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Sinitic languages are mixed languages according to Malchukov et al (2007) & Haspelmath’s classification (2005), based on Mandarin ditransitives:

- Indirective or prepositional object constr.
- Double object constructions

The recipient (R) is flagged by an adposition, typically with its source in a verb of giving. The theme (T) is zero marked.

However, as it turns out, there are not just two main types of word orders but six.
Contemporary Standard Chinese:
Five different structures

- A: V + R + T [R = Recipient/ indirect object (IO);
T = Theme/ direct object (DO)]
  (1) ta song le wo yi ben shu
  he offer asp.-part. me one CL book
  He offered me a book

- B: V + T + gei + R [R is flagged by gei = dative
preposition]
  (2) ta song le yi ben shu gei wo
  he offer asp.-part. one CL book to me
  He offered me a book
Five structures (Cont.)

- **C: V + gei + R + T**
  
  (3) ta song gei wo yi ben shu
  He offered me a book

- **D: gei + R + V + T**
  
  (4) ta gei wo xie le yi feng xin
  he to me write asp.-part. one CL letter
  He wrote a letter to me.

- **E: Ba + T + V (+ gei) + R [T is flagged by ba, a direct object or ‘pretransitive’ marker]**
  
  (5) ta ba shu song (gei) wo
  he BA book offer (to) me
  He offered me a book
Other Sinitic languages

A sixth type of ditransitive construction of the double object or ‘neutral’ type is also found in other Sinitic languages, particularly of the Southern group:

6. Verb + DO + IO

Mantaro Hashimoto (1976) – key parameter in distinguishing Northern from Southern Sinitic (Wu, Hakka, Cantonese Yue, Min etc)
Hakka example

Verb + DO + IO

*nyin*²*hak*⁶  *yit*⁶  *tau*⁴

人 客 一 到
guest as:soon:as arrive

*tshyu*⁴  *oi*⁴  *pin*¹  *tsha*² *ki*²

就 愛 分 茶 佢
then must give tea 3sg

‘As soon as the guests arrive, give them tea.’
Verbs in dative constructions

Verbs can be divided into two categories: lexical datives and extended datives (Leclère 1978, Zhu 1979)

- **Lexical datives:** presuppose an IO. Two sub-categories:
  - verbs [+ give]. Ex: *song* ‘to offer’, *mai* ‘to sell’, *zhuan* ‘to transmit’, etc.
  - verbs [+ receive]. Ex: *shou* ‘to receive’, *mai* ‘to buy’, *tou* ‘to steal’, etc.

- **Extended datives:** the lexical definition of the verb does not presuppose an IO. Examples: *zuo* ‘to make’, *kai* ‘open’ (in *kai menr* ‘open the door’), etc.
IO in Ditransitives

The IO can be the recipient (R), the source (S), the beneficiary (B).

In all the examples above, the IO is the recipient. (6) is an example where the IO is the source, (7) where the IO is the beneficiary:

(6) ta tou le wo yi wan kuai
    he steal asp.-part. me one 10,000 dollar
    He stole 10,000 dollars from me.

(7) ta gei wo mai le yi ben shu
    he to me buy asp.-part. one CL book
    He bought a book for me.
In part I, we retrace the development of ditransitive constructions, including the double object and the indirective or prepositional object construction throughout the history of Chinese.

In part II, we examine the relationship of medieval Chinese to 16th century Early Modern Southern Min.

-- Consider four different markers of ditransitive constructions of the prepositional object or ‘indirective’ type, concentrating on extended uses of recipient markers and the grammaticalization processes thereby entailed.
I. Archaic Period (11th-3rd BC)

There were three main dative structures in Archaic Chinese:
(i) V + IO + DO,
(ii) V + DO + 于 + IO,
(iii) 以 + DO + V + IO (or V + IO + 以 + DO).

(8) 公赐之食 gong ci zhi shi [prince offer him food]
‘The prince offered him food.’
[V+IO+DO] V [+give] IO = recipient

(9) 尧让天下与许由 Yao rang tianxia yu Xu You [Yao leave Empire to Xu You] ‘Yao left the Empire to Xu You’
[V+DO+yu+IO] V [+give] IO = recipient

(10) 今买诸商人 jin mai zhu shang ren [now buy it+from merchant people ‘(He) bought it now from the merchant.’
[V+DO+yu+IO] V [+receive] IO = source
Archaic Period (Cont.)

(11) 孔子以其兄之子妻之 Kongzi yi qi xiong zhi zi qi zhi [Confucius object-marker his brother det.-part. daughter give-for-marriage him] ‘Confucius gave him his niece in marriage.’

[yi+DO+V+IO] V [+give] IO=recipient

Only verbs [+give] are used in patterns (i) and (iii) while only verbs [+ receive] or extended datives can be used in pattern (ii), i.e. V + DO + yu + IO
A new construction emerged in the Pre-Medieval period: $V_1 + V_2 + IO + DO$. The verbs that can fill the $V_1$ position are all specific verbs of giving such as ‘transmit, offer, sell, distribute, etc.’ implying a specific type of giving. Verbs in $V_2$ position are three distinct verbs [+give], but express only a general sense of giving. These are: $yu$ (與), $yu$ (予) and $wei$ (遺).

The complex verb construction is obviously redundant, as the meaning "to give" expressed by the $V_2$ is already included in that of the $V_1$. This is a good example of "strengthening of informativeness" (Traugott):

(12) ... 而厚分与其女财 er hou fen yu qi nu cai [and generously share give his daughter property] ‘And (he) generously gave parts of his property to his daughter’.
This V1+V2+IO+DO construction appeared suddenly under the Early Han (2nd BC – 1st AD). It obviously evolved from the V+IO+DO construction, as the two forms share the same constraints: only verbs [+give] can be used, and the IO has to be the recipient of the verb. Indeed, it functions as the recipient of both V1 and V2 in the serial verb construction.

Under the Late Han (1st-2nd c. AD), the new form spreads considerably. Many examples can be found in the Late Han Buddhist texts (dated 150-220) and also in the comments and translation of the *Mengzi* (Mencius) made by Zhao Qi (? - 201). In many cases, Zhao Qi has translated the original V+IO+DO sentences in *Mengzi* by V1+V2+IO+DO sentences.
Significantly, beginning in the Late Han period, there was a process of lexical unification for the verb *yu* (與). The verb *yu* 與 gained ascendancy over the two others:

{**yu** 與, **yu** 予, **wei** 遺} > {**yu** 與 (與)}

A comparative analysis of the *Shi Ji* (1st c. BC) and the *Han Shu* (1st c. AD) gives support to such a claim. In the following ex. *yu* 予 in the *Shi ji* has been replaced by *yu* 與 in the *Hanshu*.

(13) 分与文君僮白人 *fen yu Wenjun tong bai ren* [distribute give Wenjun slave hundred people] ‘(He) distributed a hundred slaves to Wenjun.’
The V1+V2+IO+DO construction becomes more widespread. And yu 与 (與) is almost always found in the V2 position:

We claim it is still a verb. The main reason behind this claim is that the process of lexical unification is not yet completely finished, and the grammaticalization process is unlikely to have started before the completion of the lexical unification process.

Another new structure emerged under the Early Medieval period: V1+DO+V2+IO, where the V2 position is filled by yu 与 or sometimes (more rarely) by wei 遺.

(14) 时跋跋提国送狮子两头与乾陀罗王 shi Babati guo song shizî er liang tou yu Qiantuoluo wang [that-time Bactria kingdom offer lion cub two CL give Gandhara king] ‘At that time, the kingdom of Bactria offered two lion cubs to the king of Gandhara.’
Early Medieval (Cont.)

- As the V1 is a verb [+give], the IO is the recipient of the action expressed by both V1 and V2. We can nonetheless find cases where the V1 is a [+receive] verb, and, consequently, the IO is the beneficiary of the action expressed by "V1+DO" and not the recipient.

(15) 把粟与鸡呼朱朱 ba su yu ji hu zhuzhu [take grain give chicken call zhuzhu] ‘(She) took grain (and) gave (it) to the chicken calling to (them): Zhu-zhu.’
Several hypotheses can be made to account for the emergence of the new structure $V1+DO+V2+IO$.

We claim that the right derivation is the following one: $V1+V2+IO+DO > V1+DO+V2+IO$.

Hu Zhu'an has another scenario. He proposes the following derivation: $V1+DO+V2-\text{-yu}+IO > V1+V2-\text{-yu}+IO+DO$.

This derivation cannot be upheld diachronically. It is impossible, of course, to derive diachronically a structure $A$ ($V1+V2+IO+DO$) from a structure $B$ ($V1+DO+V2+IO$) which is posterior to $A$, that is, developed later.
Late Medieval (7th-13 c.)

- The process of lexical unification of the V2, which started under the Late Han, is now complete. All the V2 in V1+V2+IO+DO or in V1+DO+V2+IO are filled solely the verb *yu* (與). As the process of lexical unification of the V2 is now complete, it is no longer obvious that *yu* is still a verb meaning "to give". It could equally well be a dative preposition ‘to’. In the following example, it is probable that the verb *yu* has already been grammaticalized and become a preposition:

(16) 说与他道 shuo yu ta dao [speak to him dao] ‘(He) spoke of dao to him.’

- Our view is that the following grammaticalization process took place around the 8th-9th centuries:

\[
[yu 与, +V] > [yu 与, + Prep]
\]
The reasons are: (i) it could not have happened before the completion of the lexical unification process; (ii) it could not have happened after the emergence of a new structure where "yu +IO" is found before the verb: yu +IO+V+DO.

This latter structure started to be used in Late Medieval, around the 9th century. It has not yet become widespread, but several examples can be found in several texts:

(17) 与老僧过净瓶水 yu lao seng guo jing ping shui [to old monk pass drinkable bottle water] ‘Pass me a bottle of drinkable water.’
It is likely that the structure \textit{yu+IO+V+DO} evolved from \textit{V+DO+yu+IO} and not from \textit{V+yu+IO+DO}. The main reason is that verbs [+give], but also verbs [+receive] and extended dative verbs can be used in both the new form "\textit{yu+IO+V+DO}" and its presumed source "\textit{V+DO+yu+IO}", as is the case today in Contemp. Chinese. In the \textit{V+yu+IO+DO}, one can only find verbs [+give].

With verbs of the [+receive] class or extended datives verbs, the IO is the beneficiary of the action expressed by the verbs.
Pre-Modern period (ca. 1250-1400)

The $yu$+IO+V+DO construction is already widespread. By this time, the five main structures of contemporary Mandarin Chinese are all in place:

$V$+IO+DO; $V$+DO+Prep.+IO; $V$+Prep.+IO+DO;
Prep.+IO+V+DO; Prep.+DO+V+IO

The prepositions introducing the DO are $jiang$ 将 or $ba$ 把, as they are today in Mandarin. The preposition introducing the IO is $yu$ 与. It will be replaced during the 18th century by $gei$ 给, whose origin can be traced back to $kui$ 馈, used as a verb ‘to give’, but also as a dative preposition in the *Lao Qida yanjie* and in *Piao tongshi yanjie* (end of the 14th c.)
II. Early Southern Min

Background:

- Apart from Mandarin - Southern Min is the only other Sinitic language for which we have historical materials, in this case, dating back to early modern period of 16th century.

- focus on prepositional object or indirective constructions
Min dialect group

- Heterogeneous group concentrated in Fujian province on the southeastern seabord of China, also Taiwan
- 4-5% of speakers of Sinitic languages in China, 72% of speakers in Taiwan
- the two populations of Min speakers in China and Taiwan total 50-60 million
- Southern Min < Coastal Min (Norman 1991)
THE SINITIC LANGUAGES

- 北方 Mandarin - 836 million (worldwide)
- 吳 Wu - 77 million
- 粵 Cantonese - 71 million (worldwide)
- 閩 Min Family** (incl. Taiwanese) - 60 million
- 晉 Jin (usu. grouped with Mandarin) - 45 million
- 湘 Xiang (contains Wu substratum) - 36 million
Objectives in Part II

- to examine the fate of four verbs of giving in Early Modern Southern Min (16th and 17th centuries) by identifying the phases and pathways of grammaticalization for each one

1. *khit*⁴ 乞 ‘to give, to ask for’
2. *thou*³ 度 ‘to give’
3. *u*³ 與 ‘to give’
4. *hou*⁷ -- ‘to give’
Significance for S. Min

- Lexical unification: dative preposition restricted to \( yǔ \) 與 for introducing the indirect object by the middle of Tang dynasty (8th c. CE) (see slides 14-18).

- So why four verbs in the Early Modern S. Min period (from 16th century onwards) in the process of grammaticalising into prepositions marking the IO and with the same set, or almost, of polysemous functions? (not only this dative function, but also causative, passive, purposive …)
Corpus of primary materials
16th – 17th centuries

(i) *Doctrina Christiana en letra y lengua china,*
    (ca.1607), Vatican Library.

(ii) *Li Jing Ji 荔镜记 [Romance of the Litchi Mirror]* (1566, 1581) 劇本

(iii) *Arte de la lengua Chiõ Chiu [Grammar of the Chiõ Chiu language]* (1620), University of
     Barcelona Library.

(iv) *Bocabulario de la lengua sangleya* (ca. 1617), British Library.

Language of Early Modern Southern Min documents

- *Doctrina Christiana, Arte* and *Bocabulario* based on koine spoken in Manila in the late 16th and early 17th centuries.

- Late 16th century: traders from Southern Fujian settled outside the city walls of Manila.

- Proselytized by Dominican missionaries from Spain.

- Syntactically tallies well with the *Lì Jìng Jì* 荔镜记 [Romance of the Litchi Mirror] (1566, 1581) from same period - on the mainland.
  - = a melange of Chaozhou and Quanzhou Southern Min.
Bocabulario de la lengua sangleya (ca.1617), British Library.
Lì Jìng Jì 荔镜记
[Romance of the Litchi Mirror] (1566, 1581)
Doctrina Christiana en letra y lengua china (ca. 1607)
Ditransitive construction types in Early Modern Southern Min

1. Verb+IO+DO

2. Verb+PREP+IO+DO

3. Verb+DO+PREP+IO
   (PREP < ‘give’)
2.1. $khit^4$ ꙯ ‘give, ask for’:

Three grammaticalization pathways:

1. ꙯ $khit^4$ ‘give’ > dative marker (postverbal position)
   
   $V + ꙯ khit^4 + IO + DO$
   
   $V + DO + ꙯ khit^4 + IO$

2. ꙯ $khit^4$ ‘give’ > causative verb > passive marker
   
   (Noun +|required| $khit^4 + Noun + V$)

2. ꙯ $khit^4$ ‘give’ > purposive marker ‘in order that’, ‘for’ (joining two clauses)
   
   ▪ Highly grammaticalized; causative & dative uses
Examples of \textit{khit}^{4} \textit{乞}

**Dative use:**

$\text{NP}_{\text{agent}} \rightarrow \text{Verb} \rightarrow \text{DO} \rightarrow \text{乞} [\text{khit}^{4}] \rightarrow \text{IO}$

\begin{align*}
\text{你} & \text{ 挞 落 荔枝 乞 阮 為 記} \\
\text{li}^{2} & \text{ tan}^{3} \text{ loh}^{8} \text{ nai}^{7}-\text{chi}^{1} \text{ khit}^{4} \text{ gun}^{2} \text{ ui}^{5} \text{ ki}^{3} \\
\text{2SG throw-dir} & \text{ litchi} \quad \text{PREP 1PL as:token}
\end{align*}

‘Throw down the litchi branch as a token of your love.’ (LJJ 26.235)
Examples of *khit*⁴ 乞 (Cont.)

**Causative use**: NPcauser — [khit⁴] — NPcausee — VP

旦： 不 通 乞 哑公 哑妈 知

m7 thang1 khit4 A1-kong1 A1-ma2 chai1
NEG must CAUS grandfather grandmother know
‘You mustn’t let our grandparents know’。
LJJ 15.20)

**Passive**: NPpatient — [khit⁴] — NPAgent — VP

乞 本事 卑劳厨。枉 法 钉死 在 居律 上

kir Punsu Pilato ong huar teng-si tu Culut chîô
PASS (name) unjust method nail-die LOC cross on
‘Unjustly crucified by Pontius Pilate.’ (DC 146 页)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>LJJ</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lexical verb: Verb + Direct Object</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dative preposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb — [khit⁴ ᵏ] — Indirect Object — (Direct Object) [9]</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Causative verb ‘to let’;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[khit⁴ ᵏ] — NP Causee — VP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Purposive conjunction ‘in order to’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clause₁ [khit⁴ ᵏ] Clause₂</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Passive marker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP_Patient — [khit⁴ ᵏ] - NP-Agent — VP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DC = Doctrina Christiana, LJJ = Li Jing Ji)
2.2. Early Modern Southern Min 度

*thou*³

1. 度 *thou*³ less frequent and less grammaticalized than 乞 *khit⁴*:

   Nonetheless, three pathways in the 16th – 17th centuries already apparent:

2. 度 *thou*³ ‘give’ → dative marker

3. 度 *thou*³ ‘give’ → causative marker

4. 度 *thou*³ ‘give’ → purposive marker ‘in order that’, ‘for’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lexical verb ‘give’</th>
<th>Dative preposition/clitic</th>
<th>Causative verb ‘to let’;</th>
<th>Purposive conjunction ‘in order to’, ‘for’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>LJJ</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of thou³度

1. **Lexical use**

汝 有 錢 一 個 度 我

$lú́ ú́  chìn  cheg  gue  tou  gua$

2sg have money one CLF give me

‘If you have money, give me a coin.’ [Arte 1620: 12]

2. **Dative use**

我 送 度 汝

$gua  sang  tou  lu$

‘I offer it up to thee.’

[Mysteries of the Rosary, DC 24a, p.177]
Examples of \textit{thou}^3 度 (Cont.)

\textbf{Causative use}

\begin{verbatim}
  you 度 陈 三 捧 湯 來 乜 事
  li2 thou3 Tan5 San1 phang5 thng1 lai5 mihn4 tai7

  2sg caus (name) carry water come what

  ‘Why do you let Chen San carry water?’
  [LJJ 22.077]
\end{verbatim}
2.3. 與 $u^3$ [=Mandarin $yú$] ‘to give’

1. $u^3$ 與 ‘give’ > dative marker
   Verb+PREP+IO+DO
   (no Verb+DO+PREP+IO)

2. Verb$_1$ (/ PREP) + NP+Verb$_2$ +NP
   $u^3$ 與 ‘give’ > causative marker

3. NP +PREP+ NP
   $u^3$ 與 ‘give’ > comitative ‘with’, ‘and’
Uses of $u^3$ 與

- $u^3$ 與 used in Early S. Min as a dative marker – similar to Late Medieval Chinese $yû$ 與.
- two other grammaticalized uses: the preverbal comitative use and the causative use.
- data need to be handled very carefully.
- causative use only found in the LJJ:
  -- a literary character being employed for $thou^3$ 度？
Table 3: Syntactic constructions with $u^3$ 與

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>LJJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lexical verb ‘give’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb 與 － Indirect Object － Direct Object</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dative preposition/clitic &lt; V2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verb － [與 $u^3$] － Indirect Object － Direct Object</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Causative verb ‘let’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>與 － NP <em>cause</em> － verb</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Comitative preposition ‘and’, ‘with’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP － [與 $u^3$] － NP － verb</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 8 17
Introduces IO as V₂:

Verb₁ — Verb2 [="與u³"] — Indirect Object — Direct Object

汝 賜 與 我 汝 子 來
2sg bestow give 1sg 2sg son come
lu su u gua lu kia lay
探 我 神 魂
tam gua sin hun
search 1sg soul

‘You granted us your son to search our souls (and forgive us our sins).’ [Mysteries of the Rosary, DC 15a]
Causative use of $u^3$ 與

Verb$_1$ - $u^3$ 與 - NP$_{causee}$ - Verb$_2$

你 应当 與 家長 知

2sg should give$_{caus}$ head know

‘You should let the head of the family know.’ [LJJ 44.058]
2.4. *hou*⁷ ‘give’

- *hou*⁷ ‘give’
- the *Bocabulario* describes *hou* (no character given) as a verb of giving
  p.110a: *dar: hou y no* ‘Give it to him/her!’
  but states that it differs from *khit⁴*, as it cannot mean ‘to ask for’.
- No evidence of dative use:
- no examples in the DC which has both character and romanized versions; no character can be associated with it in LJJ
The mystery of *hou*

- In contemporary Taiwanese Southern Min, *hou* has all the same uses as *khit* in Early Southern Min (see Chappell 2000)
  - i.e. Dative, purposive, causative, passive
- *hou* is also used at least as a verb of giving and a dative preposition in several other S. Min dialects – Xiamen, Zhangzhou, Quanzhou, Yongchun – forming a small dialect island
In contrast, $khit^4$ 乞 is widespread as a verb of giving, a dative preposition and a passive marker in most of Southern Min but also nearly exclusively in Northeastern Min, including the Fuzhou dialect (Chappell 2000).

$khit^4$ 乞 thus appears to be mainly in competition with $hou^7$ in parts of the Southern Min areas.
Mei Tsu-lin (2005) has reconstructed contemporary Southern Min *hou* as having the same origins as the Mandarin borrowing found in these Early Southern Min texts, *u*³ 與, the third marker discussed (where it is not, however, the main verb of giving).

Hence, the early texts reflect either a different variety of S. Min from those using *hou* today, such as Taiwanese and Xiamen, or a stage preceding any putative lexical replacement of *khit* by *hou* as the main verb of giving.
Table 4: Stages of grammaticalization for 4 verbs of giving in 16th–17th c. S. Min

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>khit^4 乞</th>
<th>thou^3 度</th>
<th>u^3 與</th>
<th>hou^7 與</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical – ‘give’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical – ‘ask for’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; verbs of giving in V_2 position of SVC construction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; verbs of giving in V_1 position of SVC construction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>[rare]</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resume Part II

1. *khit*\(^4\) 乞 in full flower – it has achieved all its grammaticalization functions while the lexical ‘give’ meaning appears to be obsolete

2. *thou*\(^3\) 度 midway along the grammaticalization process for several pathways

3. *u*\(^3\) 與 is obsolete; a borrowing from Mandarin used in the literary register

4. *hou*\(^7\) (no associated character) - a linguistic phoenix, given its reconstruction as *yu* 與, identical to No 3; evinces merely an incipient stage of grammaticalization to a dative use
Part III: Interpretation

- multiplicity of markers arises from overlapping cycles of grammaticalization and renovation – each of the three ‘native’ verbs (khit⁴乞, hou⁷與, thou³度) shows different degrees of grammaticalization suggesting such a cyclicity.

- ubiquity of verbs of giving also attested in different periods of Chinese. As outlined in Part I, in Pre-Medieval Chinese and Early Medieval Chinese, three general verbs of giving were used as V2 to introduce the IO in the V1-V2-IO-DO construction: 與 yǔ, 予yǔ, and 遺 wéi.
CONCLUSION

Verb+PREP+IO+DO and Verb+DO+PREP+IO.
- these two postverbal prepositional object construction types found in Medieval Chinese are also available in Early Modern Southern Min
- but not the preverbal position for dative prep.: *PREP IO Verb DO. Why?

- structure with 与 in the preverbal position as a dative marker, appeared relatively late, towards the end of the Tang dynasty (9th century) (Peyraube 1988)
- Possibly this development in Late Medieval Chinese occurred long after the Min dialects had split off (in the Han dynasty according to Ting 1983)
Typological implications

- In terms of word order typologies, Southern Min does not use the Cantonese type of double object construction Verb+DO+IO
  ‘I give book you’ and therefore is a counterexample to one of the parameters used in Hashimoto’s North-South typological classification for Sinitic languages
Typological implications (Cont.)

- It therefore aligns with the northern strategy for the double object construction in terms of word order.
- While lacking the preverbal position for the dative preposition that is found in Mandarin.
- This slot is reserved for causative and passive functions in S Min.
- Mandarin is the exception here with its 5 indirectives in contrast to the rest of Sinitic.
Thank you!

END

謝謝！
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