

## Double Object Construction in Hainan Min<sup>\*</sup>

Hui-chi Lee

*National Cheng Kung University*

This paper focuses on the ditransitive construction in Hainan Min. The giving verb in Hainan Min is *bun*<sup>44</sup>, which corresponds to the Hakka giving verb *bun* rather than to Southern Min *hoo* or *khit*. The syntactic and semantic properties of Hainan Min *bun* are examined and compared with those of other dialects. Furthermore, the dative alternations of the giving verb *bun* in Hainan Min are shown. The interaction between verb types and the different dative constructions is tested. There is a unique dative marker *ti*<sup>11</sup> in Hainan Min. The origin of this word is explored through a comparison of five possible candidates in terms of phonetic similarity and semantic association.

Key words: Hainan Min, double object construction, dative alternation, ditransitive

### 1. Introduction

The aim of this study is to explore the ditransitive construction in Hainan Min,<sup>1</sup> a Chinese Min dialect spoken on Hainan Island. The dialects of Chinese can be basically divided into seven subgroups: Guanhua, Xiang, Gan, Wu, Yue, Min, and Hakka. The Hainan dialects belong to the Min group, specifically to the Southern Min group.<sup>2</sup> Research into Southern Min dialects has shown remarkable advances in recent decades. However, the few studies on Hainan Min mainly focus on lexical and phonological issues (e.g. Hashimoto 1959, 1960, 1961a, 1961b, 1976, Liang 1986, Chen 1996, Woon

---

<sup>\*</sup> This paper has been partially supported by NSC 99-2410-H-006-109. I have benefited from the comments of Feng-fu Tsao, Chinfa Lien, Chi-on Chin, Rui-wen Wu and Chu-fang Huang during the writing of this paper. Thanks are also due to two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

<sup>1</sup> The phonological transcription of Hainan Min used in this paper basically follows the international phonetic system. The voiced consonants in the Wenchang dialect include /b, b, d, d, m, n, ŋ, l, dz, g, fi/. The voiceless consonants are /p, t, s, ts, k, h, ʔ/. Vowels include /a, i, u, e, o/. The vowel [ɛ] is rendered as <e> and the consonant [ŋ], [ʔ] as <ng> and <h>. The transcription of tone systems in Hainan Min is rendered by tone values.

<sup>2</sup> Yang & Xia (1992) utilize the statistical method to calculate relative coefficients among Min dialects. They assume that Hainanese belongs to Southern Min dialects.

2004, and X.-Z. Liu 2006). Qian (2002) discusses syntactic topics in the Hainan Min Tunchang dialect, but the book does not offer any theoretical explanations. The paucity of syntactic studies in the literature on Hainan Min motivates the present study. Lee (2009a, 2010) has started the investigation of syntactic constructions in Hainan Min, focusing especially on predicate-related constructions, e.g. disposal, passive, and causative structures. As for predicative syntax, the double object construction is an essential topic, which has not been included in Lee's earlier work. Building up on previous research, the present study attempts to explore the ditransitive construction in Hainan Min.

This paper aims to examine the following three issues. The giving verb in Hainan Min is pronounced *ɸun*<sup>44</sup> 'give', a pronunciation quite unlike those of the other giving verbs in other Min dialects. The present study, therefore, starts by accounting for the giving verb in Hainan Min and presenting its syntactic distribution. Second, the various sentence patterns that make up the ditransitive construction are examined, following the findings of earlier studies on Mandarin and other Min dialects. Third, the recipient (or dative) marker in Hainan, *ti*<sup>11</sup>, which is not found in most Chinese dialects, is analyzed in §4. The last section concludes this paper. The data in this paper come mostly from my own field work on Hainan Island. The informants are native speakers of the Hainan Wenchang dialect.<sup>3</sup> The Wenchang dialect is the official language for TV broadcasters on Hainan Island; Hashimoto (1959, 1960, 1961a, 1961b, 1976), Liang (1986), and Woon (2004) also select Wenchang as representative of the Hainan Min dialects.

## 2. The double-object verb GIVE in Hainan Min

The verb GIVE in Hainan Min is *ɸun*<sup>44</sup> with an implosive voiced initial which is a unique phonetic feature of the Hainan dialect. The normal word order pattern for the word *ɸun* is for it to occur with the theme argument preceding the recipient, [V Theme Recipient (V DO IO)]. In contrast, the reverse word order [V Recipient Theme (V IO DO)] is not allowed, as shown in (1) and (2).

- (1) Gua<sup>21</sup>   ɸun<sup>44</sup>   dziak<sup>33</sup>   ɸui<sup>21</sup>   seh<sup>55</sup>   i<sup>44</sup>                      [V DO IO]  
       1SG    give    one       CL    book    3SG  
       'I give a book to him.'

<sup>3</sup> The informants are local villagers in their 50s. Mandarin (Putonghua) is not spoken in their daily lives. The inhabitants in their village use only Hainan Min to communicate with one another.

- (2) \*Gua<sup>21</sup>    ɓun<sup>44</sup>    i<sup>44</sup>    dziak<sup>33</sup>    ɓui<sup>21</sup>    seh<sup>55</sup>    [\*V IO DO]  
 1SG    give    3SG    one    CL    book  
 ‘I give him a book.’

In addition to the double object construction,<sup>4</sup> the dative alternation is also found in Hainan Min, in which *ti*<sup>11</sup> functions as a recipient marker, as illustrated in (3). Moreover, unlike Mandarin, where [V-*gei* IO DO] is a common form, the recipient marker *ti*<sup>11</sup> in Hainan Min does not occur directly after the double object verb in the [V-*ti* IO DO] form, as can be seen in (4).

- (3) Gua<sup>21</sup>    ɓun<sup>44</sup>    dziak<sup>33</sup>    ɓui<sup>21</sup>    seh<sup>55</sup>    ti<sup>11</sup>    i<sup>44</sup>    [V DO *ti* IO]  
 1SG    give    one    CL    book    to    3SG  
 ‘I give a book to him.’
- (4) \*Gua<sup>21</sup>    ɓun<sup>44</sup>    ti<sup>11</sup>    i<sup>44</sup>    dziak<sup>33</sup>    ɓui<sup>21</sup>    seh<sup>55</sup>    [\*V *ti* IO DO]  
 1SG    give    to    3SG    one    CL    book  
 ‘I give him a book.’

## 2.1 Counterparts of Hainan Min BUN in other dialects

In the Min dialects, 分 (*bun/pun/ɓun*) is not commonly found as a giving verb. The most frequent giving verbs in the Min dialects are *hoo* 與/予 and *khit* 乞.<sup>5</sup> It is noteworthy that *pung*<sup>33</sup> 分 is also used in the Chaoshan dialects,<sup>6</sup> along with *khih*<sup>2</sup> 乞. These two words can also function as agent markers in passive sentences. According to Lin (1996) and Shi (2000), the two words *pung*<sup>33</sup> and *khih*<sup>2</sup> convey the same meaning and are syntactically interchangeable. Unlike Chaoshan Min, Hainan Min does not employ the two main giving verbs found in Min dialects, *hoo* and *khit*, as variants of *ɓun*. Moreover, the word *ɓun* is not as multifunctional as Chaoshan Min *pung*<sup>33</sup> which can mean ‘giving, allowing’ or indicate the passive.

<sup>4</sup> The term “double object construction” (DOC) used in this paper refers to a structure that contains a main verb immediately followed by two objects. Unlike the English double object [give IO DO], the word order of Hainan Min double object construction is [*ɓun* DO IO].

<sup>5</sup> The other possibilities for giving verbs in the Min dialects are *kheing* 欠 and *na* 納. The giving verb in Mandarin dialects is *gei* 給, in the Gan dialects *pa* 把 or *pai* 擺, in the Xiang dialects *pa* or *te* 得, in the Yue dialects *pei* 畀, in the Hakka dialects *bun* 分 or *na* 拿 and in the Wu dialects *peh* 撥 (cf. Chin 2009).

<sup>6</sup> The Chaoshan dialects are sub-dialects of Southern Min and spoken in Guangdong Province, rather than in Fujian Province where Southern Min dialects are mostly used. Guangdong is situated geographically closer to Hainan Island than Fujian Province.

Hainan Min *bun* is phonetically similar to the giving verb in the Hakka dialect group, *bun* 分,<sup>7</sup> though they differ in the onsets. According to Lai (2001), Hakka *bun* performs several syntactic functions—giving verb, causative verb, adposition (a goal marker), and complementizer—because Hakka *bun* is undergoing a process of grammaticalization from verb-of-giving to agent marker. She provides six examples of *bun* demonstrating the diversity of its uses:

(5) Hakka (Lai 2001:139, (1a-f))

- a. Gi    bun    yi    gi    bid    ngai  
       3SG BUN one CL pen 1SG  
       ‘He gave a pen to me.’
- b. Gi    bun    ngai    yi    gi    bid  
       3SG BUN 1SG one CL pen  
       ‘He gave me a pen.’
- c. Gi    sung    yi    gi    bid    bun    ngai  
       3SG give one CL pen BUN 1SG  
       ‘He gave a pen to me.’
- d. Gi    dai    dung-xi    bun    geu-e    sid  
       3SG bring thing BUN dog eat  
       ‘He brought food for the dog to eat.’
- e. Gi    voi    bun    ngai    hi    toibed  
       3SG would BUN 1SG go Taipei  
       ‘He would let me go to Taipei.’
- f. Gi    bun    ngai    da  
       3SG BUN 1SG beat  
       ‘He was beaten by me.’

Hakka *bun* in (5a) and (5b) functions as a double object verb. It acts like a goal marker in (5c), a complementizer linking two clauses in (5d), a causative verb in (5e), and an agent marker in a passive sentence in (5f).

Unlike Hakka *bun*, Hainan Min *bun* does not perform multiple functions. It is not associated with the use of a causative verb and a complementizer as there are at least five causative verbs in Hainan Min: *ioh*<sup>33</sup>, *toh*<sup>55</sup>, *fiat*<sup>42</sup>, *hing*<sup>44</sup>-*hai*<sup>42</sup> and *tai*<sup>21</sup>.<sup>8</sup> The agent marker in Hainan Min is mostly rendered as *ioh*<sup>33</sup>. Data in Woon (2004) show that first

<sup>7</sup> Following Lai’s (2001) transliteration, the Hakka giving verb is rendered as *bun*. However, the onset of Hakka *bun* is articulated as a voiceless bilabial stop /p/ rather than /b/.

<sup>8</sup> The causative constructions and causative verbs are explored in Lee (2010).

generation Hainan Min speakers in Singapore use both *bun* and *ioh* as agent markers to convey passives, while second and third generations prefer employing *ioh* to express passives,<sup>9</sup> as shown in (6).

- (6) a. First generation:  
 Mih<sup>33</sup> dɔu<sup>44</sup> bun<sup>44</sup>/ioh<sup>33</sup> nang<sup>22</sup> kiap<sup>55</sup> liau<sup>21</sup> hu<sup>11</sup> la<sup>11</sup>  
 thing all give/PASS people rob PERF go PART  
 ‘The things were all stolen.’ (Woon 2004:269)
- b. Second generation:  
 Mih<sup>33</sup> dɔu<sup>44</sup> ioh<sup>33</sup> nang<sup>22</sup> kiap<sup>55</sup> liau<sup>21</sup> hu<sup>11</sup> la<sup>11</sup>  
 thing all PASS people rob PERF go PART  
 ‘The things were all stolen.’ (Woon 2004:269)
- c. Third generation:  
 Mih<sup>33</sup> dɔu<sup>44</sup> ioh<sup>33</sup> nang<sup>22</sup> kiap<sup>55</sup> liau<sup>21</sup> hu<sup>11</sup> la<sup>11</sup>  
 thing all PASS people rob PERF go PART  
 ‘The things were all stolen.’ (Woon 2004:269)

It is assumed that the grammatical function of *bun* as agent marker gradually disappears since it competes with the other agent marker *ioh*. Unlike Hakka, the giving verb *bun* has not been grammaticalized into a complementizer. Hashimoto (1988) points out, from a typological perspective, that southern Chinese dialects use their giving verbs as passive markers. For example, Hakka *bun*, Yue *pei*, Min *hoo* or *khit*, and Wu *peh* are verbs meaning ‘to give’ which also perform passive functions. Hainan Min, as a branch of the Min dialect group, tends to employ different words for the giving verb and the passive marker.

Hainan Min *bun* is phonetically close to Chaoshan Min *pung* and Hakka *bun*, but their syntactic behaviors are divergent. Hakka *bun* has the greatest range of functions among the three variants: a giving verb, a causative verb, a goal marker, an agent marker, and a complementizer. This multifunctionality shows that Hakka *bun* has been undergoing a process of grammaticalization from lexical verb to several function words. The course of grammaticalization for Hakka *bun* seems not to have been followed by Hainan *bun* or Chaoshan *pung*. The various stages of *bun/pung/bun*’s grammaticalization lead in the present study to the assumption that Chaoshan *pung* and Hainan *bun* are not intrinsic words in the Min dialects. When the historical Min data in *Li Jing Ji*<sup>10</sup> are checked, 270

<sup>9</sup> As was the case in Woon’s survey, my informants do not actively use *bun* as passive. They rather have *ioh* as passive, although they do understand *bun*-passives.

<sup>10</sup> *Li Jing Ji* is a Southern Min play script written over the Ming and Qing dynasties (ca. 1522-1908 AD).

tokens of the word 分 are found, but none of them convey the meaning of ‘giving’.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, according to Lien’s (2005) study, ditransitive constructions in *Li Jing Ji* often feature the words *khit* 乞, *thoo* 度, *heng* 還, *yu* 與, and *sang* 送.<sup>12</sup> Notice that *pung* 分 does not appear in the groups of ditransitive constructions in *Li Jing Ji*, mainly written in Chaoshou and Quanzhou Min dialects. This fact indicates that *pung* does not function as a verb of giving in early Southern Min, including in Chaoshan Min dialects. The word *pung* in modern Chaoshan dialects is likely borrowed from neighboring Hakka dialects following language contact. Modern Chaoshan dialects retain the intrinsic lexical item *khih* 乞 and also allow the loan word *pung* 分 to share the function of giving verbs. Like Chaoshan *pung*, Hainan Min *bun* may also be a loan word, since *bun* is not found in early Southern Min. Unlike Chaoshan dialects, Hainan Min has not retained *hoo* 與/予, *khit* 乞, or other original Min ditransitive verbs to share the functions of *bun*. Hainan Min *bun* is a fully-fledged member of the groups of ditransitive constructions. In addition, the Chaoshan *pung* and Hainan *bun* borrowed forms may have occurred at different time periods. This discrepancy may have been the cause for the different patterns of grammaticalization in *pung* and *bun*, as well as initiating a sound change: when Hakka *bun* (/pun/) was borrowed into Hainan Min, the plain /p/ onset was replaced by an implosive bilabial /ɓ/, in accordance with the specific sound rules of Hainan Min. To sum up, the above characteristics of Hainan Min *bun* make it syntactically and phonetically distinct from its corresponding dialectal counterparts.

## 2.2 The inverted double object construction

The Hainan Min ditransitive construction exhibits an ‘inverted’ double object construction<sup>13</sup> with the theme (DO) preceding the recipient (IO), as shown in (7). The word order of the double object construction in Hainan Min is [V DO IO]; the opposite word order [V IO DO] is not acceptable.

- (7) a. Bun<sup>44</sup> tsi<sup>22</sup> i<sup>44</sup>  
           give money 3SG  
           ‘Give him the money.’

<sup>11</sup> Among the 270 tokens, only two examples seem to behave like the verb ‘give’. However, the examples do not indicate solely ‘to give’; they are better interpreted as ‘to divide the object into parts and then give some parts to someone’.

<sup>12</sup> The phonetic forms of the five giving words follow the transliteration of Lien (2005).

<sup>13</sup> The term ‘inverted double object construction’ is used by Tang (1998) to indicate that the [V IO DO] word order in English and Mandarin is normal, while the [V DO IO] word order is aberrant. The term ‘inverted’ is thus employed here.

- b. \*Bun<sup>44</sup> i<sup>44</sup> tsi<sup>22</sup>  
       give 3SG money  
       ‘Give him money.’

The ill-formed example (7b) with the [V IO DO] pattern is assumed to be the reason that Hainan Min *bun* subcategorizes a theme as its immediate complement rather than a recipient. In addition, a theme in a caused possession event type is an entity possession which is capable of being transferred. Therefore, the immediate complement of Hainan Min *bun* is found to be mostly an inanimate entity. Another pair of examples follows:

- (8) \*I<sup>44</sup> bun<sup>44</sup> ko<sup>44</sup>-hiang<sup>22</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> kai<sup>22</sup> phing<sup>22</sup>-kue<sup>21</sup>  
       3SG give sister one CL apple  
       ‘He gave his younger sister an apple.’
- (9) I<sup>44</sup> bun<sup>44</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> kai<sup>22</sup> phing<sup>22</sup>-kue<sup>21</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> ko<sup>44</sup>-hiang<sup>22</sup>  
       3SG give one CL apple to sister  
       ‘He gave an apple to his younger sister.’

The [V DO IO] double object sentence pattern also occurs commonly in the Yue dialect, Cantonese. Previous studies on this issue (Xu & Peyraube 1997, Tang 1998, Chin 2009, Matthews 2010) basically propose that the [V DO IO] pattern has been derived from the [V DO *pei* IO] pattern by deleting the recipient marker *pei*. This analysis is convincing especially because when the main verb is *pei*, as using the recipient marker *pei* would require phonetic reduplication ([*pei* DO *pei* IO]). Moreover, like Cantonese, the [V DO IO] pattern is often found in Hakka, as shown in (10), and the word *bun* can occur twice in the [*bun* DO *bun* IO] structure, as in (11).

- (10) Gia ba bun yi kiu tien gi  
       3SG-GEN father BUN one CL field 3SG  
       ‘His father gave a piece of land to him.’ (Lai 2001:141, (2))
- (11) Gia ba bun yi kiu tien bun gi  
       3SG-GEN father BUN one CL field BUN 3SG  
       ‘His father gave a piece of land to him.’ (Lai 2001:141, (3))

In line with this analysis of Cantonese, the [V DO IO] pattern may also apply to Hakka. According to Lai (2001), the repetitive *bun* pattern simply conveys a pragmatic difference; i.e. (11) expresses more emphatically the act of giving something to the recipient.

The omission analysis may account for the Hainan Min [V DO IO] pattern, although the reduplication of *bun* does not occur in Hainan Min, as shown in (12).

- (12) I<sup>44</sup>      bun<sup>44</sup>      dziak<sup>33</sup>      pha<sup>44</sup>      fūe<sup>44</sup>      \*bun<sup>44</sup>/ti<sup>11</sup>      Bo<sup>22</sup>-ti<sup>11</sup>  
       3SG    give      one      CL      flower      give/to      Bo-ti  
       ‘He gave a flower to Bo-ti.’

However, when the main verb is not *bun* itself, the word can occupy the position introducing the indirect object, as in (13). Note that examples are few in number compared with the data for the [V DO *ti* IO] pattern.

- (13) Gua<sup>21</sup>      boi<sup>21</sup>      dziak<sup>33</sup>      bui<sup>21</sup>      seh<sup>55</sup>      bun<sup>44</sup>      i<sup>44</sup>  
       1SG    buy      one      CL      book      give      3SG  
       ‘I bought a book for him.’

It seems that the underlying [*bun* DO *bun* IO] structure might represent a possible analysis in Hainan Min, but it necessitates the deletion of one *bun*, a result of haplology, i.e. the repetitive form of *bun* tends to be avoided, either in the [*bun* DO IO] structure or in the [V DO *bun* IO] structure.

## 2.3 Successful transfer of possession

The event type that Hainan Min *bun* joins is the ‘causation of possession’ event. There are two event types with which the dative alternation is often associated (cf. Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2008): caused possession and caused motion. The event structures are schematized respectively in (14).

- (14) a. Caused possession schema: ‘x cause y to receive z’ (y is a recipient)  
       b. Caused motion schema: ‘x cause z to be at y’ (y is a spatial goal)

Different dative verbs are involved in divergent event types. For instance, the verb *give* only involves a change of possession, while the verb *send* can be associated with either a ‘caused possession’ or a ‘caused motion’ event. Rappaport Hovav & Levin (2008) further suggest that the event types are related to morphosyntactic frames. The caused motion event type is syntactically expressed by the English *to* construction, while the caused possession event type leads to both the *to* construction and the double object construction.



## (15) Event types match to syntactic types

	Double object construction	to construction
<i>give</i> -type verbs	caused possession	caused possession
<i>send</i> -type verbs	caused possession	caused motion or caused possession

English *give*-type verbs, either occurring in the double object variant or in the dative variant, have the meaning of “caused possession”. Like English *give*, Hainan Min *bun* can be used in either a double object variant (16) or a dative variant (17).

- (16) Bun<sup>44</sup> tsi<sup>22</sup> i<sup>44</sup>  
       give money 3SG  
       ‘Give him the money.’
- (17) Bun<sup>44</sup> tsi<sup>22</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> i<sup>44</sup>  
       give money to 3SG  
       ‘Give the money to him.’

The two variants both yield the meaning of caused possession. Like English *give*-type verbs, Hainan Min *bun* does not convey the caused motion meaning, even if it co-occurs with the dative *ti*.

The Hainan Min giving verb *bun* conveys not only the caused possession meaning, but also the successful transfer of possession. In other words, if the ditransitive construction mainly expresses a core sense, “X CAUSES Y to RECEIVE Z”, Hainan Min *bun* expresses not only the core sense but also the meaning of ‘x successfully causes y to receive z’. Goldberg (1995:37-39) points out that verbs in a ditransitive construction should not be assumed simply to articulate the core sense. She postulates six groups of verbs in the ditransitive construction which convey three senses: “X CAUSES Y to RECEIVE Z”, “X INTENDS to CAUSE Y to RECEIVE Z”, and “X CAUSES Y not to RECEIVE Z”. Hainan Min *bun* is found not to occur in a situation involving intension of transfer or disapproval of transfer events. When Hainan Min native speakers use the verb *bun*, the given theme is successfully transferred from the agent to the recipient. For example, if the speaker uses *bun* to describe the situation in example (18), the subject *i* ‘he’ should not only give the theme *sak* ‘chisel’ away, but he is also supposed not to ask for the chisel back.

- (18) I<sup>44</sup> bo<sup>22</sup> hien<sup>21</sup> 6un<sup>44</sup> dzia<sup>11</sup> ki<sup>44</sup> sak<sup>33</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> du<sup>21</sup>  
       3SG NEG willing give this CL chisel to 2SG  
       ‘He was not willing to give the chisel to you.’

In addition to the implication of successful transfer, *bun* selects entities that can undergo transfer of possession as its direct objects. *Bun* also tends to s-select concrete objects to be its complements. In the following examples, the theme (*cake*) in (19) is observable and transferable, while the theme (*story*) in (20) cannot overtly undergo transfer of possession.

- (19) Gua<sup>21</sup>    bun<sup>44</sup>    dziak<sup>33</sup>    kai<sup>22</sup>    nui<sup>42</sup>-kau<sup>44</sup>    ti<sup>11</sup>    du<sup>21</sup>  
       1SG    give    one        CL    cake            to    2SG  
       ‘I give a cake to you.’
- (20) \*Gua<sup>21</sup>    bun<sup>44</sup>    dziak<sup>33</sup>    kai<sup>22</sup>    ku<sup>11</sup>-se<sup>42</sup>    ti<sup>11</sup>    du<sup>21</sup>  
       1SG    give    one        CL    story            to    2SG  
       Lit.: ‘I give a story to you.’

In other words, the verb *bun* does not involve metaphorical or abstract transfer. Moreover, when *bun* functions as a dative marker, it cannot accept an abstract transfer either, as shown in (21).

- (21) \*I<sup>44</sup>    kong<sup>21</sup>    dziak<sup>33</sup>    kai<sup>22</sup>    ku<sup>11</sup>-se<sup>42</sup>    bun<sup>44</sup>    gua<sup>21</sup>    hia<sup>44</sup>  
       3SG    talk    one        CL    story        give    1SG    listen  
       ‘He told a story for me to listen to.’

It is assumed that *bun* expresses the central sense of a double object verb which involves both successful and concrete transfer, rather than potential or abstract transfer.

### 3. Dative alternation and verb types

The issue regarding word order patterns occupies an important place in the discussion of ditransitive constructions. For example, the subject in Mandarin Chinese has been widely studied in the previous literature. Her (2006) proposes a five-way analysis and F.-H. Liu (2006) suggests a three-way analysis regarding dative constructions. Similar to Her and F.-H. Liu, Chen & Lien (2008) and Lee (2009b) categorize the ditransitive constructions in Taiwan Southern Min as four sentence patterns. Based on the research findings of previous studies, the present study explores the word order patterns of the ditransitive construction in Hainan Min. There are basically four syntactic variants found: (i) [S V DO IO], (ii) [S V DO *ti/bun/bun ti* IO], (iii) [S *kang* IO V DO], and (iv) [S V IO DO]. These constructions mainly involve events of transfer of possession. In addition, different verbs can occur in different constructions; some



- (23) Bo<sup>22</sup>-ta<sup>44</sup> kia<sup>11</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> ban<sup>44</sup> ngien<sup>22</sup> 6un<sup>44</sup>/6un<sup>44</sup> ti<sup>11</sup>/ti<sup>11</sup> gua<sup>21</sup>  
 Bo-ta send one ten thousand dollar give/give to/to 1SG  
 ‘Bo-ta sent ten thousand dollars to me.’
- (24) Bo<sup>22</sup>-ta<sup>44</sup> kia<sup>11</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> ban<sup>44</sup> ngien<sup>22</sup> gua<sup>21</sup>  
 Bo-ta send one ten thousand dollar 1SG  
 ‘Bo-ta sent ten thousand dollars to me.’

When *6un* does not function as the main verb in a serial verb construction, it is frequently followed by the recipient marker *ti*<sup>11</sup> to form a [V DO *6un ti* IO] pattern, which is commonly found in both earlier studies, e.g. (25)-(27), and as in (28) from our own field notes. That the dative alternative of [V DO *6un* IO] is low in number may result from the lexical verb sense.

- (25) I<sup>44</sup> 6ue<sup>42</sup> niauh<sup>55</sup> kai<sup>22</sup> 6un<sup>44</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> gua<sup>21</sup>  
 3SG take small CL give to 1SG  
 ‘He gave a small one to me.’ (*Hainan Colloquial*<sup>14</sup> 1941:16)
- (26) Hu<sup>11</sup> de<sup>11</sup> ioh<sup>33</sup> tsi<sup>22</sup> 6un<sup>44</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> du<sup>21</sup>  
 go where take money give to 2SG  
 ‘Where should (somebody) give money to you?’ (*Hainan Colloquial* 1941:17)
- (27) He<sup>42</sup> 6ui<sup>21</sup> seh<sup>55</sup> 6un<sup>44</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> gua<sup>21</sup>  
 take CL book give to 1SG  
 ‘Give the book to me.’ (Woon 2004:267)
- (28) Bo<sup>22</sup>-ta<sup>44</sup> kia<sup>11</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> ban<sup>44</sup> ngien<sup>22</sup> 6un<sup>44</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> gua<sup>21</sup>  
 3SG send one ten thousand dollar give to 1SG  
 ‘Bo-ta sent ten thousand dollars to me.’

Among the three variants, the word *6un* implies a strong implication of transfer of possession. For example in (29), the event of ‘handing over the assignment’ does not involve any transfer of possession; therefore it is not good to precede the recipient with *6un* or *6un ti*.

- (29) O<sup>21</sup>-te<sup>44</sup> tang<sup>11</sup> toh<sup>55</sup>-ngiap<sup>55</sup> \*6un<sup>44</sup>/\*6un<sup>44</sup> ti<sup>11</sup>/ti<sup>11</sup> lau<sup>42</sup>-se<sup>44</sup>  
 student give assignment give/give to/to teacher  
 ‘The student handed over the assignment to the teacher.’

<sup>14</sup> It denotes Yamaji & Matsutani’s (1941) *Kainantoogo Kaiwa* (hereafter, *Hainan Colloquial*).

Moreover, when the verb *bun* is used, the denoted event always implies a successful transfer; only the *ti*-dative construction can indicate unsuccessful transfer.

- (30) Gua<sup>21</sup> kia<sup>11</sup> tien<sup>11</sup> \*bun<sup>44</sup>/\*bun<sup>44</sup> ti<sup>11</sup>/ti<sup>11</sup> i<sup>44</sup>, (i<sup>44</sup> tsiap<sup>55</sup> bo<sup>22</sup> dfoh<sup>33</sup>)  
 1SG send letter give/give to/to 3SG 3SG receive NEG successfully  
 ‘I sent a letter to him, (but he has not received it yet).’
- (31) Bo<sup>22</sup>-ta<sup>44</sup> tiom<sup>42</sup> hui<sup>22</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> Bo<sup>22</sup>-ti<sup>11</sup>, (Bo<sup>22</sup>-ti<sup>11</sup> tsiap<sup>55</sup> bo<sup>22</sup> dfoh<sup>33</sup>)  
 Bo-ta throw ball to Bo-ti Bo-ti catch NEG successfully  
 ‘Bo-ta threw a ball to Bo-ti, (but Bo-ti didn’t catch it).’

Unlike *bun*, the verb *ti* can carry an extended meaning of transfer and accept a metaphorical recipient, as shown in (32). The lexical items ‘orphanage’ and ‘hometown’ are extended recipients that can be introduced by the dative marker *ti*.

- (32) a. De<sup>44</sup> kien<sup>44</sup> tsi<sup>22</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> ku<sup>44</sup>-lu<sup>22</sup>-zuan<sup>42</sup>  
 father donate money to orphanage  
 ‘Father donated money to an orphanage.’
- b. Gua<sup>21</sup> tang<sup>11</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> bui<sup>21</sup> tu<sup>44</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> ke<sup>44</sup>-fio<sup>44</sup>  
 1SG give as gift one CL book to hometown  
 ‘I gave a book to my hometown.’

The *ti*-dative construction may accept a metaphorical recipient, but a location complement is ruled out. The location complement can be introduced by the goal marker *hu*<sup>11</sup> ‘go’. The *ti*-construction tends to select a human entity as its recipient complement, while the *hu*-construction does not impose a human requirement on the goal complement. The contrast between recipient and goal exhibits the difference between dative and non-dative constructions, as shown in (33) and (34).

- (33) a. \*Gua<sup>21</sup> kia<sup>11</sup> tien<sup>11</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> hai<sup>22</sup>-bak<sup>55</sup>  
 1SG send letter to Taipei  
 ‘I sent a letter to Taipei.’
- b. Gua<sup>21</sup> kia<sup>11</sup> tien<sup>11</sup> hu<sup>11</sup> hai<sup>22</sup>-bak<sup>55</sup>  
 1SG send letter go Taipei  
 ‘I sent a letter to Taipei.’
- (34) a. \*Gua<sup>21</sup> he<sup>42</sup> tih<sup>55</sup> mih<sup>33</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> lou<sup>44</sup>-hau<sup>21</sup> bang<sup>11</sup>  
 1SG take some thing to intersection put  
 ‘I take something to put at the intersection.’

- b. Gua<sup>21</sup> he<sup>42</sup> tih<sup>55</sup> mih<sup>33</sup> hu<sup>11</sup> lou<sup>44</sup> -hau<sup>21</sup> 6ang<sup>11</sup>  
 1SG take some thing go intersection put  
 ‘I take something to put at the intersection.’

There are some other examples of outward verbs which have similar distributions to that of *kia*<sup>11</sup> ‘send’, for example *dui*<sup>21</sup> ‘return’, and *bue*<sup>22</sup> ‘compensate’, as shown in (35) and (36).

- (35) a. Gua<sup>21</sup> dui<sup>21</sup> ta<sup>44</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> i<sup>44</sup> [S V DO ti IO]  
 1SG return clothes to 3SG  
 ‘I returned the clothes to him.’  
 b. \*Gua<sup>21</sup> dui<sup>21</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> i<sup>44</sup> ta<sup>44</sup> [S V ti IO DO]  
 1SG return to 3SG clothes  
 ‘I returned to him the clothes.’  
 c. \*Gua<sup>21</sup> dui<sup>21</sup> i<sup>44</sup> ta<sup>44</sup> [S V IO DO]  
 1SG return 3SG clothes  
 ‘I returned him the clothes.’  
 d. Gua<sup>21</sup> dui<sup>21</sup> ta<sup>44</sup> i<sup>44</sup> [S V DO IO]  
 1SG return clothes 3SG  
 ‘I returned the clothes to him.’
- (36) a. Hau<sup>22</sup>-ke<sup>44</sup> 6ue<sup>22</sup> tsi<sup>22</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> Bo<sup>22</sup>-ta<sup>44</sup> [S V DO ti IO]  
 shopkeeper compensate money to Bo-ta  
 ‘The shopkeeper compensated Bo-ta with money.’  
 b. \*Hau<sup>22</sup>-ke<sup>44</sup> 6ue<sup>22</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> Bo<sup>22</sup>-ta<sup>44</sup> tsi<sup>22</sup> [S V ti IO DO]  
 shopkeeper compensate to Bo-ta money  
 ‘The shopkeeper compensated Bo-ta with money.’  
 c. \*Hau<sup>22</sup>-ke<sup>44</sup> 6ue<sup>22</sup> Bo<sup>22</sup>-ta<sup>44</sup> tsi<sup>22</sup> [S V IO DO]  
 shopkeeper compensate Bo-ta money  
 ‘The shopkeeper compensated Bo-ta with money.’  
 d. Hau<sup>22</sup>-ke<sup>44</sup> 6ue<sup>22</sup> tsi<sup>22</sup> Bo<sup>22</sup>-ta<sup>44</sup> [S V DO IO]  
 shopkeeper compensate money Bo-ta  
 ‘The shopkeeper compensated Bo-ta with money.’

To sum up, outward verbs, such as *kia*<sup>11</sup> ‘send’, *kien*<sup>44</sup> ‘donate’, *tang*<sup>11</sup> ‘give as present’ and *dui*<sup>21</sup> ‘return’, occur in [S V DO ti IO] and [S V DO IO] dative constructions, and not in [S V ti IO DO] and [S V IO DO].

### 3.2 Inward verbs

An inward verb is a transactional verb which involves an event in which the recipient gets the theme from the source. Such verbs include *uat*<sup>33</sup> ‘fine’, *uang*<sup>21</sup>/*kun*<sup>11</sup> ‘cheat/deprive by deceit’, *tsioh*<sup>55</sup> ‘borrow’, *ho*<sup>21</sup> ‘require/ask for’ and *kiap*<sup>55</sup> ‘rob’. Inward verbs do not occur in the *ti*-dative construction, while the *kang* ‘from’ phrase is frequently employed in the inward-verb construction, as in (37), (38), and (39).

- (37) Gua<sup>21</sup> kang<sup>44</sup> i<sup>44</sup> tsioh<sup>55</sup> no<sup>42</sup> 6eh<sup>55</sup> ngien<sup>22</sup> [S *kang* IO V DO]  
 1SG from 3SG borrow two hundred dollar  
 ‘I borrowed two hundred dollars from him.’
- (38) Gua<sup>21</sup> kia<sup>44</sup> i<sup>44</sup> kang<sup>44</sup> gua<sup>21</sup> ho<sup>21</sup> tsi<sup>22</sup> [S *kang* IO V DO]  
 1SG scare 3SG from 1SG ask for money  
 ‘I was scared that he would ask me for money.’
- (39) Gua<sup>21</sup> kang<sup>44</sup> i<sup>44</sup> tsioh<sup>55</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> 6ui<sup>21</sup> tu<sup>44</sup> [S *kang* IO V DO]  
 1SG from 3SG borrow one CL book  
 ‘I borrowed a book from him.’

The direction implied by Hainan Min transactional verbs matches the constructions in which they participate. Inward verbs join the *from*-phrase construction and the outward verbs join the *to*-dative alternation.

It is noteworthy that the [S V IO DO] pattern is acceptable for inward verbs. Verbs such as *uat*<sup>33</sup> ‘fine’, *uang*<sup>21</sup> ‘cheat’, *kun*<sup>11</sup> ‘cheat’, *hiam*<sup>11</sup> ‘owe’, and *kiap*<sup>55</sup> ‘rob’ exemplify the participation of inward verbs in the [V IO DO] pattern.

- (40) Kong<sup>44</sup>-an<sup>44</sup> uat<sup>33</sup> gua<sup>21</sup> lak<sup>33</sup> 6eh<sup>55</sup> ngien<sup>22</sup> [S V IO DO]  
 policeman fine 1SG six hundred dollar  
 ‘The police fined me six hundred dollars.’
- (41) Bo<sup>22</sup>-ta<sup>44</sup> uang<sup>21</sup> Bo<sup>22</sup>-meng<sup>22</sup> ta<sup>44</sup> ban<sup>44</sup> ngien<sup>22</sup> [S V IO DO]  
 Bo-ta cheat Bo-meng three ten thousand dollar  
 ‘Bo-ta cheated Bo-meng out of thirty thousand dollars.’
- (42) I<sup>44</sup> kun<sup>11</sup> gua<sup>21</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> ban<sup>44</sup> ngien<sup>22</sup> [S V IO DO]  
 3SG cheat 1SG one ten thousand dollar  
 ‘He cheated me out of ten thousand dollars.’
- (43) Heh<sup>55</sup>-nang<sup>22</sup> hiam<sup>11</sup> 6ang<sup>22</sup>-dong<sup>44</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> kai<sup>22</sup> gueh<sup>33</sup> tou<sup>44</sup>-kiom<sup>44</sup>  
 guest-person owe landlord one CL month rent-gold  
 ‘The tenant owed the landlord one month’s rent.’

- (44) I<sup>44</sup> kiap<sup>55</sup> gua<sup>21</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> ha<sup>44</sup> kai<sup>11</sup>-tsi<sup>21</sup> [S V IO DO]  
 3SG rob 1SG one CL ring  
 ‘He robbed me of a ring.’

### 3.3 Bi-directional verbs

A bi-directional verb is a transactional verb that may be interpreted as an outward verb or an inward verb. Examples include verbs such as *tsioh*<sup>55</sup> ‘borrow/lend’ and *tou*<sup>44</sup> ‘rent’. As discussed above, the [S V DO *ti* IO] pattern and the [S *kang* IO V DO] pattern agree respectively with the semantic properties of outward verbs and inward verbs. The verb *tsioh* can participate in both constructions, as shown in (45).

- (45) a. Gua<sup>21</sup> tsioh<sup>55</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> bui<sup>21</sup> seh<sup>55</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> i<sup>44</sup> [S V DO *ti* IO]  
 1SG lend one CL book to 3SG  
 ‘I lent a book to him.’  
 b. Gua<sup>21</sup> kang<sup>44</sup> i<sup>44</sup> tsioh<sup>55</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> bui<sup>21</sup> seh<sup>55</sup> [S *kang* IO V DO]  
 1SG from 3SG borrow one CL book  
 ‘I borrowed a book from him.’

When *tsioh* is construed as an outward verb, like other outward verbs, it cannot occur in the following two sentence patterns.

- (46) a. \*Gua<sup>21</sup> tsioh<sup>55</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> i<sup>44</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> bui<sup>21</sup> seh<sup>55</sup> [S V *ti* IO DO]  
 1SG lend to 3SG one CL book  
 ‘I lent him a book.’  
 b. \*Gua<sup>21</sup> tsioh<sup>55</sup> i<sup>44</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> bui<sup>21</sup> tu<sup>44</sup> [S V IO DO]  
 1SG lend 3SG one CL book  
 ‘I lent him a book.’

The [S V IO DO] pattern becomes acceptable if *tsioh* is interpreted as an inward verb.

- (47) Lau<sup>42</sup>-uang<sup>22</sup> tsioh<sup>55</sup> gua<sup>21</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> ki<sup>44</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> [S V IO DO]  
 Lau-uang lend 1SG one CL fan  
 ‘Lau-uang lent me a fan.’

The [S V DO IO] pattern is a typical construction for outward verbs. Although the verb *tsioh* can be bi-directionally construed, it can only receive an outward verb reading when it occurs in the [S V DO IO] construction.



- (48) Lau<sup>42</sup>-uang<sup>22</sup> tsioh<sup>55</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> ɸui<sup>21</sup> tu<sup>44</sup> gua<sup>21</sup> [S V DO IO]  
 Lau-uang lend one CL book 1SG  
 ‘Lau-uang lent a book to me.’  
 ‘\*Lau-uang borrowed a book from me.’

Example (48) displays the interaction between the lexicon and construction. In a double object construction like the [V IO DO] pattern, the construction can shape the meaning of the lexical entry. Likewise, the [S V DO *ti* IO] and [S *kang* IO V DO] patterns help distinguish the meaning of the bi-directional verb.

- (49) Lau<sup>42</sup>-se<sup>44</sup> tsioh<sup>55</sup> i<sup>21</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> o<sup>21</sup>-te<sup>44</sup> [S V DO *ti* IO]  
 teacher lend chair to student  
 ‘The teacher lent a chair to the student.’  
 ‘\*The teacher borrowed a chair from the student.’
- (50) Lau<sup>42</sup>-uang<sup>22</sup> kang<sup>44</sup> gua<sup>21</sup> tsioh<sup>55</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> ki<sup>44</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> [S *kang* IO V DO]  
 Lau-uang from 1SG borrow one CL fan  
 ‘Lau-uang borrowed a fan from me.’  
 ‘\*Lau-uang lent a fan to me.’

### 3.4 Communicative verbs

Like transactional verbs, communicative verbs also involve three thematic roles: agent, goal, and theme. These often participate in dative alternations. Verbs like *ka*<sup>11</sup> ‘teach’, *dah*<sup>55</sup> ‘answer’, and *ue*<sup>44</sup> ‘say/tell’ indicate transfer of information or message. Verbs of communicated message occur in the [V DO *ti* IO], [V IO DO] and [V DO IO] alternations, not in the [V *ti* IO DO] and [*kang* IO V DO] alternations.

- (51) a. Gua<sup>21</sup> ka<sup>11</sup> phat<sup>55</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> i<sup>44</sup> [S V DO *ti* IO]  
 1SG teach method to 3SG  
 ‘I taught a method to him.’
- b. Gua<sup>21</sup> ka<sup>11</sup> i<sup>44</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> kai<sup>22</sup> phang<sup>44</sup>-phat<sup>55</sup> [S V IO DO]  
 1SG teach 3SG one CL method  
 ‘I taught him a method.’
- c. Gua<sup>21</sup> ka<sup>11</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> kai<sup>22</sup> phang<sup>44</sup>-phat<sup>55</sup> i<sup>44</sup> [S V DO IO]  
 1SG teach one CL method 3SG  
 ‘I taught a method to him.’

- d. \*Gua<sup>21</sup> ka<sup>11</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> i<sup>44</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> kai<sup>22</sup> phang<sup>44</sup>-phat<sup>55</sup> [S V *ti* IO DO]  
 1SG teach to 3SG one CL method  
 ‘I taught to him a method.’
- e. \*Gua<sup>21</sup> kang<sup>44</sup> i<sup>44</sup> ka<sup>11</sup> dziak<sup>33</sup> kai<sup>22</sup> phang<sup>44</sup>-phat<sup>55</sup> [S *kang* IO V DO]  
 1SG from 3SG teach one CL method  
 ‘I taught him a method.’

The [V DO *ti* IO] pattern tends to be the most frequent form in which communicative verbs occur, as in the following:

- (52) a. Gua<sup>21</sup> ue<sup>44</sup> tih<sup>55</sup> se<sup>42</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> i<sup>44</sup>  
 1SG tell some matter to 3SG  
 ‘I told some matters to him.’
- b. I<sup>44</sup> ue<sup>44</sup> kui<sup>21</sup> kai<sup>22</sup> phong<sup>22</sup>-iu<sup>21</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> gua<sup>21</sup>  
 3SG introduce several CL friend to 1SG  
 ‘I introduced some friends to him.’
- c. Du<sup>21</sup> dāh<sup>55</sup> dzia<sup>11</sup> dīau<sup>22</sup> doi<sup>22</sup> sut<sup>55</sup> lai<sup>22</sup> ti<sup>11</sup> gua<sup>21</sup>  
 2SG answer this CL question exit come to 1SG  
 ‘I answered this question posed to me.’

To sum up, the double object construction in Hainan Min involves four syntactic variants (i) S V DO *ti* IO, (ii) S V IO DO, (iii) S V DO IO, and (iv) S *kang* IO V DO. It is obvious that the [V-*ti* IO DO] pattern is not allowed in Hainan Min, even though it is very common as a dative alternation in Mandarin ([V-*gei* IO DO]) and in Southern Min ([V-*hoo* IO DO]). Verbs that participate in the four dative alternations are basically transactional verbs and communicative verbs. The present study examines the interaction between verb type and the constructions they join. The findings regarding verb-construction correspondence agree with the basic tenet of construction grammar (Goldberg 1995, Jackendoff 2002). Such interactions are as follows.

(53) Comparison of verbs in the four constructions

	[V DO <i>ti</i> IO]	[V IO DO]	[V DO IO]	[ <i>kang</i> IO V DO]
Transactional verbs				
Outward verbs	yes	yes	no	no
Inward verbs	no	no	yes	yes
Bidirectional verbs	yes	yes	yes	yes
Communicative verbs	yes	yes	yes	no

#### 4. The indirect object marker

The recipient marker *ti*<sup>11</sup> in Hainan Min is phonetically unique compared to recipient markers in other Chinese dialects. The recipient marker *ti* is not found in other Chinese dialects. The giving verb in Mandarin (*gei*), in Southern Min (*hoo*), in Hakka (*bun/pun*), and in Cantonese (*pei*) can function as both verb and recipient marker.

(54) Mandarin

- a. Ta<sup>1</sup>    gei<sup>3</sup>    wo<sup>3</sup>    yi<sup>1</sup>    zhi<sup>1</sup>    bi<sup>3</sup>  
      3SG    give    1SG    one    CL    pen
- b. Ta<sup>1</sup>    song<sup>4</sup>    yi<sup>1</sup>    zhi<sup>1</sup>    bi<sup>3</sup>    gei<sup>3</sup>    wo<sup>3</sup>  
      3SG    give    one    CL    pen    give    1SG  
      ‘He gave me a pen.’

(55) Southern Min

- a. I<sup>1</sup>    hoo<sup>7</sup>    goa<sup>2</sup>    chit<sup>8</sup>    ki<sup>1</sup>    pit<sup>4</sup>  
      3SG    give    1SG    one    CL    pen
- b. I<sup>1</sup>    sang<sup>3</sup>    chit<sup>8</sup>    ki<sup>1</sup>    pit<sup>4</sup>    hoo<sup>7</sup>    goa<sup>2</sup>  
      3SG    give    one    CL    pen    give    1SG  
      ‘He gave me a pen.’

(56) Hakka (Sixian)

- a. Ki<sup>3</sup>    pun<sup>5</sup>    ngai<sup>2</sup>    yit<sup>8</sup>    ki<sup>5</sup>    pit<sup>4</sup>  
      3SG    give    1SG    one    CL    pen
- b. Ki<sup>3</sup>    sung<sup>1</sup>    yit<sup>8</sup>    ki<sup>5</sup>    pit<sup>4</sup>    pun<sup>5</sup>    ngai<sup>2</sup>  
      3SG    give    one    CL    pen    give    1SG  
      ‘He gave me a pen.’

(57) Cantonese

- a. Khoy<sup>13</sup>    pei<sup>35</sup>    ngo<sup>13</sup>    tsi<sup>55</sup>    pat<sup>5</sup>  
      3SG    give    1SG    CL    pen
- b. Khoy<sup>13</sup>    song<sup>33</sup>    tsi<sup>55</sup>    pat<sup>5</sup>    pei<sup>35</sup>    ngo<sup>13</sup>  
      3SG    give    CL    pen    give    1SG  
      ‘He gave a pen to me.’

The Hainan Min recipient marker *ti* stands apart from other Southern Min, Hakka, and Yue dialects. The origin of this special dative marker is intriguing and is explored in §4.

Among the limited references, four possibilities for the origin of the word *ti* can be found. *Ti* is rendered as the Chinese character 是 offered by native informants, as 於

in *Hainan Colloquial* (1941), as 給 in Woon (2004), and as 賜 in Fu (2008). Among these four candidates, the word 是 is pronounced  $ti^{42}$ , which sounds the most similar to the dative  $ti$ . However, the phonetic forms of the two words still differ in tone. 是 belongs to the *yang* tone group; the dative marker  $ti$  belongs to the *yin* tone group. In addition, the semantic properties of 是 are not readily associated with the sense of transfer of possession. The word 是 is thus not considered to be the optimal candidate for the etymon of the dative marker  $ti$ .

The lexical items 於, 給, and 賜 are semantically related to the sense of dative ‘to’ and the verb ‘give’. Chin (2009, 2010) proposes that the recipient markers in Chinese dialects are divided into two classes: the *go*-type and the *give*-type. If Chin’s hypothesis is accepted, 於 can be assumed to belong to the *go*-type; 給 and 賜 to the *give*-type. From a semantic perspective, these three words are all potential candidates for the etymon. However, the three words all fail to match the phonetic form of the dative marker  $ti^{11}$ . First, the word 於 bears the *even* tone (Ping tone), while the dative marker  $ti$  bears the *departing* tone (Qu tone). In addition, 於 belongs to the *ying* 影 initial group, which does not contain the sound /t/ in Modern Hainan Min. Second, 給 is pronounced  $kiop^{55}$  in Hainan Min, which can be commonly found in the literature (e.g. *Hainan Colloquial*). Third, the word 賜 belongs to the *qing* 清 initial group, which is pronounced /s/ rather than /t/ in Modern Hainan Min. Without proper sound correspondence, these three lexical items are thus considered to be not etymologically appropriate for the dative marker  $ti$ .

The present study proposes the word 至 as the optimal candidate for the etymon because it is compatible in terms of sound and meaning with the word  $ti$ . From a phonetic perspective, the initial sound of 至 belongs to the *zhang* 章 group, which can be pronounced either /t/ or /ts/ in Modern Hainan Min. The final sound of 至 is expressed as /i/ and the tone category of 至 is *departing* tone, rendered as 11 in Hainan Min. On the one hand, the final segment and the tone of 至 exactly fit the phonetic properties of the recipient marker  $ti^{11}$ . On the other hand, because of the two alternatives of the initial, 至 can be spelled out as either  $ti^{11}$  or  $tsi^{11}$ . If the word 至 is assumed to be the etymon of the recipient marker  $ti^{11}$ , the two possible phonetic forms of 至 need further explanation. In Woon’s (2004) data, 至 is pronounced  $tsi^{11}$  in the expression  $dang^{44} tsi^{11}$  冬至 ‘winter solstice’. According to Chen (1996), 至 is also pronounced  $tsi^{35} 15$  in the term  $he^{24} tsi^{35}$  夏至 ‘summer solstice’ in the Haikou dialect (another Hainan Min dialect). The present study proposes that 至 is rendered  $tsi^{11}$  in the literary stratum and  $ti^{11}$  in the colloquial stratum. The correspondence of literary /ts/ and colloquial /t/ is also found in the word 知 in the Wenchang dialect (cf. X.-Z. Liu 2006). In addition, Ho (1981) shows some pairs of /ts/ and /t/ initial correspondences with

<sup>15</sup> The tone 35 in the Haikou dialect corresponds to 11 in the Wenchang dialect.

literary and colloquial readings in the Chengmai (Liovai) dialect, for example 狀 and 莊. The four examples are given in the following table:

Examples	Literary	Colloquial
知	ts- (tsi)	t- (tai)
狀	ts- (tsuang)	t- (to)
莊	ts- (tsuang)	t- (to)
至	ts- (tsi)	t- (ti)

Ho (1981) presents many pairs of literary and colloquial readings in which it is common to have a fricative or affricate initial corresponding to an obstruent initial, such as /ts/-/t/, /s/-/t/ or /ts/-/d/. As far as the Wenchang dialect is concerned, the initial *zhang* 章 group is mostly pronounced /ts/ and /t/ rather than /s/ or /d/. Therefore, from a phonetic viewpoint, the word 至 is proposed to have the literary reading *tsi*<sup>11</sup> and the colloquial reading *ti*<sup>11</sup>.

In addition to the phonetic agreement, the word 至 also accords with the dative sense. In Heine & Kuteva's (2002) cross-linguistic study, there is a conceptual category *allative* case, indicating 'direction toward' and glossed the same as dative case 'to'. It is universally common for an allative (directional) case marker to undergo grammaticalization to become a dative case marker. Examples of the development from allative to dative functions are commonly found in European languages. As for the word 至, it is defined as 'arrive' in the Chinese *Shuowen* (212 AD) and *Yupian* (543 AD) dictionaries. Therefore, it is assumed that the word 至 originated as a directional verb which develops into an allative (directional) case marker which is also used as a dative marker. Furthermore, the word 至 can be a member of the *go*-type markers, since indirect object markers in Chinese can basically be divided into *go*-type and *give*-type (cf. Chin 2009, 2010). The *go*-type IO marker is derived from directional verbs and is mostly found in pre-modern dialects and in Modern Wu and Min dialects. It is thus reasonable from a semantic viewpoint to propose the word 至 as the origin of the dative marker *ti*<sup>11</sup>.

Besides examining the Chinese data, the word *ti* is also checked against data from the substratum languages. Aboriginal ethnic groups may include Zhuang-Tai, Be, and Li,<sup>16</sup> but their exact relationship is not yet clear (cf. Solnit 1982). Compared to Chinese, they are often proposed to be genetically connected. The giving verbs in the different variants of this language group include *hauu*, *γauu*, *huu*, *sa:i*, *khɣe*, *ha:i*, *na:k*, *deu*, and

<sup>16</sup> Yue (2010) points out that the Li people have inhabited the island of Hainan since more than three millennia ago and the Li language has phonologically influenced Hainan Min dialects.

*tuu:ng*. The directional verb ‘go’ is uttered as *pai*, *ka*, *pa:i*, and *hei*; the verb ‘arrive’ as *tang*, *theng*, *hot*, *pheu*, *theu*, *thau*, *lo:n*, and *da:n*.<sup>17</sup> None of the variants of the verbs ‘give’, ‘arrive’, or ‘go’ seem to bear a close similarity to Hainan Min *ti*. This excludes the possibility that Hainan Min *ti* is a remnant of a substratum language. The data from substratum languages do not challenge our conclusion that the dative *ti* is originally derived from the Chinese word 至.

## 5. Concluding remarks

This paper focuses on the double object construction in Hainan Min. Syntactic issues in Hainan Min have been ignored in Min studies. Previous research mostly provides descriptive data on Hainan Min; theoretical accounts are very scarce. The Hainan Min ditransitive construction has not been explored in the literature. The present study argues that the giving verb in Hainan Min is *bun*<sup>44</sup>. The word *bun* agrees with Goldberg’s (1995) central sense of the ditransitive construction involving successful transfer of an object to a recipient. The core meaning proposed by Goldberg also involves concrete rather than metaphorical transfer, i.e. *bun* cannot be used to convey potential transfer or extensive transfer. In addition to *bun*’s semantic properties, the paper also compares its syntactic properties with its counterparts in other related dialects. Hainan Min is a branch of the Min dialect group, specifically the Southern Min subgroup. However, *bun* is phonetically close to the giving verb in Hakka, and unlike the Southern Min verbs *hoo* or *khit*. Hakka *bun* can perform several functions: ditransitive verb, dative marker, causative verb, agent marker, or complementizer (cf. Lai 2001), but in comparison Hainan Min *bun* does not parallel the syntactic functions of Hakka *bun*. Hainan Min *bun* basically functions as a double object verb, though it can also be used as a recipient marker or agent marker. The grammatical functions are not as fully-fledged as the verbal function. The dative function is restricted to successful and concrete transfer; the passive function is used more often by the older generation. As for sentence patterns, Hainan Min *bun* behaves similarly to Cantonese in having a special form, [S V DO IO]. In contrast to Mandarin, Hakka, Southern Min, and Cantonese, Hainan Min *bun* cannot occur in the [S V IO DO] pattern. It is assumed that *bun* as a main verb subcategorizes a theme rather than a recipient as its immediate complement.

When linguists investigate the double object construction, they are usually interested in the argument structure and the verb types that join the divergent syntactic configurations. In our survey, the dative alternations in Hainan Min basically involve

<sup>17</sup> Evidence from the Li language group refers to data collected in Ouyang & Zheng (1980) and in Wang (1984).

four patterns: [V DO IO], [V IO DO], [V DO *ti* IO], and [*kang* IO V DO]. Notice that the common [V-*gei* IO DO] pattern in Mandarin (or Southern Min) is not allowed in Hainan Min. The dative construction contains three variants, [V DO *bun/bun ti/ti* IO]. Participation in the alternation in Hainan Min is subject to various constraints. The availability of the dative alternation is examined with respect to types of verbs. Two main verb types are found to participate in the alternation: transactional and communicative verbs. Three subclasses of transactional verbs are checked and found to join different dative constructions. Outward verbs participate in the [V DO *ti* IO] and [V IO DO] alternations, but not in [V DO IO]. Inward verbs occur in the [V IO DO] and [*kang* IO V DO] alternations, but not in [V DO *ti* IO] and [V IO DO]. Bi-directional verbs join in the dative alternation depending on the directional interpretation of the verb. In addition, verbs of communicated message occur in the [V DO *ti* IO], [V IO DO] and [V DO IO] alternations, not in [*kang* IO V DO] alternations. These facts support the analysis that the direction of transaction events interacts with the dative alternation.

There is a unique indirect marker in Hainan Min, *ti*<sup>11</sup>. It has not been carefully studied in any of the previous literature. The word *bun* cannot bear the senses of unsuccessful transfer, potential transfer, or abstract transfer. These extended transfers can be expressed by the dative marker *ti*<sup>11</sup>. However, the origin of *ti* is mysterious and deserves further exploration. There are several candidates for the etymon of *ti*: 是, 於, 給, and 賜. These four possibilities are ruled out due to lack of a semantic correlation and phonetic dissimilarity. The optimal candidate proposed by the present study is the word 至. Semantically, it denotes ‘arrive’; phonetically, it can be pronounced ‘*ti*<sup>11</sup>’. It is common for directional verbs to undergo a process of grammaticalization into dative markers in Southern Chinese dialects. Finding the etymologically appropriate character can help linguists to interpret the words more clearly. If the etymon of the dative marker *ti* is 至, it leads to the conclusion that the dative *ti* is a member of the *go*-dative category rather than a *give*-dative. Moreover, this paper proves that it is more reasonable to assume a Chinese origin for the dative *ti* rather than it being a remnant of the substratum language.

## References

- Chen, Chen-ju, and Chinfa Lien. 2008. Transfer of possession verbs in Taiwanese Southern Min: a case study of lexical and constructional effects. *Chinese Linguistics in Leipzig*, ed. by Redouane Djamouri, Barbara Meisterernst & Rint Sybesma, 191-205. Paris: Centre de Recherches Linguistiques sur l'Asie Orientale, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales.
- Chen, Hongmai. (ed.) 1996. *Haikou Fangyan Cidian* [*Haikou Dialect Dictionary*]. Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Press. (In Chinese)
- Chin, Andy C. 2009. *The Verb GIVE and the Double-object Construction in Cantonese in Synchronic, Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Seattle: University of Washington dissertation.
- Chin, Andy C. 2010. Two types of indirect object markers in Chinese: their typological significance and development. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 38.1:1-25.
- Fu, Qiwu. 2008. *Qiongbai Minyu Cihui Yanjiu* [*A Lexical Study of the Min Dialect in Northern Hainan*]. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press. (In Chinese)
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1959. Kainango oninron [Hainan phonetic and phonology—on Wenchang dialect]. *Chūgoku Gogaku* 91:12-16. (In Japanese)  
[Republished as Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1999. *Hashimoto Mantaro Chosakushū* [*Hashimoto Mantaro Publication Collection*], Vol. 2, ed. by Hashimoto Mantaro Chosakushū Kankoukai, 452-458. Tokyo: Uchiyama Shoten.]
- Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1960. The Bon-Shio dialect of Hainan: a historical and comparative study of its phonological structure. *Gengo Kenkyū* 38:106-135.  
[Republished as Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1999. *Hashimoto Mantaro Chosakushū* [*Hashimoto Mantaro Publication Collection*], Vol. 2, ed. by Hashimoto Mantaro Chosakushū Kankoukai, 483-514. Tokyo: Uchiyama Shoten.]
- Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1961a. Kainango no seichou taikei [Tone system in Hainan Min]. *Tokyo Shina Gakuho* 7:35-52. (In Japanese)  
[Republished as Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1999. *Hashimoto Mantaro Chosakushū* [*Hashimoto Mantaro Publication Collection*], Vol. 2, ed. by Hashimoto Mantaro Chosakushū Kankoukai, 462-474. Tokyo: Uchiyama Shoten.]
- Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1961b. Bilabial and alveolar implosives in a South Chinese dialect. *Onsei no Kenkyū* [*The Study of Sounds*] 9:255-263.  
[Republished as Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1999. *Hashimoto Mantaro Chosakushū* [*Hashimoto Mantaro Publication Collection*], Vol. 2, ed. by Hashimoto Mantaro Chosakushū Kankoukai, 475-482. Tokyo: Uchiyama Shoten.]
- Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1976. Kainango Bonshio hougen [On the Wenchang dialect in



- Hainan Min]. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 11:65-86. (In Japanese)  
 [Republished as Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1999. *Hashimoto Mantaro Chosakushū* [*Hashimoto Mantaro Publication Collection*], Vol. 2, ed. by Hashimoto Mantaro Chosakushū Kankoukai, 429-451. Tokyo: Uchiyama Shoten.]
- Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1988. The structure and typology of the Chinese passive construction. *Passive and Voice*, ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani, 329-354. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Her, One-soon. 2006. Justifying part-of-speech assignments for Mandarin *gei*. *Lingua* 116.8:1274-1302.
- Ho, Dah-an. 1981. Chengmai fangyan de wen bai yidu [The literary and colloquial readings in Lio-vai]. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology Academia Sinica* 52.1:101-152. (In Chinese)
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 2002. *Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lai, Huei-ling. 2001. On Hakka BUN: a case of polygrammaticalization. *Language and Linguistics* 2.2:137-153.
- Lee, Hui-chi. 2009a. On the object marker *BUE* in Hainan Min. *Language and Linguistics* 10.3:471-487.
- Lee, Hui-chi. 2009b. *KA...HOO* constructions in Taiwan Southern Min. *Taiwan Journal of Linguistics* 7.2:25-48.
- Lee, Hui-chi. 2010. *Three Predicate Constructions in Hainan Min—Disposals, Passives and Causatives*. Taipei: Crane.
- Liang, Yougang. 1986. Hainandao Wenchang fangyan yinxi [Sound system of Hainan Min Wenchang dialect]. *Fangyan [Dialect]* 1986.2:123-132. (In Chinese)
- Lien, Chinfa. 2005. Families of ditransitive constructions in *Li Jing Ji*. *Language and Linguistics* 6.4:707-737.
- Lin, Lunlun. 1996. *Chenghai Fangyan Yanjiu [The Study of Chenghai Dialect]*. Shantou: Shantou University Press. (In Chinese)
- Liu, Feng-hsi. 2006. Dative constructions in Chinese. *Language and Linguistics* 7.4: 863-904.
- Liu, Xinzong. 2006. *Hainan Minyu de Yuyin Yanjiu [The Study of Phonology in Hainan Min]*. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press. (In Chinese)
- Matthews, Stephen. 2010. Cantonese dative as complex predicates: insights from typology, processing and acquisition. Paper presented at the 12<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Chinese Languages and Linguistics (IsCLL-12), June 19-21, 2010. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Ouyang, Jueya, and Yiqing Zheng. 1980. *Liyu Jianzhi [Introduction to Li Language]*.

- Beijing: Nationalities Press. (In Chinese)
- Qian, Dianxiang. 2002. *Hainan Tunchang Minyu Yufa Yanjiu* [On Syntax of Hainan Tunchang Min]. Kunming: Yunnan University Press. (In Chinese)
- Rappaport Hovav, Malka, and Beth Levin. 2008. The English dative alternation: the case for verb sensitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 44.1:129-167.
- Shi, Qisheng. 2000. Shantou fangyan de jieci [Prepositions in the Shantou dialect]. *Jieci* [Preposition], ed. by Rulong Li & Song Hing Chang, 157-172. Guangzhou: Jinan University Press. (In Chinese)
- Solnit, David B. 1982. Linguistic contact in Ancient South China: the case of Hainan Chinese, Be, and Vietnamese. *Berkeley Linguistic Society (BLS)* 8:219-230.
- Tang, Sze-wing. 1998. On the 'inverted' double object construction. *Studies in Cantonese Linguistics*, ed. by Stephen Matthews, 35-52. Hong Kong: Linguistic Society of Hong Kong.
- Tsao, Feng-fu. 2005. Taiwan Minnanyu de ka7 yu binyu de qianzhi [On ka7 in Taiwanese Min and object fronting]. *Hanyu Xuebao* [Chinese Linguistics] 2005.1:21-30. (In Chinese)
- Wang, Jun. 1984. *Zhuang-Dong Yuzu Yuyan Jianzhi* [Introduction to Languages of the Zhuang-Dong Races]. Beijing: Nationalities Press. (In Chinese)
- Woon, Wee-lee. 2004. *Yizhong Fangyan zai Liangdi Sandai Jian de Bianyi* [A Dialect Variation in the Three Generations and Two Locations]. Xiamen: Xiamen University Press. (In Chinese)
- Xu, Liejiong, and Alain Peyraube. 1997. On the double-object construction and the oblique construction in Cantonese. *Studies in Language* 21.1:105-127.
- Yamaji, Enji, and Tadashi Matsutani. 1941. *Kainantoogo Kaiwa* [Hainan Colloquial], ed. by Association of Southern Taiwan. Tokyo: Sanseido. (In Japanese)
- Yang, Dingfu, and Yingcun Xia. 1992. Min fangyan fenqu de jiliang yanjiu [Statistic study on categorization in Min dialects]. *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Min Dialects*, 41-48. Guangzhou: Jinan University Press. (In Chinese)
- Yue, Anne O. 2010. Relationship between the Hainan dialect and the Li language. Paper presented at 2010 Taiwan Summer Institute of Linguistics: Min Studies. July 21, 2010. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

[Received 14 September 2010; revised 15 March 2011; accepted 8 April 2011]

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature  
National Cheng Kung University  
1 University Road  
Tainan 701, Taiwan  
hcleee6@mail.ncku.edu.tw

## 海南閩語之雙賓結構

李惠琦

國立成功大學

本文主要探討海南閩語的雙賓句型。不同於一般閩南語常見的給予動詞「予 hoo」及「乞 khít」，海南閩語的給予動詞是「分 6un<sup>44</sup>」，比較接近於客語的給予動詞「分」。本文討論了海南閩語「分」的語法及語意特性，並且也將「分」與其他方言的給予動詞做了比較。同時，本文還列舉了海南閩語雙賓結構所有可能出現的句型及句型間的替換。接著再測試不同類型的動詞能參與在哪些不同的句型替換。本文最後探討海南閩語特有的與格標記「ti<sup>11</sup>」，這個標記的詞源雖然有五個可能，但是透過語音及語意的追溯，本文給了海南閩語與格標記一個明確的定位。

關鍵詞：海南閩語，雙賓結構，與格標記，雙賓句型替換