in the major crosslinguistic study of *give* verbs presented in Newman (1996), nor similarly in Heine & Kuteva’s lexicon of grammaticalization pathways (2002).

### 2.2 Verbs of giving and helping

> Object markers, e.g.:

* cognates and synonyms of *gěi 給* ‘to give’ as in Beijing Mandarin, Southwestern, Jianghuai and Zhongyuan Mandarin
* *bà 把* ‘to give’ in many Hunan Xiang dialects, E’dong Jianghuai Mandarin, Nanchang Gan
* *te⁵得 得* ‘to give’ in Xiang dialects, *ter 得* in Dabu Hakka
* *bāng 幫 ‘to help’ in Wu, Huizhou and Xiang dialects; e.g. Jinhua (Wu)
* *dei¹¹代* ‘to help’ in Wenzhou (Wu)

The same observation applies to comitatives for which grammaticalization into object markers rarely receives a description in the relevant crosslinguistic literature. Crosslinguistic documentation shows that comitatives typically develop into instrumentals, allatives, manner and even ergative markers, but never into accusative or object markers (*pace* Stolz 2001 on the instrumental and ergative association; see also Heine & Kuteva 2002 for a similar listing of comitative targets to Stolz). Sinitic languages thus show a special pathway in this respect which has heretofore not been attested in other language families (see Chappell 2000 for this source in Southern Min). Listed below are the dialect groups and individual dialects, uncovered to date, which show this pathway for Sinitic.

### 2.3 Comitatives

> Object markers, e.g.:

* cognates and synonyms of *kā 共* in Min dialects;
* *t’ung⁷同* and *lau⁷同* in Hakka dialects;
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- tseʔ\(^45\) 跟 (?? < 藉) in Shaoxing Wu;
- kən\(^{42}\) 跟 in Jiang-Huai Mandarin dialects of Jiangsu province (Shuyang, Huaiyin);
- Southwestern Mandarin in Hubei province (Suixian);
- kɛ\(^{55}\) 跟 in Waxiang (Hunan).

These markers all have the source meanings in the semantic domain of ‘to accompany’, ‘to mix’ or ‘to follow’ (see Wu Fuxiang 2003).

3. Pathways of grammaticalization for object markers in Sinitic

A brief explanation is in order regarding how these different verbal and comitative sources develop into object markers:

3.1 Verbs of taking and holding

T\(\text{AKE/HOLD} \quad > \quad \text{instrumental} \quad > \quad \text{direct object}\)

Verbs of manipulation including ‘take’ and ‘hold’ semantically bleach into object markers, often, but not always, via an instrumental stage (cf. \(\text{yǐ} \) and \(\text{jīāng} \) in Medieval Chinese). This is also the source of object markers in languages of Southeast Asia, including Hmong, Vietnamese, Thai and Khmer (Bisang 1992). Further afield, this pathway has been well-described for Benue-Kwa languages (Lord 1993) and for creoles, as mentioned earlier. Hence, I will not dwell on the grammaticalization process here.

3.2 Verbs of giving and helping

G\(\text{IVE/HELP} \quad > \quad \text{beneficiary} \quad > \quad \text{direct object}\)

I have decided to merge the two semantic domains of verbs of giving and helping for the reason that their grammaticalization pathways are most likely parallel: It is well-known that verbs of giving develop into markers of the dative or the beneficiary role (Newman 1996). More specifically, in the first stage of grammaticalization, this semantic class of verbs grammaticalizes into prepositions marking the beneficiary ‘for’, ‘on behalf of’ in \(V_1\) position of a serial verb construction in the case of Sinitic languages. From this stage, they develop further, in the given Sinitic languages, into object markers.

Although this is not common, it can be explained in terms of the closely related semantic change from DATIVE > ACCUSATIVE in Indo-European languages, described in
Heine & Kuteva (2002:103, 37), for example, the use of dative a as an accusative preposition with Spanish animate nouns; also for the diachronic change between the Old English and Modern English periods for the pronouns hire\textsubscript{DAT} > her\textsubscript{DAT>ACC}, him\textsubscript{DAT} > him\textsubscript{DAT>ACC} which involves reanalysis of a former dative as an accusative/dative; and finally for Persian \( r\hat{a} \) (Heine, Claudi & Hünnemeyer 1991:165-168).

3.3 Comitative source

Object markers generated by the morpheme \( k\hat{i} \) in most Min dialects evolved from an original verb meaning ‘to gather, share’, while \( t\textsuperscript{ung} \) in many Hakka dialects can be traced back to the basic lexical meanings of ‘to be the same as’, ‘to accompany’ in Archaic Chinese. In certain Hakka dialects, \( \text{lauf} \) is still used as a verb ‘to mix’ alongside its comitative and other grammatical functions. These verbs grammaticalize first into adverbials with an adjunct function, next into comitative markers ‘with’, and later into a coordinative conjunction ‘and’ in certain Sinitic languages (Liu & Peyraube 1994 on the history of \( g\hat{ong} \) from Archaic Chinese to Early Modern Mandarin and Wu Fuxiang 2003 on the diachronic and synchronic dialectal situation for the coordinative conjunction pathway). In other Sinitic languages, such as the Min group, a somewhat different pathway is followed whereby \( k\hat{i} \), having reached its comitative marker stage ‘with’, further grammaticalizes into an oblique marker of addressee, benefactive and ablative case roles, then specializes into an accusative or object marker via the beneficiary meaning (Chappell 2000).

The morpheme \( \text{跟} \) used as an object marker in certain Mandarin dialects and in Waxiang is associated with the verb ‘to follow’ while \( t\text{se} \) in Shaoxing Wu is likely to have \( \text{著} z\hat{hu}\text{ê} \) ‘to stick together’ as its source and not \( \text{則} \) (see Xu & Tao 1999:139). Hence, the lexical verbs which occur as sources for the comitative all share the notion of being together, if not being in the same place.

This pathway shares the last stages of its grammaticalization with give and help verbs, that is, from beneficiary to object marker.

\[
\text{STAGE I} > \text{STAGE II} > \text{STAGE III} > \text{STAGE IV}
\]

\[
\text{VERB} > \text{COMITATIVE} > \text{oblique marker} \rightarrow \text{beneficiary} \rightarrow \text{direct object} \rightarrow \text{ablative}
\]

Two Meixian Hakka examples follow which show firstly the comitative and verbal use; and secondly the object marking function of \( \text{lauf} \) (see also Lai 2003a, 2003b):
(3) Meixian Hakka – Comitative and verbal use of lau11 拚
NP – [lau11 + comitative NP] – Verb1 – (Verb2)
糯米酒 拚 葡萄酒 拚 合台
nó mì tsiou laō p’ō t’aō tsiou laō mģ kāp
rice:wine COM grape:wine mix NEG together
‘le vin de riz mêlé au vin de raisin n’est pas bon’
[‘Rice wine and grape wine don’t mix well together.’] (Rey 1926:479)

(4) Meixian Hakka – Object use of lau11 拚
(NPAGENT) – [lau11 OM + NPDIRECT OBJECT] – Verb1 – (Verb2)
我 拚 屋 買 到 (了)
ngaî lau vuk mai tò le
1SG OM house buy COMP CRS
‘I (successfully) bought the house.’ (Lin 1990:79)

Possible exceptions:

Before concluding, it behoves us to point out that there are necessarily exceptions to this proposed typology: In my survey of current literature on the topic of disposal constructions, several object markers turned up that do not appear to belong to any of the three proposed lexical fields; their sources are either obscure or not stated. These are:

(i) 招 [tʂao53] in Xinjiang (新绛), Shanxi province (山西), thus possibly a Jin dialect (affiliation not given). The lexical source is not indicated apart from what might be inferred from the character chosen, ‘to beckon’ in Mandarin. Again, this may more likely be related to 著 ZHUÓ, ZHÁO ‘to adhere to’ a verb source which possesses multiple grammaticalization pathways, such as those of complementizers, aspect, causative and passive markers in certain Sinitic languages. Without further proof, this hypothesis can only remain speculative at this point of time.

(ii) 對 [tuī214] in the Chaozhou dialect of Southern Min (潮州話), according to Zhan Bohui et al. (1991). The gloss is not provided at all so it can only be remarked that in Chaozhou and other Min dialects, this lexeme also has the meanings of ‘to face’ and ‘from’. The construction appears, however, to be used alongside those with other markers such as KI 共 < COM discussed above.

(iii) 到 [tɛɐ̟324] in the Yixian dialect (黟縣話) of Huizhou (徽州) according to Hirata (1998:280). Note that this marker is used alongside [pei31] 界 ‘to give’. Again, the lexical source is not indicated, apart from what might be inferred
from the character chosen which means ‘to arrive’ or ‘to’ in Mandarin.\(^6\)

(iv) Qian (2001) observes that in the Ji-Lu dialects of Shandong province, in addition to the principal use of bǎ 把, lái 来 ‘to come’ and lián 连 ‘coordinative conjunction’ are also used. This is certainly worthy of further research.

(v) 叫 JIAO < causative verb ‘to make’ in certain Shandong dialects (Qian 2001) and also in Central Mandarin, for example, in Henan province (Cao 2008, Map 93). This is related to the intriguing issue of passives and disposal constructions using identical markers (see Wu 1999, 2013).

These remain unsolved for the present, awaiting further research. However, given the relatively small number and their low frequency, I believe it is plausible to maintain the overall trends and patterns for the three principal lexical sources of the object markers. These three main sources have been more recently independently confirmed in a larger study using data from over 650 dialects\(^7\) and also coincide to some extent with Endo (2004),\(^8\) and the data found in the dialect map for disposal markers, Map 93, in Cao Zhiyun (2008).

4. Construction types

At least five types of disposal construction can be identified in Sinitic languages, defined in terms of their syntactic configuration. Even though the word order varies considerably, all construction types share the feature of explicit morphological marking of the direct object. This supplies the justification for the combined treatment as

---

\(^6\) Similar examples can be found in Cao Zhiyun (2008) [Volume on Grammar], Map 93, and in Endo (2004) that also appear to have a low frequency, including conjunctions such as [LIAN 连]; also [ZHAO 招], [ZHUO 著] and [ZHAO 招] (no source meaning explicitly given) and two other markers which may also be used as passive markers: [JIAO 叫] and [TING 听]. The latter three are the subject of work in progress on identical agent and patient markers in Sinitic languages.

\(^7\) This project is entitled ‘The disposal construction in Sinitic languages and related issues’ which I am currently undertaking with Li Lan who has established a database of materials for over 650 dialects.

\(^8\) I thank Christine Lamarre for bringing this important analysis to my attention. Endo (2004) uses a database of over 450 dialects and independently classifies disposal markers (that is, object markers) into two main types: TAKE/HOLD and GIVE. He does not use a lexical field classification, however, as in the present analysis, but rather classifies each form in terms of descending frequency in his database. Comitative forms are classified in with the beneficiary use of GIVE verbs (see his Table 2) rather than being given separate treatment.
object-marking or disposal constructions.

Each structure has been given a descriptive label, to be regarded purely as a mnemonic device to aid in distinguishing one from another:

I. Common disposal construction

\[(N_{\text{subject}}) - [MARKER_{\text{OM}} + N_{\text{direct object}}] - \text{VERB PHRASE}\]

II. “Medieval” disposal construction with a resumptive pronoun following verb

\[(N_{\text{subject}}) - [MARKER_{\text{OM}} + N_{\text{direct object}(i)}] \text{VERB}_1 - \text{VERB}_2 - \text{PRONOUN}_{(i)}\]

III. Disposal construction with clause-initial object and its resumptive pronoun introduced by the object marker

\[N_{\text{direct object}(i)} - [MARKER_{\text{OM}} + \text{PRONOUN}_{(i)}] - \text{VERB PHRASE}\]

IV. “Archaic Chinese” disposal construction with clause-initial object followed by the object marker and a zero anaphor

\[N_{\text{direct object}} - [MARKER_{\text{OM}} + \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_] \text{VERB PHRASE}\]

V. Hybrid disposal construction with two object markers

\[(N_{\text{subject}}) - [MARKER_{\text{OM}(i)} - N_{\text{direct object}(i)}] - MARKER_{\text{OM}(ii)} - \text{PRONOUN}_{(i)} - \text{VERB PHRASE}\]

### 4.1 Common disposal construction

\[(N_{\text{subject}}) - [MARKER_{\text{OM}} + N_{\text{direct object}}] - \text{VERB PHRASE}\]

All the Sinitic languages examined in this brief survey possess at least one type of disposal construction, which I have labelled ‘the common disposal construction’ for convenience.9 In other words, it is found in Mandarin, Jin, Xiang, Gan, Wu, Huizhou,...

---

9 Endo (2004) also surveys construction types for the disposal construction in Chinese dialects. He recognizes two main types, the narrow and the broad disposal constructions (狹義處置式 and 廣義處置式). The ‘narrow’ type corresponds more or less to what I am calling the ‘common disposal construction’, that is, the basic type found in all Sinitic languages surveyed. His ‘broad’ type is then further subdivided into two constructions which have either a postverbal pronominal anaphor coding the direct object (our construction II, the ‘Medieval’ type, as found in Yue dialects) or a preverbal one (our construction types III and V, both common in Min with III also occurring in Wu; see Endo’s Map 5 with similar trends). For Endo, the determining
Min, Yue, Pinghua and Hakka. As this has already been exemplified above for Mandarin and Xiang, just one further example is provided below from Taiwanese Southern Min: 10

(5) Taiwanese Southern Min disposal construction with \( k\dot{a} \):

\[
(NP_{subject}) - [ka_{om} + \text{NP}_{do}] - \text{VERB PHRASE}
\]

\[
\text{啊 汝 共 汝 的 氣力 攏 用 去 啊}
\]

\[
a\ \text{li} \ \text{k\dot{a}}\ \text{li} \ \text{ê} \ \text{khui-lat} \ \text{lóng} \ \text{iòng-khi} \ a
\]

\[
\text{PRT} \ \text{2SG} \ \text{OM} \ \text{2SG GEN} \ \text{strength} \ \text{all} \ \text{use-DIR} \ \text{PRT}
\]

‘You used up all your strength.’ (Jesse’s Story:823) 11

4.2 “Medieval” disposal construction with a resumptive pronoun following verb

The second type of disposal construction appears to mainly form positive imperatives. I have located it in Meixian Hakka, Cantonese Yue, Shanghainese Wu, Jianghuai Mandarin (Yingshan and Chaoxian) and Southwestern Mandarin (Gong’an). It is possibly a reflex of an isomorphic structure found in Medieval Chinese which is discussed in depth in Peyraube (1996), the structure with a postverbal resumptive pronoun being common in Tang dynasty vernacular texts (see also Chappell 2006):

\[
(NP_{subject}) - [\text{MARKER}_{om} + \text{NP}_{direct object(i)}] \ \text{VERB}_{1} - (\text{VERB}_{2}) - \text{PRONOUN}_{(i)}
\]

(6) Northeastern Hakka: Jiayingzhou or Meixian Hakka

\[
(NP_{subject}) - [tsiong_{om} + \text{NP}_{direct object(i)}] \ \text{VERB}_{1} - (\text{VERB}_{2}) - \text{PRONOUN}_{(i)}
\]

\[
\text{將 裡 隻 雞 拿來 食帛 佢}
\]

\[
\text{tsiông} \ \text{li} \ \text{tchâc} \ \text{kê} \ \text{nā-loî} \ \text{chit-p’êt} \ \text{kî}
\]

\[
\text{OM} \ \text{this–CLF} \ \text{chicken} \ \text{bring} \ \text{eat–COMP} \ \text{3SG}
\]

factor is thus the position of the resumptive pronoun, while in my analysis it is the overall syntactic configuration which is at issue.

Map 92 in Cao Zhiyun (2008) looks at variation in disposal constructions in terms of the areas in which (i) the common disposal construction is used versus (ii) those which add the verbal prefix \( gê \) to the predicate: 給 + VP versus (iii) areas or dialects where the disposal construction is not used at all. As such, it is not strictly comparable with our study, apart from confirming the use of the common disposal construction all over China.

10 Chappell (2006) discusses the construction types in more depth, according to each particular Sinitic language in the sample. Hence, this will not be repeated here.

11 This narrative was recorded in Taipei in the 1990s. Jesse recounts various adventures as a young boy growing up on the outskirts of Taipei in the postwar period.
De cette poule, n’en laissez rien.
[‘Eat up all this chicken.’] (example from Rey 1926:III)

(7) Hong Kong Cantonese disposal construction with jeung and a postverbal pronoun:
\[ (\text{NP}_{\text{SUBJECT}}) - [\text{JEUNG}_{\text{OM}} + \text{NP}_{\text{DIRECT OBJECT}(i)}] \text{ VERB}_1 - (\text{VERB}_2) - \text{PRONOUN}(i) \]
‘Be sure not to dye your hair black.’ (example from Cheung 1992:286)

4.3 Disposal construction with clause-initial object and its resumptive pronoun introduced by the object marker

In a third construction type, the direct object is placed in clause-initial position and an anaphoric or resumptive pronoun follows the object marker. It appears to be restricted geographically to the central and southeast of China, specifically to certain Min and Wu dialects: Taiwanese, Xiamen, Shantou, Chaozhou and Hainan (Southern Min), Fuzhou (Mindong), Min dialects of southern Zhejiang, Wenzhou (Wu) and other Zhejiang Wu dialects including Shanghainese, Shaoxing, Zeguo (Yuan 1960:286, Xu & Tao 1999, Huang 1996).

\[ \text{NP}_{\text{DIRECT OBJECT}(i)} - (\text{NP}_{\text{SUBJECT}}) - [\text{MARKER}_{\text{OM}} + \text{PRONOUN}(i)] - \text{VERB PHRASE} \]

(8) Taiwanese Southern Min accusative kā construction with a clause-initial object:
\[ \text{NP}_{\text{OBJECT}(i)} - [\text{KA}_{\text{OM}} + \text{PRONOUN}(i)] - \text{VP} \]
‘Close the door.’
[more literally: the door, take it and close] (example from Tsao 1994:383).

(9) Wenzhou dialect accusative dei\(^{11}\) construction with a clause-initial object:
\[ \text{NP}_{\text{OBJECT}(i)} - [\text{DEI}^{11} + \text{PRONOUN}(i)] - \text{VP} \]
‘Eat up the apple!’ [more literally: apple, take it and eat]
(example from Xu & Tao 1999:143)
In both construction types II and III, the pronoun is necessarily coreferential with the direct object preposed to it, not to mention, typically in third person singular form. This contrasts strikingly with the case for standard Mandarin which does not possess either structural subtype for its bā construction.

4.4 “Archaic Chinese” disposal construction with clause-initial object followed by the object marker and a zero anaphor

\[ \text{NP}_{\text{DIRECT OBJECT}(i)} - [\text{MARKER}_{\text{OM}} + \text{___}] \text{ VERB PHRASE} \]

In a similar fashion, a fourth structural type places the direct object into clause-initial position preceding the object marker. However, there is no ‘double marking’ of this object by means of a resumptive pronoun: in fact, the object marker directly precedes the predicate. In my survey of the literature on this topic, it was identified just for the small number of following dialects: Dongkou (Xiang); Huaiyin (Jianghuai Mandarin); and Xiuzhuan Hakka.

(10) Dongkou Xiang
\[ \text{NP}_{\text{DIRECT OBJECT}(i)} - [\text{MARKER}_{\text{OM}} + \text{___}] \text{ VERB PHRASE} \]

衣衫 担 脫 咖
\[ i^4 tae^2 tae^4 t^h kua^2 \]
clothes OM take.off-ASP
‘Take off your clothes.’
(example from Wu 2005:205; data recorded by Tang Zuofan in Wu 1996: 472-473)

This does not appear to be a case of the development of a passive prefix as in Taiwanese Southern Min (Cheng & Tsao 1995) since the object marker may also precede intransitive verbs such as ‘to go’; see example (11) below. In other words, it can be expanded into a type of serial verb construction where the verbs share the same object.

(11) 書 担 去 賣 咖
\[ shts' tae^4 t^h mai^4 kua^2 \]
book OM go sell ASP
‘(Go and) sell these books.’ (example from Wu 2005:205)

This construction type is attested as early as texts from the Archaic period whence its label (see Peyraube 1988:77 for examples from the Shi Jing 詩經 or Book of Odes).
4.5 Hybrid disposal construction with two object markers

\[(\text{NP}_{\text{SUBJECT}}) - [\text{MARKER}_{\text{OM}(i)} - \text{NP}_{\text{DIRECT OBJECT}(i)}] - [\text{MARKER}_{\text{OM}(ii)} - \text{PRONOUN}_{(i)}] - \text{VP}\]

A fifth structure found so far only in Southern Min involves hybridization, whereby both the vernacular and literary markers of the disposal construction co-occur, as well as the use of a resumptive pronoun. The double marking strictly follows the order of the literary marker first, that is, \(\text{chiong}\), followed by the vernacular marker \(kā\). I have only found it described for the two Southern Min dialects of Taiwanese and Chaozhou.

(12) Taiwanese Southern Min hybrid form with two object markers:

\[
(\text{NP}_{\text{SUBJECT}}) - [\text{CHIONG}_{\text{OM}} + \text{NP}_{\text{DO}(i)}] - [\text{Kā}_{\text{OM}} + \text{PRONOUN}_{\text{DO}(i)}] - \text{VP}
\]

將 门 共 伊 關 起來
\(\text{chiong} \ mīng \ kā \ yī \ kuì\) \(\text{khì-lāi}\)
\(\text{OM}_1\) 门 门 3SG close INC
‘Close the door.’ (example from Tsao 1994:383)
[more literally: take the door, take it and close:up]

This ends the overview of lexical sources and construction types for object-marking or disposal constructions in Sinitic languages. The fifth and final part of this description concentrates on the typological analysis of Sinitic languages, according to the source of the object marker in the basic disposal construction for which the most data are available.

5. Linguistic zones in China

According to a preliminary survey of approximately 200 Sinitic languages and dialects from secondary references (in addition to the main sources quoted above), four linguistic areas can be discerned, and tentatively established, according to the main source of the object marker:

1) **NORTHERN ZONE:**
Mandarin and Jin, Northern Wu.

2) **CENTRAL CHINA TRANSITIONAL ZONE:**
Xiang, Gan, Hui and Southern Wu, many central and southern Mandarin dialects including Zhongyuan, Jianghuai and Southwestern Guanhua areas.

3) **SOUTHEASTERN ZONE:**
Min and certain Hakka and Wu dialects, and a non-contiguous area comprised of several Jianghuai and Southwestern Mandarin dialects, also Waxiang (Hunan).
4) **SOUTHERN ZONE:**
Yue and Hakka dialects.

5.1 Discussion

For the Jin, Northern and Northwestern Mandarin dialect groups, *take* verbs are in the majority, as is the case for the Northern Wu dialect region (the Taihu cluster). In the centre of China, however, we find a swathe of *give* and *help* verbs used as object markers as the primary lexical source. This is particularly apparent in the transitional zones of the Xiang, Gan, Hui and Southern Wu dialects for areas south of the Qiantang River (see Xu & Tao 1999 on Wu dialects). It also holds for the non-northern Mandarin dialect groups (see further remarks below).

In the central south provinces of Hunan and Jiangxi, Xiang and Gan languages show similarities in having *take* verbs as a second, less frequent, source. Often it is difficult to identify the basic lexical meaning of the verb associated with the object marker from the reference materials, since in these central transitional zones, depending on the dialect, ‘give’ can mean ‘take’ or ‘take’ can mean ‘give’ (temporarily using the Mandarin meaning as the departure point for this observation). For example, the meaning of *na2* 拿 and *laq7* 換 in Gan dialects of Nanchang alternates between ‘give’ in some or ‘take’ in others, whereas the first verb can only mean ‘hold’, ‘take’ in standard Mandarin (the second verb is not used in Mandarin). Similarly, *te* 得 in certain Guangdong Hakka and Southwestern Mandarin dialects of Hunan means ‘to give’ and not ‘to obtain’ as it does in standard Mandarin.

It is interesting to note that many Mandarin dialects of the Zhongyuan (Central Plains), Jianghuai and Xinan (Southwestern) groups also use object markers based on ‘give’, and not ‘take’, unlike the northern group of Mandarin dialects which includes the standard language, *pùtōnghuà* 普通话. An exception to this generalization would however be the vernacular form of the Beijing dialect (Northern Mandarin) in which *gěi* 給 ‘give’ is the object marker, not *bǎ* 把 < ‘hold’ (see Wang 2004, Chirkova 2008; the example from her transcribed conversations which follows interestingly also makes use of a resumptive pronoun after its object marker).

(13) Colloquial Beijing dialect

\[
yíge xiǎo miào gěi tā huàncéng huáng liúliwā ma\]
\[
one:CLF little temple OM 3SG change:into yellow tile Q\]

‘Otherwise, how would a tiny little temple get covered with yellow glazed tiles?’

*Help* verbs are the predominant source for the Huizhou dialects while this source is
common alongside *give* in Southern Wu.

Pinghua and Yue dialects, including Cantonese, but also many Hakka dialects form a second area of *take* verbs in the south but, in the case of Hakka with widely varying sources compared with the Northern area: The Yue dialects show a predilection for the marker *jiāng* 將 and its cognates whereas a range of verbs is attested for Hakka dialects. However, in the literature consulted, many scholars note that morphologically unmarked OV or SVO constructions are preferred to the disposal construction in Yue and Hakka. Furthermore, they observe that the disposal construction with *jiāng* 將 belongs to a more literary or formal register (書面語 *shūmiànyǔ*). For example, see Cheung (1992). Hence, it does not appear to originally have been a ‘native’ strategy for coding objects but has possibly been introduced by the court language in the Medieval period. In Chappell (2006), I discuss some other examples of *take* verbs found in colloquial Hong Kong Cantonese narratives that are used to introduce objects in serial verb constructions.

Out on a limb, we find the Min dialects which make use of a comitative source, namely *kā* 共 and its cognates, as mentioned in §2 and §3. This is the same semantic field as found for the source of object markers in certain Hakka, Wu and even Mandarin dialects. Hakka dialects, including Meixian 梅縣 and some of those located in Taiwan, make use of *t'ung*／同 < ‘to accompany’ and *lau*／㧯 < ‘to mix’, as explained in §2 above. A small segment of Wu dialects, including Shaoxing 紹興 and Ningbo 宁波, have what was originally a comitative marker as their source for object markers (搭), as do a smattering of Jianghuai and Southwestern Mandarin dialects, not to mention the Waxiang language of Hunan, as yet unclassified. The latter groups all use *GEN* 跟 < ‘to follow’ and its cognates (see Chappell, Peyraube & Wu 2011 for a detailed discussion).

### 6. Conclusion

Firstly, I have shown that, regardless of the large number of languages and dialects which belong to the Sinitic taxon, there are just three main sources for object markers:

- verbs of taking and holding;
- verbs of giving and helping and
- comitatives

On this basis, and this basis only—the source of object markers—four linguistic zones

---

12 A summary form of the data for the four linguistic zones is presented in Table 1 below for ease of reference. A fuller listing of object markers and the source of information is provided in Appendix 1 while a dialect map of China representing the four linguistic zones is given in Appendix 2.
may be tentatively set up: Northern, Central, Southern and Southeastern (see Table 1).

Secondly, at least five different kinds of object marking constructions can be identified in which overt morphological marking is used to code the direct object. These can be distinguished on the basis of their word order, constituency and the position of the direct object with respect to its marker. This was treated in §4.

Table 1: Principal sources of object markers in the four linguistic zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINGUISTIC ZONE</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) NORTHERN ZONE</td>
<td>- Jin dialects 晉: BA 把</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin, Jin and Northern Wu</td>
<td>- Northern Mandarin dialects 北方官話: BA 把, NA 拿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take verbs (Zone I)</td>
<td>- Northwestern Mandarin dialects 西北官話: Lanzhou 蘭州, Qinghai 青海 (西北部): BA 把</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Northern Wu: Suhu cluster 蘇戶小片, Shaoxi cluster 蒲溪小片: NA 拿</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) CENTRAL CHINA TRANSITIONAL ZONE</td>
<td>- Central, Jianghuai and SW Mandarin dialects, 江淮, 中原和西南官話: GEI 給, BA 把 = ‘give’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Give/help verbs – primary source</td>
<td>- Xiang 潮: BA 把 = ‘give’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Take verbs – secondary source</td>
<td>- Gan 湘: na2 拿, laq7 撼 = ‘give’ or ‘take’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Huizhou 徽州: BANG 帮 ‘help’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Southern Wu 吳 (南部): DAI 代 ‘help’, YUE 約 ‘give’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hakka dialects 客家話:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. give verbs NA 拿 DE 得</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. a range of take verbs: TI 提, ZHUO 提, DOULAI 兜来, BAI 摆, YAN 摒, DA 搭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) SOUTHEASTERN ZONE</td>
<td>- Min dialects: KA 共</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min and certain Hakka and</td>
<td>e.g.: Fuzhou 福州, Taiwanese 台灣, Xiamen 厦门,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu dialects;</td>
<td>Chaozhou 潮州, Dongshan 東山, Quanzhou 泉州, Hainan 海南</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a sprinkling of Jianghuai and SW Mandarin; Waxiang</td>
<td>N.B. use of JIANG 將 in formal registers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitatives</td>
<td>- Hakka dialects: Meixian 梅縣, Taiwan 台灣: LAU 拽, TUNG 同</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wu dialects 威 (Taihu cluster): Shaoxing 紹興: ZE 則 (=?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Jianghuai and SW Mandarin dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Waxiang (unclassified): GEN 前</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) SOUTHERN ZONE</td>
<td>- Yue 粵 and Hakka 客家 dialects: JIANG 將</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yue; Hakka dialects spoken in Guangdong</td>
<td>- Yue 粵: Serial verb constructions with partly grammaticalized take verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take verbs (Zone II)</td>
<td>N.B. use of JIANG 將 and BA 把 corresponds to more formal registers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from the “common” disposal construction, found in all ten Sinitic languages, a determining feature of some of these constructions was the linking of the direct object with a following resumptive pronoun (types II, III, V). A particularly clear case was the “Medieval-style” construction (II) with a resumptive pronoun following the main verb. Clause-initial direct objects (III) or those constructions with double-marking, construction V (with the co-occurrence of two different object markers as in certain Southern Min dialects) also reveal the use of such a resumptive pronoun but one that is introduced by the object marker in this case. In contrast to this, the “Archaic Chinese” clause-initial object construction was followed by its overt marker and a zero anaphor, that is, it did not make use of any resumptive pronoun (IV).

The lack of data on most of these construction types, except for the common one, does not allow for any reliable classification into zones or determining of regional patterning at this point of time, as opposed to the type and semantic source of object markers which allows a broad division into four zones (as discussed in §5 above). All that can be said is that the degree of variation is particularly prominent in the Central and the majority of Southern Sinitic languages, that is, everywhere but in the north which uses the one main common disposal construction type. Postverbal resumptive pronouns common in imperative form are found in Wu, Hakka and Yue dialect groups but not in Min where the preference is to prepose the full lexical form of the object into clause-initial position with the pronominal reprise directly following the object marker (including the hybridized form). This type is found in Wu dialects as well.

The extensive range of structural possibilities and semantic constraints which shape these different disposal constructions highlights the fact that it is an erroneous exercise to assume a broad syntactic isomorphism between Mandarin and other Sinitic languages, as has often been the case in many earlier grammatical studies. From this it can be concluded that researching Sinitic languages as a whole (and not just standard Mandarin) can make an important contribution to typology and grammaticalization theory, since, for example, comitatives and verbs of giving/helping are not widely known or attested as sources for object markers in the relevant literature.

A comprehensive survey of this construction type would also aid in determining the relevant intra-Sinitic typological parameters that pertain to syntax and morphology and thereby refine the work of pioneers in typology and dialectology such as Li Fang-Kuei, Yuan Jiahua and his team of linguists, Mantaro Hashimoto, Anne Yue(-Hashimoto) and Jerry Norman inter alia. There is probably not just a north-south divide, as proposed by Hashimoto, nor even a north-central-south trichotomy, as proposed by Norman, but at least four major zones, identified on the basis of shared morphosyntactic properties. The reason for enlarging the number of linguistic areas is the fact that the Min dialect group typically shows different syntactic strategies to the Hakka and Yue groups of Southern Sinitic.
Further support for the diversity which abounds in the object-marking strategies of Sinitic languages can be found in typological studies of other constructions or morpho-syntactic categories: for example, Lamarre (2001) on verb complementation; Li Lan (2003) on comparative constructions; Liu Danqing (2003) on basic word order differences; and my own work on aspect and evidential markers (Chappell 1992b, 2001c) which similarly show that the Min dialect group patterns differently from the rest of Sinitic—it uses different lexical sources for its verb complementizers, comparative and evidential markers, and undoubtedly for many other phenomena. A recently completed study on complementizers grammaticalized from quotative verbs (Chappell 2008) similarly reveals that these verbs in Yue and Hakka are at a much younger stage of development than in Southern Min, while the central zone, represented by certain Wu, Xiang and Gan dialects, does not turn up this development at all.

Finally, these linguistic zones or grammaticalization areas crosscut the traditional dialect group boundaries, such as those set up by Li Fang-Kuei (1973) and Yuan Jiahua (1960) and which were largely based on phonological and morphological criteria. Further in-depth research is needed however on a much larger set of grammatical constructions before we can claim these zones exist in any confident way. This small study represents an initial step in this direction, hinting at the possibility of using a typology based on grammaticalization pathways, as one crucial diagnostic.
Appendix 1

SURVEY OF OBJECT MARKERS IN SINITIC LANGUAGES BY DIALECT GROUP
(from South to North)

1. Yue dialect group 粵方言:
   TAKE verbs

   JIANG 將 is the most common marker—the case for 41/45 dialects surveyed in Guangdong province with the caveat that many scholars remark on the preference for OV or for SVO structures where Mandarin uses BA 把.

   Other markers listed in surveys: BA 把, □ [ȵia$^{55}$]

   Sources: Zhan & Cheung (1988) on Pearl River Delta dialects
            Zhan & Cheung (1994) on Yue dialects in Northern Guangdong
            Chang (2000); Huang (1996:238-239)

2. Hakka dialect group 客家方言:
   TAKE verbs

   Hakka dialects, more than any other group, show a tendency to pattern according to their geographical area and neighbours. Thus, even though most of the dialects represented in our survey use a variety of TAKE verbs as their object markers, others in Jiangxi, for example, use a GIVE verb, while yet others use a comitative, as in Taiwan.

   (i) Hakka in Guangdong province: 5/5 use JIANG 將
       Similar to Yue dialects in this area, they may not use a disposal construction at all. If they do, it is likely to be JIANG 將. Two studies turn up an approximately equal usage of either SOV or OV structures as opposed to S Marker OV (Li & Chang 1992, Liu 1999:743).
       Source: Zhan & Cheung (1988)

   (ii) Hakka in Jiangxi, Hunan, Fujian and Sichuan provinces: 12/17 can use BA 把 ‘take’.
       Source: Li & Chang (1992)

   (iii) Hakka in Jiangxi province: 5/11 use NA 拿 ‘give’.
       Source: Liu (1999:633, 743)
(iv) Hunan Hakka: e.g. Rucheng uses NA 拿 ‘give’
   Source: Huang (1996:662)

(v) Other markers listed in surveys: other attested TAKE verbs in Hakka dialects:
   TI 提, ZHUO 捉, DOULAI 達來, BAI 擺, YAN 搏, DA 搭.
   Source: Li & Chang (1992)

(vi) Comitative:
   Note that such surveys using elicitation techniques on the basis of standard Mandarin
   do not turn up object markers with a comitative source at all, namely, t’ung11 同 and
   lau11 捕 (Chappell 2006). For further detailed descriptions of lau11 捕 as an object
   marker, see Lin (1990) and Lai (2003a, 2003b). JIANG 將 is also listed as the main
   disposal marker in many grammars of Hakka but does not appear to be the native
   strategy.

3. Gan dialect group 贛方言:
   GIVE verbs and TAKE verbs

   In general, the Gan dialects show a preference for verbs of giving as the source for
   their object markers, and secondly, verbs of taking, reflecting their status as central
   transitional zone dialects.

(i) Gan dialects in Jiangxi, Hunan, Fujian, Hubei and Anhui provinces:
   14/17 use a GIVE verb, particularly BA 把 with the meaning of ‘give’ (9/17). Two
   other principal verbs of giving in this survey are ma3 □ (listed with the meaning of
   ‘give’ on p.386) (3/17) and pei3 麗 (3/17). The two verbs na2 拿 and laq7 撫 ‘to
   hold’ are also sources of object markers; these can mean either ‘take’ or ‘give’,
   depending on the dialect.
   Source: Li & Chang (1992)

(ii) In Jiangxi province taken alone, verbs of taking appear to prevail but a caveat
   applies:
   8/21 Gan dialects use 把 = ‘take’ while another 4 /21 had NA 拿 and 1/21, TI 提
   (total 13/21 dialects surveyed). Note that a further 3/21 of Gan dialects with BA 把
   as the OM use this as their give verb, while 5/21 Gan dialects had BAI 擺 as their OM
   similarly meaning ‘give’).
   Source: Liu (1999:743). See also Liu (1999:633) for a list of GIVE verbs in Gan
   dialects.
4. **Xiang dialect group** 湘方言:
   GIVE verbs and TAKE verbs

   Similarly, the Xiang dialects show a preference for verbs of giving as the source for object markers, and secondly, verbs of taking. A further source, third in frequency is found in verbs of helping.

   Overall, GIVE is the main source of disposal markers in a survey carried out by Wu (2005: Ch. 6) of 98 Hunan dialects including Xiang, Gan/Hakka and Mandarin: 74/98. In this function, it is the verb BA 把 ‘give’ which prevails: 62/74. Restricting the discussion to just the 33 Xiang dialects in her survey, we obtain the following figures:

   (i) **GIVE:** 把, 給
       27/33 localities 26/27 BA 把 and 1/27 GEI 給.

   (ii) **TAKE:** 5/33 NA 拿, DAN 擔
       In this category, 3/5 localities use NA 拿 and 2/5 use DAN.

   (iii) **HELP:** 1/33 BANG 幫
       *Source:* Wu (2005: Ch. 6)

5. **Wu dialect group** 吳方言:
   GIVE, HELP and TAKE verbs, and the COMITATIVE

   According to Xu & Tao (1999), there are three main sources for object markers which correspond to clearly delineated geographical areas in Wu:

   (i) **TAKE verbs:**
       TAKE verbs as OMs are spread over the region north of the Qiantang river (錢塘江) including Shanghai, Suzhou (Suhu cluster) and Shaoxi clusters.
       Examples: NA 拿, ZHUO 捉, BA 把

   (ii) **GIVE and HELP verbs:**
       This is the most widespread source for Wu dialects, and is found across the entire region except for the Taihu subgroup: WUZHOU 婺州, CHUQU 處衢片, OUJIANG 瓯江
       GIVE: BO 撥, YUE 約
       HELP: BANG 幫, DAI 代
(iii) COMITATIVE
This source is located within the Taihu subgroup, namely, Shaoxing and Ningbo in central eastern Zhejiang.

Shaoxing 紹興: ZE 則
Ningbo 寧波: DA 搭

Source: Xu & Tao (1999)
Qian (1992)

6. Huizhou dialect group 徽州方言:
HELP / GIVE verbs

According to Hirata Shoji’s description of 8 Huizhou dialects (1998), the HELP verb BANG 帮 is found in 4/8, while GIVE verbs and TAKE verbs have two each (2/8). This means that the combined category of HELP/GIVE is possibly the preponderant one.

Source: Hirata (1998)

7. Min dialect group 閩方言:
COMITATIVES par excellence

(i) In most dialects surveyed, the marker used is the cognate of GONG 共, which also serves as the comitative (Chappell 2000). This includes the Mindong dialect of Fuzhou as well as Southern Min where its use is widespread.

GONG 共:
Fuzhou ky¹ (Chen 1997) Quanzhou kaŋ¹ (Lin 1993)
Chaozhou kaʔ³² Hainan kaʔl (Nakajima 1979)

(ii) JIANG 將 is also used in more formal registers, but is not considered as the native strategy (see Tsao 1994, Cheng & Tsao 1995).

Fuzhou tsyŋ⁵⁵ ~ tsiaŋ¹ Putian tsyŋ⁵⁵
Quanzhou tsiaŋ¹ Xiamen tsiaŋ¹
Chaozhou tsiaŋ¹ Chaoyang tsiaŋ³
Hainan tsiaŋ¹ (cf. references as above)
8. **Mandarin dialect group** 北方話:

   **TAKE verbs and GIVE verbs**

   (i) **TAKE verbs**: BA 把

   - Jianghuai group: BA 把 (Chaoxian, Anhui; Yingshan, Hubei), NA 拿 (Taixing, Jiangsu)
   - Lanyin group: BA 把 (Lanzhou, Gansu)
   - Zhongyuan group: BA 把 (Qinghai; Weinan, Shaanxi)

   (ii) **GIVE verbs**: GEI 給

   - Beijing Mandarin (see Chirkova 2008)
   - Zhongyuan group (Luoyang, Henan; Suqian, Jiangsu)
   - Jianghuai group (E’dong, Hubei, Yangzhou, Jiangsu BA 把 = ‘give’)
   - Southwestern Mandarin group (Wuhan, Hubei BA 把 = ‘give’)

   (iii) **HELP verbs**

   - Southwestern Mandarin: BANG 帮 (Heqing, Yunnan)

   *Source: Huang (1996)*

9. **Jin dialect group** 晉方言:

   **TAKE verbs** BA 把

   According to Hou & Wen (1993), all 6 Jin dialects in their survey of Shanxi province make use of BA 把 in the disposal construction; as does Huhehot in Inner Mongolia; Jiaocheng, Shanxi (Huang 1996)

   *Sources: Hou & Wen (1993)*

10. **Guangxi Pinghua** 廣西桂北平話:

   **TAKE verbs**: Mainly JIANG 將 in more formal registers.

   **GIVE verbs**

   - Nanning Pinghua 許 [hài] (Qin 2000 and p.c.)

11. **Hunan Waxiang** 湖南瓦鄉:

   **COMITATIVE**

   - Hunan Yuanling Waxiang: 跟 [kɛ̃⁵⁵] (Yang 1999)
   - Hunan Guzhang Waxiang: 跟 [kai⁵⁵] (Wu & Chappell 2008)
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