Marja Kaurila

Complex Predicates and Clause Linking in Chinese and Tibetan

Abstract

In this article, I discuss the difficulties in discerning between finite and nonfinite verb forms, both in Chinese and in Tibetan. I will argue that in topic-prominent languages, such as Chinese and Tibetan, secondary predicates tend to be concatenated with the primary predicate, forming a complex predicate, while in subject-prominent languages they tend to be nominalized, becoming integrated into the argument structure of the primary predicate. Moreover, I will argue that a sequence of successive clauses in Tibetan, despite the formal difference between the final and non-final verb forms, is functionally equivalent to a clause chain in Chinese. I will suggest that nominalizers, when taken by a verb in a predicating function in Tibetan, do not turn the verb into a verbal noun but move it in the axis of transitivity, turning it into a "nominal" verb instead. I will show that the same kind of deranking of the verb will happen in clause chaining structures in Chinese as well, even though no formal deranking is present. Thus, despite the formal asymmetry in Tibetan, the structures in Chinese and Tibetan are functionally similar and can be applied in a similar way to advance the narrative.

1. Introduction

In this article, I will look at clause internal and interclausal verb–verb structures in Chinese and Tibetan. In Chinese, I will deal with Mandarin, while, in Tibetan, I will consider structures in Written Tibetan, Lhasa, and Amdo.[1]

I will start my presentation by looking at the definitions of different types of strategies that languages use in clause internal and in interclausal

---

[1] In Chinese examples, I apply the standard *pinyin* transliteration, and, in Tibetan, the *wylie* transliteration system. In Mongolic examples, transcription follows the source material so that the Cyrillic alphabet is used in examples that come from Outer Mongolia and the Latin alphabet in examples that come from Inner Mongolia in China.

linkage. The three interrelated strategies to be considered when dealing with Chinese and Tibetan are verb serialization, clause chaining, and converb formation. With each of these strategies, I will discuss the problems of distinguishing between finite and nonfinite verb forms.

Second, I will consider the typological division of languages into subject-prominent and topic-prominent. I will show that this typology correlates with the choice of the type of linkage in verb–verb structures. I will also show that complex structures in Chinese can be divided into two basic types. Embedded structures formed by nominalizations contain background information and tend to occur in the beginning of a sentence or a sequence of sentences, while serial verb structures, formed by juxtaposition of clauses (verb phrases or verbs), contain foreground information and are used to advance the narrative.

Finally, I will show that, in discerning between a verb and a noun, the same indeterminacy which is present in Chinese is also found in Tibetan, where the same form can often function as both. This leads to difficulties in the in-between cases, where the interpretation of the construction depends on the definition of the verbal form's function. I will show that, as a topic-prominent language, Tibetan is very similar to Chinese in its organization of the information in syntactic structures. Tibetan appears to be a good example of the relatedness of the strategies of verb serialization, clause chaining and formation of coordinate converbs.

2.   Verb serialization

The first accounts of serial verb constructions come from West African languages (cf. Westerman 1930 for Ewe), and Caribbean creoles (cf. Sebba 1987 for Sranan). Later on serial verb constructions have been claimed in various languages and geographical areas (cf. Li & Thompson 1973; Bisang 1991 for Chinese; Nishiyama 1998 for Japanese; Lee 1994 for Korean; Crowley 2002 for Oceanic). Lord (1993) pays attention to the historical change in serial verb constructions, while Lefebre (1991) offers several analyses of verb serialization in various theoretical frameworks, addressing the question of structure and thematic constitution of the construction, as well as the question of the differentiating aspects of grammar between serializing and non-serializing languages.

In recent literature, Muysken and Veenstra (2005), working in the formal framework, give an account of serial verb constructions mainly discussing Saramaccan structures. They (2005: 235–237) note that,

depending on the criteria, serial verbs are either a particular family of constructions, restricted to some language families, or a phenomenon found to some extent in all languages. They consider the issue of argument sharing: whether it is resolved in the lexicon or whether it is mediated through empty categories; the issue of possible concatenation principles: whether the constructions involve coordination, subordination, or adjunction; the issue of corresponding constructions in non-serializing languages, possible candidates including asymmetric coordination, verb–preposition combinations, and secondary predication constructions; and also the issue of the difference between serializing and non-serializing languages: whether it comes out by means of different options of a single parameter or through different ways of doing syntax and morphology.

Finally, Aikhenvald and Dixon (2006) offer a set of empirical studies framed in general typological-descriptive framework with a wide range of languages from Southeast Asia, Pacific, Africa, and the Americas. They (2006: 2) do not take serial verb construction as a stable category for exact cross-linguistic description or comparison, but rather a type of strategy that languages can exploit, a grammatical technique covering a wide variety of meanings and functions.

All the aforementioned writers discuss the difficulty of finding a uniform definition for a serial verb. In the earlier literature, Sebba (1987: 1–2) states that "serial verb (…) has (…) been used to refer a surface string of verbs or verb-like or verb phrase-like items which occur within what appears to be a single clause (…)".

In recent literature, Aikhenvald (2006: 4–21) presents a more detailed definition, stating that a serial verb construction is a sequence of verbs which act together as a single predicate without any overt marker of coordination, subordination, or syntactic dependency of any other sort. She notes that serial verb constructions are monoclausal, they have just one tense, aspect, and polarity value, and may share core and other arguments. Each component must be able to occur on its own.

Bisang (2001: 1408) for his part defines verb serialization in a broad sense as the unmarked juxtaposition of two or more verbs or verbal phrases (with or without actor and/or undergoer), each of which would also be able to form a sentence on its own. This definition is consistent with Li and Thompson (1981: 594) as they use the term in Chinese to refer to a sentence that contains two or more verb phrases or clauses juxtaposed without any marker indicating the relationship between them.

Stewart (1998: 200–201) in the formalist side, however, gives a much more restricted definition, only accepting cases where both subjects and objects are shared. He (1998: 194–195) denies the existence of serial verb constructions in Chinese altogether, arguing the clause internal structures to belong to verb compounding, while the multi-event descriptions are excluded in principle because of the presence of a separate subject. For him (1998: 250–255), control constructions with PROs involve covert subordination and a nonfinite verb form, while structures with pros involve covert coordination. He comments on the rather loose linkage between the verbs in many multi-event descriptions in Chinese, noting the possibility of negation before the second verb and a perfective marker on both verbs, as shown in (1):

(1)   a. 李白买(了)LGB看（了）。
          *Libai   **mai (le)   LGB kan   (le)***
          Libai   buy   ASP   LGB look ASP
          'Libai bought LGB and he did read it.'

        b. 李白买了LGB不看。
           Libai   mai   le   LGB   bu   kan
           Libai   buy   ASP   LGB   NEG   look
           'Libai bought LGB not to read it.' (Stewart 1998: 197.[2])

Stewart does not speculate on the syntactic nature of the above constructions. He, however, refers to Wu (forthcoming) who analyzes them as coordinate constructions realized as CP adjuncts. Given that consequential serial verb constructions, which describe connected events with coreferential objects, are analyzed by Stewart as VP adjuncts, the CP adjuncts could perhaps be interpreted as involving a clause chaining type of phenomenon, where the component clauses under the same absolute tense may have temporal-aspectual interdependences.

In conclusion, the above speculations highlight the problems in distinguishing between finite and nonfinite verb forms together with coordinate and subordinate clause linkage in languages that do not make a clear formal distinction between a verb and a noun. Next, I will examine the line between finiteness and nonfiniteness, and then discuss converbs, medial verbs, and their relationship to coordinate and subordinate linkage.

---

[2] Without a context these example are a bit odd.

3.   Finite vs. nonfinite verb forms

The term finite verb normally refers to a verb that takes a set of obligatory verbal markers and can stand alone to form a sentence. Nonfinite verbs, on the other hand, are dependent verb forms that lack the finite verbal marking and occur in subordinate clauses. In other words, a nonfinite verb has lost part of its verbness becoming less a verb than the finite verb is. It cannot function as an independent predicate, and must instead be integrated in the structure of another verb.

Bisang (2001: 1403) states that one way to look at the concept of finiteness is to take it as a scalar phenomenon. Increasing degree of nominalization and of thematic coherence (i.e. referential continuity, sequential action continuity, and tense-aspect-modal continuity) are both indicators of a decreasing degree of finiteness. Accordingly, nonfinite verb forms, such as participles, infinitives, and verbal nouns, are typically used in descriptions of overlapping events with more referential continuity, sequential action continuity, and tense-aspect-modal continuity. However, as I will show later, descriptions of overlapping events may also take the form of verb serialization so that the deranking of the verb, which takes place along with the increasing degree of thematic coherence, is shown in decreasing level of transitivity of the verb, rather than in increasing degree of nominalization.

Bisang (2001: 1405) continues by stating that another way to make a distinction between finite and nonfinite verb forms (languages) is to look at the asymmetry created by the obligatoriness of certain verbal markers. Languages where there are no obligatory categories cannot develop any asymmetry between finite and nonfinite clauses, since asymmetry needs either exclusion of some categories or the addition of information not necessary in the main clause to the subordinate form. Chinese is one example of such languages. However, as I will show, deranking of the verb, shown in many languages in the formal asymmetry, takes place in languages like Chinese also, even though no formal asymmetry is present, and may be shown in the verb's inability to take certain verbal markers.

Finally, Bisang (2001: 1405) notices that converbs are verb forms that are specialized for combining clauses sequentially or adverbially. They are nonfinite in the sense that they cannot form a sentence on their own. Haspelmath (1995: 4), for his part, explicitly defines converbs as nonfinite subordinate adverbial verb forms.

4. Converbs vs. medial verbs

Haspelmath (1995: 20–21) states that the notion of the medial verb has been used in verb-final Papuan languages involving switch-reference systems. Medial verbs cannot be used in isolated independent sentences; they share the mood and tense of the controlling verb, and the reference of their subject is often determined by the controlling verb. As medial verbs can be combined into long sequences, structures of this type have been characterized as clause chaining, and languages where they are prominent as clause-chaining languages. Haspelmath also suggests that sequential structures in many African languages should be considered an analogous phenomenon.

Example (2) shows clause chaining in Chuave, a Papuan switch-reference OV language:

(2)   *yai kuba i-re*   *kei* *su-n-goro*   *fu-m-e*
      man stick get-SEQ.SP dog   hit-SEQ-DFP   go-3SG-INDIC
      'The man got a stick, hit the dog, and it went away.' (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 448.)

Example (3) shows a similar kind of phenomenon in Swahili, an African VO language, where *-ka-* is a prefix marking sequentiality:

(3)   *tu-li-kwenda mji-ni*   *tu-ka-mw-ona* *Ali* *tu-ka-sema*   *na-ye*
      1P-PST-go   village-LOC 1P-SEQ-3SG-see Ali   1P-SEQ-speak   with-3SG
      tu-ka-ondoka   *tu-ka-rudi*   *kwe-tu*
      1P-SEQ-come.away   1P-SEQ-return   LOC.CL-our
      'We went to the village, and saw Ali, and spoke with him, and came away, and returned to our home.' (Bisang 2001: 1407.)

Haspelmath (1995: 23) continues stating that there are also converbs which are used analogously to medial verbs in long chaining sequences of clauses. He refers to certain converbs in Turkmenian and Kumyk, noting that Bickel (1991: 35) explicitly argues an analogous Turkish example to show clause chaining. These arguments thus set together clause chaining and converb formation, which in the above was defined as involving nonfinite subordinate adverbial verb forms. However, Haspelmath (1995: 24) points out that several linguists working on clause-chaining languages have observed that, despite the fact that a medial verb lacks its own tense, mood, etc., and cannot occur independently, medial clauses are not subordinate.

This leads to the conclusion that not all converbs are subordinate either, a fact explicitly stated by Nedjalkov (1995: 98) for certain converbs in Turkic languages. An example of coordinate converbs in Kumyk is given in (4):

(4) *bu-lar, köl-nü   **gör-üp**   arba-syn   **toqtat-yp**   čemodan-ny*
     this-PL lake-ACC see-CONV cart-3.POSS stop-CONV suitcase-ACC
     *Manaj-ğa   da   **göter-t-ip**   köl-nü   jağa-syn-a   **bar-yp***
     Manaj-DAT also take-CAUS-CONV lake-GEN   bank-3.POSS-DAT go-CONV
     *čemodan-ny   **ač-yp**   šišla-ny   čyğar-yp   tiz-ip*
     suitcase-ACC open-CONV bottle-ACC take.out-CONV   put.in.row-CONV
     *suw-dan   toltur-up   **qajtar-yp**   čemodan-ğa   sal-la*
     water-ABL fill-CONV   return-CONV   suitcase-DAT   put-PRS
     'They see the lake, make Manaj bring the suitcase, go to the bank of the lake, open the suitcase, stop their cart, take out the bottles putting them in the row, fill them with water, and put them back into the suitcase.' (Haspelmath 1995: 7.)

Finally, Stewart (1998: 4–5) states that certain particles in Japanese traditionally analyzed as markers of converbs have been reinterpreted and the respective structures reanalyzed as serial verb constructions. One of these is the *-te* converb (cf. Nishiyama 1995). Haspelmath (1995: 26) on the other hand refers to Kuno (1973) and notes that, according to Kuno, clauses with *-te* converb are subordinate when they are same subject, but coordinate when they are different subject. Example (6) shows the Japanese *-te* converb:

(5) *Koobe-e   **it-te**   tomodachi-ni **at-te**   issho-ni   **tabe-masu***
     Koobe-DIR go-CONV friend-DAT   meet-CONV together-DAT eat-PRS.HON
     '[I] go to Kobe, meet my friend, and [we] eat together.' (Bisang 2001: 1405.)

Nedjalkov (1995: 98–99) for his part divides converbs into three basic types: converbs proper which function as adverbials in simple sentences; coordinative converbs that have a similar function as the English conjunction and; and conjunctional converbs, whose function is similar to the function of subordinating conjunctions in European languages. From the theoretical point of view, including coordinate verb forms under the definition of converb seems a less than ideal solution in that the name converb (converted verb) implies something less than a full verb, linking converbs to other nonfinite verb forms. On the other hand, Nedjalkov's

division gives a handy way to refer to coordinate verb forms traditionally called converbs.

In summary, both clause chaining involving medial and final verb forms and concatenation of coordinate converbs are similar to verb serialization in a broad sense in that all involve sequences of successive coordinate structures used to advance the narrative.

5. Verb–verb constructions in Chinese

Chinese is an isolating language with little morphology. It has several aspect particles, such as *le*, marking perfective; *zhe*, marking resultative (or in some cases imperfective); and *guo*, marking experiential perfect. The zero-marked neutral aspect is, however, always possible. A complicated system of complement verbs, which are grammaticalized in varying degrees, are part of the aspectual system (Smith 1991: 343). A complement verb immediately following the main verb gives the main verb a completive meaning (Fan et al. 1988: 169–170), while a complement verb mediated by the structural particle *de* conveys a non-completive (Fan et al. 1988: 154–155) or an irrealis (deontic) meaning (Fan et al. 1988: 206–207). In respect to the argument structure, the verb in Chinese shows no distinction between an active and a passive voice. However, Chinese has a system of *ba-* and *bei*-constructions, which is used to make explicit the orientation of the verb and, at the same time, to topicalize or to dispose the patient (cf. Li 1986: 222). Chinese has many sentence particles, the most common of which is the phase particle *le*, which expresses a change in reality or in the consciousness of the speaker (cf. Yue 2003: 92).

In their typological study of basic relations in simple sentences, Li and Thompson (1976: 459) divide languages into subject-prominent, where the basic relation is subject–predicate, and topic-prominent, where the basic relation is topic–comment. Topics are always definite (or generic/specific). Thus, an unmarked noun phrase in Chinese must be interpreted as definite if it occurs in the topic, but indefinite if it is part of the comment. Likewise, in Tibetan, an unmarked noun phrase in the beginning of the clause tends to be interpreted as part of the comment and is not easily taken as the topic, while a noun phrase in the beginning of the clause and succeeded by a demonstrative is readily interpreted as the topic.

Example (6) in Chinese shows how the position of a constituent in terms of topic–comment affects its interpretation as definite or indefinite.

In (6a), *che* 'car' functions as the topic and must be interpreted as definite, while in (6b), it occurs in the comment and is interpreted as indefinite:

(6) a. 车没来。
     che   mei   lai
     car   NEG   come
     'The car didn't come.'

     b. 没来什么车。
     mei   lai   shenme   che
     NEG   come   what   car
     'A car did not come.' (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 219.)

Example (7) in Tibetan shows how the interpretation of the position in terms of topic-comment depends on the definiteness of the constituent. In (7a), *smyu gu* 'pen' in the beginning of the clause lacks any definite marking and is not easily interpreted as the topic; in (7b), *smyu gu* 'pen' in the beginning of the clause is followed by the demonstrative *'di* 'this' and is readily interpreted as the topic. In (8c), the pronoun *'di* 'this' itself functions as the topic, while *smyu gu* 'pen' is interpreted as part of the comment:

(7) a. *smyu.gu   nag.po   red*
     pen   black   be:ASSERT
     '[This] is a black pen.'

     b. **smyu.gu   'di**   *nag.po   red*
     pen   this   black   be:ASSERT
     'This pen is black.'

     c. ***'di***   *smyu.gu   nag.po   red*
     this   pen   black   be:ASSERT
     'This is a black pen.' (Tournadre & Dorje 2003: 95, analysis mine.)

The conceptualization of an event in terms of topic–comment in topic-prominent languages is also reflected in mapping the secondary predicates in the semantic representation of the clause into syntax. The following examples show how the secondary predicates in the semantic representation of a clause have been realized in the syntactic structure in English. The semantic representations are given in Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) model, introduced by Van Valin and LaPolla (1997).

In (A), the secondary predicates in the semantic structure of the primary predicate *immerse* have been realized as adverbs of different levels in the syntactic structure of the clause:

(A)   **evident**' ([**slow**' (**do**' (Leslie, ø))] CAUSE [BECOME [**complete**' (**immersed**' (language, Leslie))]])
Leslie *has been immersing* herself ***completely*** in the new language ***slowly***, ***evidently***.
(Van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 167.)

In (B), the locative predicate *be-on* together with its internal argument *table* is realized as a prepositional phrase *on the table*, which functions as an oblique argument in the syntactic argument structure of the primary predicate *put*:

(B)   [**do**' (Sally, ø)] CAUSE [BECOME **be-on**' (table, book)]
Sally *put* the book ***on the table***.
(Van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 127; where x = Sally, y = table z = book.)

In (C), the secondary predicate *use* with its internal argument *spoon* is realized as a prepositional phrase *with a spoon*, which functions as an oblique argument in the syntactic argument structure of the primary predicate *eat*:

(C)   **do**' (Abdul, [**eat**' (Abdul, cereal) ^ **use**' (Abdul, spoon)])
Abdul *ate* the cereal ***with*** a spoon.
(Van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 121.)

In (D), the locative predicate *be-in* with its internal argument *kitchen* is realized as prepositional phrase *in the kitchen*, which functions as an adjunct in the syntactic argument structure of the primary predicate *bake*:

(D)   **be-in**' (kitchen, [[**do**' (Sam, ø)] CAUSE [BECOME **baked**' (cake)]])
Sam *baked* a cake ***in the kitchen***.
(Van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 163.)

In (E), the control predicate *say* together with the clause connective CAUSE are realized as the matrix verb *persuade*, while the clause connective PURP together with the lexical predicate get are realized as a nonfinite verb form to get, which is embedded in the syntactic structure of the matrix verb *persuade*:

(E)   [**do'** (I, [**say'** (I, he$_i$)])] CAUSE [[**do'** (he$_i$, ø)] CAUSE [BECOME **have'** (he$_i$, fish)] PURP [BECOME **have'** (mother, fish)]]
    I *persuaded* him **to get** fish for mother.
    (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 553.)

The above examples show that, in subject-prominent languages, such as English, where the basic relation is predicate and its arguments, the secondary predicates together with their internal arguments are embedded in the argument structure of the primary predicate. They lose part of their verbal character and obtain nominal features instead, occurring as adverbs, prepositions, and nonfinite verb forms in the syntactic structure of the primary predicate.

In topic-prominent languages, where the basic relation is topic and predicate, the secondary predicates providing background information are realized as NPs, PPs, or adverbs in the beginning of the clause, where they form a rather loose relationship with the predicate verb, while the secondary predicates advancing the narrative and providing foreground information are integrated in the predicate either as adverbs or as serialized verbs.

In the Mandarin example (8), the loose relationship that the topical constituents in the beginning of the clause form with the predicate verb can be seen in the possibility to leave out the preposition.

(8)   （在）圖書館（里）他呆了十分鐘就離開了。
    (zai) tushuguan (li)   ta dai   le   shi   fenzhong   jiu   likai   le
    (in) library   (inside) he stay PRF ten   minute   then leave PRF:PHS
    '*(In) the library*, he stayed ten minutes and then left.' (Li 1986: 45, analysis mine.)

Examples (9–11) in Mandarin together with their English translations, on the other hand, show the different way the two languages handle secondary predicates of displacement (9), transition (10), and transformation (11). In English, these predicates together with their arguments are integrated into the argument structure of the primary predicate occurring as prepositional phrases, while in Chinese they form a serial verb construction with the primary predicate. The verbal status of the secondary predicate has been made explicit by the position of the aspect particle *le*, which, when present, must follow the second verb, i.e. the verb which expresses displacement, transition, or transformation and which is realized as a preposition in English:

(9) 把我们兄弟的热血洒在了战场上，难道就为保存一堆臭粪吗？
     ba   women xiongdi de   re   xue   sa   zai   le   zhanchang shang
     DISP we   brothers STR hot   blood shed be   PRF   battlefield on
     nandao   jiu   wei   baocun yi   dui   chou   fen   ma
     how.come then because.of keep   one pile   stinking dung QST
     'How can it be that the blood of our brothers was *shed on* the battlefield just to
     keep a pile of stinking dung?' (Lao 2003: 51, analysis mine.)

(10) 它们自己已是那么自由也把自由之感传达给了别人。
     tamen ziji yi   shi   name   ziyou ye   ba   ziyou zhi   gan
     they   self already be like.that free also DISP freedom STR feeling
     chuanda   gei   le   bieren
     transfer   give PRF   others
     'They themselves were already so free and also *transfered* the feeling of freedom *to*
     other people.' (Chi 2002: 160, analysis mine.)

(11) 小弟让他给培养成了家里的唯一的知识分子。
     *xiao di   rang ta gei **peiyang cheng le**   jia   li   de   weiyi de*
     little brother pass he on   educate become PRF   home   in   STR   only STR
     zhishi fenzi
     intelligentsia
     'The younger brother was the only one in the family that was *educated to* a member
     of intelligentsia by him.'(Liu 1992: 78, analysis mine.)

Moreover, examples (12–14) in Mandarin together with their English
translations show the different way the two languages handle the lexical
predicates in the semantic structure of a control predicate. In English, the
control predicate occurs as a matrix verb, while the lexical predicate takes a
nonfinite form and is integrated in the argument structure of the matrix
verb. In Chinese, the lexical predicate and the control predicate together
with their arguments form a serial verb construction. The verbal status of
the lexical predicate has been made explicit by the position of the aspect
particle *le* or *guo*, which, when present, must follow the second verb, i.e.
the lexical verb which is realized as a nonfinite verb form in English.

     In (12), the purposive verb *qu* 'go' is followed by the lexical verb *kan*
'look at', which takes the experiential particle *guo*:

(12) 他病了以后，我去医院看过他。
     *ta bing   le   yihou wo **qu**   yiyuan **kan guo** ta*
     he get.sick PRF   after I   go   hospital see   EXP he
     'After he got sick, I *went* to hospital *to see* him.' (Zheng et al. 1992: 93, analysis
     mine)

In (13), the causative verb *jiao* 'tell, make' is followed by the lexical verb *huan* 'change for', which takes the perfective particle *le*. In Mandarin Chinese, basic causatives are syntactically simple and do not take any aspect markers (Li 1986: 143). The lexical verb, on the other hand, is relatively free and can take any verbal marking (Li 1986: 162).

(13) 當初不知道是什么鬼跟上了我，叫我用一只戒指換了個羅漢錢，
      害得后來被人打了個半死。

dangchu		*bu*	*zhidao*	*shi*	*shenme*	*gui*	*gen*	*shang*	*le*	*wo*
in.the.beginning		NEG	know	be	what	devil	follow	ascend	PRF	I

jiao	*wo*	*yong*	*yi*	*zhi*	*jiezhi*	***huan***	***le***	*ge*	*luohanqian*
make	I	use	one	CL	ring	change.for	PRF	CL	luohan.coin

hai-de	*houlai*	*bei*	*ren*	*da*	*le*	*ge*	*ban*	*si*
do.harm-STR	later	pass	people	beat	PRF	CL	half	dead

'In the beginning, I don't know, what kind of devil entered in me and *made* me *change* a ring for a 'luohan' coin, which harmed me so that later I got beaten half dead by people.' (Li 1986: 139, analysis mine.)

In (14), the causative verb of compulsion *qiangpo* 'force' is followed by the lexical verb *dingli* 'conclude, make', which takes the perfective particle *le*. In Mandarin, verbs of compulsion, encouragement, and demand can take the experiential particle *guo*, some of them must take the resultative particle *zhe*, and none of them can take the perfective particle *le* (Li 1986: 145). In contrast, the lexical verb is relatively free and can take any verbal marking (Li 1986: 162).

(14) 帝國主義列強強迫中國訂立了許多不平等條約。

diguo zhuyi	*lieqiang*	***qiangpo***	*Zhongguo*	***dingli***	*le*	*xuduo*	*bu*
imperialist	superpowers	force	China	make	PRF	many	NEG

pingdeng	*tiaoyue*
unequal	treaty

'The imperialist superpowers *forced* China *to make* many unequal treaties.' (Li 1986: 143, analysis mine.)

The above examples show that the way the secondary predicates in the semantic representation are mapped in the syntactic structure depends on the basic relation in the language. Subject-prominent languages tend to integrate the secondary predicates in the argument structure of the primary predicate, while in topic-prominent languages, the secondary predicates tend to be concatenated with the primary predicate, forming together a serial verb construction. The above examples also show that the tightness

of the linkage between the serialized verbs varies depending on the degree of thematic coherence. With basic causative verbs, as in (13), practically no material can occur between the verbs, while with verbs of compulsion, as in (14), the first verb can take the experiential particle *guo* and the resultative particle *zhe* but not the perfective particle *le*. When the semantic relationship between the verbs gradually loosens, the restrictions on the first verb disappear.

Since serial verb constructions represent foregrounding information, they can be used in sequences of successive clauses to advance the narrative. According to Bisang (1995: 139), these chains can be used to describe a linear sequence of several events or they can be applied to establish a certain relation between two events. In both cases, the order of the verbs is iconic. In describing a sequence of events, as in (15) in Khmer, the order of the verbs follows the temporal order of the events:

(15) *pdɣy   kɔ: **kraok   laəŋ   daə(r)   tr̀ulɣ̀:k**   tɯ̀k   mù:əy   kotɛ̀əh   nùh*
      husband thus   get.up   go.up   go/walk lift/raise water   one   bucket   DEM
      *yɔ̀:k tr̀u sraok   lɣ̀:   sa:ha:y nɣ̀u   knoŋ   pì:əŋ   nùh   **slap tr̀u***
      take   go   pour   on   lover   live/be.at   in   pitcher DEM   die   go
      'The husband got up, went away, raised one bucket of [boiling] water, and poured it over the lover [of his wife] in the pitcher [where he tried to hide] who died.' (Bisang 1995: 139.)

On the other hand, in establishment of a relation between two events, the first verb functions as the topic and presents an event for the second verb to establish a relation of another event with it. The topical interpretation of the first verb is consistent with the tendency of the first verb to be more restricted and static in nature, as was shown in (13) and (14) in Chinese. Example (16) shows a chain establishing a conditional relationship in Vietnamese:

(16) ***muốn   biết   đu'ọ'c   thua phải đi   hỏi***
      want   know   win   lose must go   ask
      '[If you] want to know [whether you] won [or] lost, [you] have to go ask.' (Bisang 1995: 139.)

The above two functions are often intermixed in long sequences of clauses bound by verb serialization. There is a lot of indeterminacy in the interpretation of the interclausal relations and a lot of variation in the tightness of the linkage. Examples (17–19) give some chains of juxtaposed clauses with various relationships in Mandarin:

(17) 他買了化肥找車拉回家。
ta mai le huafei zhao che la hui jia
he buy PRF fertilizer search cart pull return home
'He bought fertilizer, searched a cart, and pulled it back home.' (Li 1986: 130, analysis mine.)

(18) 我留幾個苹果回家吃。
*wo **liu** ji ge pingguo **hui** jia **chi***
I leave some CL apple return home eat
'I'll leave some apples to eat after returning home.' (Li 1986: 131, analysis mine.)

(19) 他熬夜赶稿子累病了。
ta aoye gan gaozi lei bing le
he stay.up.all.night hurry.through manuscript be.tired get.sick PRF:PHS
'He stayed up all night hurrying to finish a paper thus being so tired that got sick.' (Li 1986: 131, analysis mine.)

In coordinate structures, part of the information in establishing relations between clauses is established in the order of the clauses. A fixed position is thus an inherent property of coordination, and combines verb serialization with other coordinate clause linkage strategies. Opposed to this, as Haspelmath (1995: 13) points out in discussing the criteria for discerning subordination, subordinate clauses may come after or before the superordinate verb.

For presenting background information, Mandarin has modern constructions corresponding more or less the structures formed by subordinative conjunctions in European languages. Traditionally, however, backgrounding information is realized by embedded structures formed by nominalizations, where the nominalizer is a noun that names the relationship, as shown in (20a):[3]

—

(20) a. 我去中国西北的时候，吃过麻辣烫。
*wo qu Zhongguo xibei **de shihou** chi guo malatang*
I go China northwest STR time eat EXP 'mala' soup
'*When* I went to the northwestern China, I ate 'mala' soup.' (My own example.)

---

[3] Example (20) has been discussed with Huang Hua, who is a native speaker of Mandarin, graduated from the Chinese language department of Nanjing University.

Clauses headed by a relational noun, such as (20a), are subordinate, and even though (20a) is the normal order, (20b) is still possible, and can be used to express the same meaning:

(20) b. 我吃过麻辣烫，是我去中国西北的时候。

wo	*chi*	*guo*	*malatang*	*shi*	*wo*	*qu*	*Zhongguo*	*xibei*	***de***
I	eat	EXP	'mala'.soup	be	I	go	China	northwest	STR

shihou
time

'I have eaten 'mala' soup, (this) was when I went to the northwestern China.' (My own example.)

In this chapter, I have shown the correlation of the basic relation of subject–predicate or topic–comment in a language with its organization of information both in simple clauses and in complex sentences. I have shown that in topic-prominent languages like Chinese, multiple predicates that advance the narrative often form long sequences of successive clauses involving verb serialization. Next, I will turn to the corresponding structures in Tibetan.

6.   Verb–verb constructions in Tibetan

In his grammar of Classical Tibetan, Hahn (1974: 57) states that it is more difficult to distinguish the line between a verbal stem and a nominal stem in Tibetan than in most Indo-European languages, and a notable number of stems can be treated as both by a case particle. He (1974: 111–120) notices that, when a verbal stem, or a verbal stem nominalized by the nominalizer pa, takes a case particle and acts as the predicate of the clause, the case particle marks the relationship of the clause with the coordinated clause which follows, or, if the verb taking the case particle is immediately followed by another verb, the relationship of the verb with the succeeding verb. Functionally, a clause (or a verbal form) formed in this way corresponds to a subordinate clause (or an infinitive) in European languages.

Hahn (1974: 61) states furthermore that the Tibetan verb paradigm contains three tenses and an imperative form and that the language also makes a distinction between a causative and a resultative stem (Hahn 1974: 189). Concerning causatives and resultatives, Vollmann (2008: 351–352) for his part goes back in the history, noticing that the old distinction of *bdag* 'self' vs. *gzhan* 'other', where present actions, the agent, and the

instrument are *bdag* 'self', while future actions and the object involved are *gzhan* 'other', seems to describe an older state of grammar, in which the present and future stem forms are opposed in the same way as nowadays the causative and resultative forms. This opposition is still seen in word formation, where a word form derived from a present tense stem is agent (action) orientated (e.g. *byed pa* 'doer'), while a word form derived from a future tense stem is patient (result) orientated (e.g. *bya ba* 'that which is done') (cf. Vollmann 2008: 346). The verb in Tibetan is neutral to voice distinctions and can take both active and passive viewpoints (Hahn 1974: 28). Reorientation strategies, that take advantage of the causative–resultative distinction, allow to make the viewpoint of the verb explicit.[4] The importance of the neutrality of the basic verb and the reorientation strategies comes clear, when changes in transitivity are discussed later.

In modern Lhasa and Amdo Tibetan verbal systems, which have their basis on the old system, temporal-aspectual categories are marked by complement verbs (or particles), which are also used to express evidential values or the perspective of the speaker. In their grammar of modern Lhasa Tibetan, Tournadre and Dorje (2003: 162–169) state that the present and imperfective past are identical, past perfective is divided into simple past perfective, which gets an aorist (sometimes a perfect) interpretation, and perfect, which conveys a durative or a resultative meaning. In simple past perfective auxiliaries, *yin* 'be' represents intentional and *red* 'be' assertive evidential mood, while in perfect auxiliaries, *red* 'be' represents assertive, *bzhag* 'put, place' inferential, *'dug* 'exist' testimonial and *yod* 'exist' egophoric evidential mood.[5]

---

[4] Vollmann (2007: 367–368) describes periphrastic constructions taking the auxiliary *'gyur* 'become' for resultative viewpoint and the auxiliary *byed* 'do' for causative viewpoint in Written Tibetan, as well as analytical verb inflections, such as the (simple past) perfective *pa yin/red*, for causative viewpoint, and auxiliaries, such as *bzhag* 'put, place', *byung* 'get; appear', *song* 'go; become', for resultative viewpoint in Spoken Tibetan. Vollmann notices that all these periphrastic systems or verbal constructions have developed as a result of the inability to make the phonological distinctions anymore in many cases.

[5] Linguists working on Tibetan often analyze the perspective markers using a conjunct–disjunct system. This system was first applied by Hale (1980) to Newari. In a conjunct–disjunct system, conjunct refers to the perspective of the 1st person, and disjunct to the perspective of the 2nd and 3rd person. Intentional evidentials, referring to the 1st person's intentional and volitional action, and egophoric evidentials, referring to

In their grammar of colloquial Amdo Tibetan, Sung and Rgyal (2005: 205–209) on the other hand distinguish plain, witnessed, focused, and durative (or resultative) past in addition to present progressive and future tenses. Plain and witnessed past are marked by a complement verb, either *btang* 'send; make, cause', which is taken by active (causative) verbs, or *song* 'go; become', which is taken by spontaneous (resultative) verbs (cf. Wang 1995: 56).[6] Both give the main verb a completive (or a resultative) meaning (cf. Haller 2007: 91 ex. (8b, c) for *btang*; Vollmann 2007: 368 table 3 for *song*). The complement verb in plain past is either followed by the particle *nga* indicating subjective perspective or by the particle *gzig* indicating objective perspective. Denwood (2007: 59) interprets the objective perspective particle as an auxiliary indicating indirect evidence and originating from the Written Tibetan verb *zug*, past form of *'dzugs* 'put, place' (cf. Haller 2007: 91–94 ex. (8b), (9b), (20)). In witnessed past, the complement verb is followed by the particle *thal*, which indicates the speaker's firsthand knowledge.

In above, I have given a short overview on three varieties of Tibetan and an analysis of their verbal systems. Before going to clause linkage and complex predicates, I will consider the nominalizer *pa* in more detail. As Vollmann (2007: 357–362) states in his article concerning active/stative case-marking type, Tibetan differs from English in that it can distinguish various levels of agent–patient relationships together with various levels of transitivity. Tibetan does not have any obligatory arguments or valency. I interpret this to mean that various levels of transitivity entails a continuum of verb classes between a prototypical verb and a noun with decreasing levels of transitivity reflected in the syntactic behavior of the items. The influence of the level of transitivity on the syntactic behavior of a verbal item makes Hahn's (1974: 57) criteria for discerning between a verb and a noun on the basis of the element's ability to take certain verbal particles problematic, as the item's ability to take those particles also depends on its level of transitivity. And as the line between a verb and a noun is obscured in case of

the default 1st person's perspective, belong to the conjunct viewpoint. Assertive evidentials, referring to a known fact; testimonial evidentials, referring to an event witnessed by the speaker; and inferential evidentials, referring to an event inferred by the speaker, belong to the disjunct viewpoint.

[6] This system of complement verbs is thus also one of the systems in different varieties of Tibetan that makes explicit the distinction between the causative and resultative viewpoints.

predicating elements, there seems to be little motivation for nominalizations of a verb in a predicating function.

I argue, therefore, that the nominalizer *pa*, when taken by a verb stem in a predicating function, does not turn the verb into a verbal noun, but moves it towards the static end of the continuum, turning it into a static or a "nominal" verb instead. This leads to the deranking of the verb in a certain degree in the sense that a static verb is less able to take all the verbal markers than a dynamic or a prototypical verb. Thus, added on a verb stem, the nominalizer *pa* turns a verb into a verbal noun when the verb takes a referring function and into a "nominal" verb when the verb is in a predicating function, acting as a part of a complex predicate or a clause chain. In Amdo, these two functions of the nominalizer are marked by different particles so that the particle *no* turns a verb into a verbal noun and the particle *ne* into a "nominal" verb. In Chinese, on the other hand, even though the verbs in complex predicates or in verb chaining take no nominalizer or other overt marking, the same kind of deranking, manifested in the inability of the first verb to take certain verbal markers, happens anyway as was shown in examples (12–14). Finally, imperative forms, which are by nature dynamic, often have restrictions concerning static verbs. In Chinese, static verbs and adjectives describing states must take the resultative (imperfective) particle *zhe*, which turns the static verb dynamic (Zheng et al. 1992: 67–68). In Tibetan, past, present, and future stem can take the nominalizer (stativizer) *pa*, while the imperative stem is unable to do so.

The following examples present the different functions of the nominalizer *pa* taken by a verbal stem. In (21), the nominalizer *pa* is used to derive verbal adjectives in Written Tibetan:

(21) *di　skad　bdag gis　**thos**　**pa**　dus gcig na　de'i　　tshe yul*
　　　this　words　I　ERG hear:PST NZR　time one LOC　that:GEN time country
　　　*de　na　bram.ze　phyin.te.yo.sha.sha zhe　**bya**　**ba**　zhig yod de/*
　　　that LOC Brahman　Pindola.Dvaja　　so　say:FUT NZR　one　exist CONT
　　　bram.ze　de'i　　chung.ma de　rab.tu　mi　　sdug　　cing mig
　　　Brahman　that:GEN　wife　　that　very　NEG　beautiful CHN eye
　　　*gnyis kyang　mi　mthong ste/　**mi**　**mthong ba**　de　la　bu.pho　ni*
　　　two　also　NEG　see　　CONT NEG　see:PRS NZR　that LOC son　　TOP
　　　med　kyi/　　bu.mo　　bdun　yod de/　rab.tu　dngul　phongs so/
　　　not.exist ADVERS daughter　seven　exist CONT very　　money　lack　DCL
　　　'These words once *heard by* me… That time, in that country, there was a Brahman *(to be) called* Pindola Dvaja. The wife of that Brahman was very ugly, and her two eyes did not see, and the *not seeing one* did not have a son, but had seven daughters, and [he] lacked money very much.' (Hahn 1974: 211,[7] analysis mine.)

In (22), the nominalizer *pa* is used to derive verbal nouns with an abstract meaning in Written Tibetan:

(22) *nad　　**med**　　**pa**　ni/　rnyed pa'i　　mchog/　chos　**shes***
　　　illness　not.exist　NZR　TOP　find　　NZR:GEN　most.high doctrine know
　　　***pa**　ni/　nor　　gyi　mchog/　yid　**brtan**　　**pa**/　gnyen　gyi*
　　　NZR　TOP　treasure GEN　most.high heart settle.down NZR　companion GEN
　　　*mchog/　nyan.ngan　**'da**　　**pa**/　bde.ba'i　　　mchog*
　　　most.high suffering　exceed:PST NZR happiness:GEN　most.high
　　　'*Being without illness* is the highest of the findings. *Knowing the doctrine* is the highest of all treasures. *Having a steadfast mind* is the highest of all companions. *Being detached from suffering* is the highest happiness.' (Periviita 2002: My notes,[8] analysis mine.)

In (23a), the nominalizer *pa* together with a case particle is added on a verb stem to form a clause connective, while in (23b), a case particle is added on a verb stem directly to form another connective in Written Tibetan:

(23) a. *des　　　rdo zhig blangs te'　**phangs**　　**pa**　**dang**/*
　　　　　that:ERG　stone one pick:PST CONT be.thrown:PST NZR　COORD
　　　　　'He picked up a stone, and it was thrown, *and*

---

[7] This phrase comes from Sanskrit.
[8] Tantra texts, possibly Candamaharosana tantra (see George 1974, personal discussion with Pirkko Periviita.)

b. *rta'i   rkang.pa   la   **phog   nas** rkang.pa   chag/*
horse:GEN foot   LOC hit:PST SEQ foot   get.broken:PST
hit the foot of the horse, *and so* the foot got broken.' (Hahn 1974: 212, analysis mine.)

In (24), the nominalizer *pa* together with an auxiliary are used in Written Tibetan to form complex predicates with various tense-aspectual or modal meanings depending on the case particle added to the nominalizer and the chosen auxiliary. In (24a), the verb taking the particle *pa* gets a durative present meaning, and in (24b), it gets a necessitative future meaning:

(24) a. *(kong)   'jug   ba   yin/*
(he)   enter:PRS   NZR   be
'(He) is *(in) entering*.' (Hahn 1974: 147, analysis mine.)

    b. *grong.khyer de   dag   dang yul.'khor   de   dag kyang   kun.tu*
city   that PL   SOC   territory   that PL   also   completely
bsrung   bar   'gyur   ro/
guard:FUT   NZR:PURP become:FUT[9] DCL
'Those cities and territories are *to be guarded* completely.' (Hahn 1974: 150, analysis mine.)

Finally, (25) and (26) show that the verb stem taking the nominalizer *pa* can also function as a finite predicate in Written Tibetan. In (25a, c), a verb with *pa* functions as the predicate of the clause; in (25b), a verb with *pa* followed by the auxiliary *yin* 'be' functions as the predicate; and in (25d), a simple verb form functions as the predicate:

(25) a. *lus   kyi sdom.pa   **legs   pa**   ste/*
body GEN commitment be.good NZR   CONT
'The commitment of the body *is good*,

    b. *ngag gi   sdom.pa   **dag   pa**   yin/*
word GEN commitment be.pure NZR   be
the commitment of the word *is pure*,

---

[9] Auxiliary *'gyur* 'become' is used in translating the Sanskrit passive (Hahn 1974: 152). Notice that, as mentioned above with reference to Vollmann (2007: 367–368), the auxiliary *'gyur* 'become' makes explicit the resultative viewpoint and the patient orientation of the verb, and suits thus to represent the passive function.

c. *yid kyi sdom.pa   **legs** **pa** ste/*
   mind GEN commitment be.good NZR CONT
   the commitment of the mind *is good*,

d. *thams.cad du   sdom.pa   **legs** so//*
   everything LOC/ALL commitment   be.good DCL
   the commitment of everything *is good*.' (Periviita 2002: my notes,[10] analysis
   mine.)

In (25a, c, d), the verb is followed by a sentence particle. However, a sentence particle is not obligatory, as can be seen in (26), where in (26a), a verb with *pa* functions as the predicate, and in (26b), a simple verb form functions as the predicate:

(26) a. *sdig.pa gang   dag mi **bgyis** **pa**/*
        bad   what   PL   NEG do:PST NZR
        'Stop doing whatever is bad,

b. *dge.ba   pun.sum.tshogs.pa   **spyad***
   good   extreme(part.three.together) exercise:FUT
   learn to do good plentifully.' (Periviita 2002: my notes,[11] analysis mine.)

Examples (25) and (26) show that the verb form taking the particle pa is also a finite predicate. Example (24) shows that, in many complex predicates conveying various temporal-aspectual meanings, the first verb takes the nominalizer *pa*. Finally, example (23) shows that, in forming a clause connective, a case particle can either be added on a verb stem directly or mediated by the nominalizer *pa*. I will argue that, in all of these examples, the function of the particle pa is to stativize the verb, moving it towards the nominal end of the abovementioned continuum of decreasing level of transitivity. I will define the nominalizer *pa*, added to a verb stem in a predicating function, as a particle that marks an extension in space or time.[12] The nominalizer *pa* sets the focus on the event that gives the background in

---

[10] Vinaya texts. See also Udanavarga (Zongtse 1990). (Personal discussion with Pirkko Periviita.)

[11] This text is common in all Buddhist literature, earliest found in Vinaya texts. The above is a quotation by Bon religion (see Laufer 1898). (Personal discussion with Pirkko Periviita.)

[12] Extent of an act, defined as displacement in space or time, is a category found in Tibeto-Burman languages, e.g. in Burmese, which has the particle *-kɛ́* (Wheatley 2003: 203).

establishing a relationship between two events in the case of complex sentences, such as in (23); it sets the focus on the temporal-aspectual or modal values conveyed by the structure in the case of complex predicates, such as in (24); and finally, it sets the focus on the duration or distance in the case of simple predicates, such as in (25).

Indeterminacy in the line between a verb and a noun is not only a feature found in Written Tibetan, but also a feature present in varieties of modern Tibetan. Example (27) shows the nominalizer *rgyu* in modern Lhasa. A verb followed by *rgyu* is nominalized, and the nominalized verb form has a future or an imperfective past reference, often conveying a sense of obligation (Tournadre & Dorje 2003: 177). In (27a), the nominalized verb form is followed by the adjectival modifier *mangpo* 'much':

(27) a. *dbus.khul   la   **mjal rgyu** mang.po   yod.pa.'dra*
         Central.Tibet LOC   visit NZR   many   exist:be.likely
         'In Central Tibet, there seems to be *much worth visiting*.' (Tournadre & Dorje 2003: 298, analysis mine.)

In (27 b), the nominalizer *rgyu* has a function similar to a deontic auxiliary conveying a meaning of obligation. It is followed by a finite verbal marking.

(27) b. *khong   **gnyid   nyal**   **rgyu** ma   byung   song*
         he   sleep   fall.to.sleep   NZR   NEG   get:PST[13]   CMT:TEST
         'His being obliged to get to sleep did not manage.' (Tournadre & Dorje 2003: 298, analysis mine.)

The above functions of the nominalizer *rgyu* can be compared with the functions of the deontic auxiliary *'dod* 'want' in different environments. In (28a), *'dod* functions as a deontic auxiliary with a meaning of desire and is followed by a finite verbal marking:

---

[13] In (27b), the verb *byung* 'get; appear' functions as an auxiliary of completive aspect. This auxiliary is common in completive aspect of static verbs in Lhasa:

*nga   de.ring   yang.bskyar   rgya.gar   spa.se'i   las.khungs la   **'gro***
I   today   again   India   passport:GEN office   LOC   go:PRS
***dgos** byung   song*
need   get:PST   CMT:TEST
'Today, I *needed to go* again to the Indian passport office.' (Tashi 1987: 45, analysis mine.)

(28) a. *nga   tsho   sgrung.deb   **klog**   **'dod**   *yod*
          I   PL   story.book   read:PRS   want   RES:EPHOR
          'We *want to read* some story books.' (Tashi 1990: 91, analysis mine.)

In (28b), the auxiliary *'dod* takes a nominal function and is followed by the adjectival modifier *chenpo* 'great':

(28) b. *nga   bod   la   **'gro**   **'dod** *chen.po yod*
          I   Tibet LOC   go:PRS   want great   exist:EPHOR
          'I have *a great desire* to go to Tibet.' (Tournadre & Dorje 2003: 285, analysis mine.)

Examples (27) and (28) are analogous to each other in that both the deontic verb *'dod* expressing desire and the nominalizer *rgyu* expressing obligation can turn a verbal noun act as a "nominal" (deontic) verb depending on whether the item taking *rgyu* has a referring or a predicating function. Analogous to the nominalizer *pa*, I define the nominalizer *rgyu*, added on a verb stem in a predicating function, as a particle that moves the verb towards the nominal end of the continuum of decreasing levels of transitivity and marks extension in time together with obligation.

The above examples in Written Tibetan and in modern Lhasa Tibetan show that Tibetan is like Chinese in that there is much indeterminacy in distinguishing a verb from a noun and that the same form can take both functions. A verb form may thus be interpreted as a verb, when in a predicating function, and as a noun, when in a referring function. The in-between cases, where the interpretation of the construction depends on defining the function of the verb form, are problematic, such as (23) and (24) in above. I will continue pursuing my argument that, in both cases, the verb taking the nominalizer *pa* preserves its verbal character, being turned into a static or a "nominal" verb, rather than into a verbal noun. I first consider (23) repeated here, and after dealing with it, go to (24):

(23) a. *des   rdo zhig blangs te' **phangs**   **pa   dang**/*
          that:ERG   stone one pick:PST CONT be.thrown:PST NZR   COORD
          'He picked up a stone, and it was thrown, *and*

     b. *rta'i   rkang.pa la   **phog**   **nas** *rkang.pa chag*/
          horse:GEN   foot   LOC hit:PST SEQ foot   get.broken:PST
          hit the foot of the horse, *and so* the foot got broken.' (Hahn 1974: 212, analysis mine.)

In (23), the past tense verb *'phangs* 'be thrown' followed by the particle *pa* takes the sociative case particle *dang*, and the past tense verb *phog* 'hit' takes the ablative case particle *nas*. One way to look at these verb forms would be to take them as nonfinite and subordinate, similar to the subordinate conjunctional converbs or quasi-converbs in many Eurasian languages. An alternative would be to take them as coordinate, similar to the coordinating converbs in Turkic, Mongolian, and many other eastern languages, where these converbs are used in chains of coordinate clauses to describe a sequence of actions in succession.

Mongolian has two coordinate converbs: the imperfective converb marked by *-ju/-cu* 'and' and the perfective converb marked by *-ɣad* 'and then' (Nedjalkov 1995: 110). Example (29) shows the narrative function of these two converbs as opposed to the backgrounding function of the subordinate (quasi-) converb marked by *-ɣsang-dur* 'after':

(29) *tedüi qan köbegün   anu nigen quɣurqai   modun-iyar beye-ben*
      then khan boy   POSS one piece.of.wood wood-INSTR   body-POSS
      qaldqu-ǰu   *čisun*   ***ɣar-ɣa-ɣsan-dur***   *bars ber čisun-i*
      stab-IMPRF.CONV blood   come.out-CAUS-PRF.PTCP-LOC   tiger TOP blood-ACC
      inu ***doliya-ɣad*** *aman-iyan*   ***nege-n***   ***čida-ɣad***
      POSS lick-PRF.CONV mouth-ACC:POSS open-MOD.CONV   be.able-PRF.CONV
      beye-deki   *miqan* *inu* *bara-tala*   *ide-bei*
      body-being.on   meat   POSS finish-TERM.CONV   eat-PRT
      'Then the son of the khan stabbed his body with a piece of wood, *and after* he had let the blood come out, the tiger licked the blood, *and then* it was able to open its mouth, *and then* ate the flesh of his body until the end.' (Grønbech & Krueger 1955: 44, analysis mine.)

Similar opposition was discussed in Chinese, where verb serialization has a narrative function as opposed to clauses where the verb is headed by a relational noun marking a subordinate temporal-adverbial function. Example (30) shows a similar opposition between clause connectives formed by the nominalizer *pa* together with a case particle and clause connectives formed by a relational noun in Written Tibetan:

(30) *de.yang las   rgyu.'bras   la   yid.ches gting   tshugs   pa*
     thus   work cause.and.effect LOC faith   foundation establish   NZR
     med   pa'i   rmongs.pa dgag ni   'dod.pa bde.ba   zhig
     not.exist   NZR:GEN   fool   PL   TOP desire happiness   some
     thob par   'dod bzhin   du   las.'bras   kha.stong   tsam
     get   NZR:PURP want be.in   PURP cause.and.effect empty.words a.little.bit
     *las tshul.bzhin ma   bsrung   **ba'i   skyon   gyis***
     ABL sufficient   NEG pay.attention:FUT NZR:GEN   reason   INSTR
     bsgrub   bya'i   bya.ba srog.gcod ma.byin.len sogs dug
     accomplish:FUT do:FUT:GEN   deed   killing   stealing   etc. poison
     *gsum   gyis   kun.nas   slangs **pas***   *sdug.bsngal 'ba'zhig gi*
     three   INSTR extremely lift:PST NZR:CAUS suffering   only   GEN
     rgyu   sgrub   par   byed   de/
     reason accomplish:PRS NZR:PURP do:PRS CONT
     'Thus, as for the fools that do not have a solid faith in the law of cause and effect,
     because they, in wanting to get their desires fulfilled and to find happiness and so
     taking the law of cause and effect nothing but empty words, do not pay sufficient
     attention to it, [*so*] the deeds they will accomplish, killing and stealing etc., are
     motivated to the extreme by the three poisons, *and thus* they get to accomplish only
     deeds that bring suffering.' (Bosson 1969: 120–121, analysis mine.)

Despite their similar meanings, the two connectives behave differently. In
accordance to the criteria for subordination by Haspelmath (1995: 13), the
clause taking the connective *ba'i skyon gyis* 'by reason of' can have a
variable position in respect to the clause that expresses the consequence, as
(31) shows:

(31) *de.yang rang la   sbyangs.pa sngon.song   gis   she.'jon   med*
     so   self LOC learning   become.before INSTR capability not.have
     pa'i   skye.bo rnams kyis/ cho.srid   gang   thad.la
     NZR:GEN person PL   ERG religion.and.politics   whatever in.respect
     she.'jon   lhag.bsam drang.ldan   gyi yon.tan.ldan dang ldan.pa.can
     capability devotion have.honesty GEN have.virtue   SOC having.one
     la lhag.par.du sdang bar   byed pa de ni   rang la
     LOC specially   hate   NZR:PURP do   NZR that TOP self LOC
     *yon.tan de   med   **pa'i   rkyen gyis*** *yin no/*
     virtue   that not.have NZR:GEN   reason INSTR be   DCL
     'So, the fact that people who have not achieved capability by getting learned in the
     past, have a strong hatred for those who in respect to religion, politics and other
     things have virtues of capability, devotion and honesty, that is *because* they
     themselves do not have those virtues.' (Bosson 1969: 129, analysis mine.)

The clause taking the connective *pas* cannot take a variable position in the
same way, since moving the clause would break the clause chain, here the

chain of cause and effect. Thus, the fixed order is not only due to syntactic rules, which demand that a clause with a finite verb form must end a chain of clauses, but it is also due to the iconicity, which is present in a clause chain and caused by the independent nature of the coordinated clauses (Haspelmath 1995: 14).[14] In fact, a clause taking the connective *pas* and expressing reason can end a chain of clauses, but in that case, it does not form a pair with the preceding clause, but gives a reason for all which was said before, as (32) shows:

(32) *de   ni   lhag.par   du   long.spyod cung.zad   des   khengs*
      that   TOP   special   LOC/ALL fortune   a.little.bit THAT:INSTR   be.proud
      te   phyi   nang   mi   shes   kun   la   rgol   ba   dang/
      CONT outward inward NEG know   all   LOC quarrel:PRS NZR   COORD
      kha.drag   snying.khams chen.pos   chang   'thung   sho   rgyan   sogs
      loud.voice enthusiasm   big:INSTR wine   drink:PRS lot   cast:PRS etc.
      spyod   ngan sdig.spyod   kho.nar 'jug   par
      behaviour bad sinful.behaviour   only   enter.into:PRS NZR:PURP
      *'gyur   te ngan.pa'i rigs kyi rang.bzhan **yin   pas**   so/*
      become:PRS CONT bad:GEN   kind GEN nature   be   NZR:CAUS DCL
      'As for that [person], he gets proud just for a little bit fortune, and unable to distinguish outward people from his own, he quarrels with everybody, and with loud voice and great enthusiasm drinking wine and casting lots etc. gets only into a bad and sinful behaviour, *for so is* the nature of bad people.' (Bosson 1969: 115–116, analysis mine.)

The above sentence shows the independent nature of the clause taking the connective *pas*. It is coordinate with the clause that precedes, but gives the reason for what follows, here for everything that was said: 'and thus it is (as was said)'.

    The different behavior of a clause taking a connective formed by a relational noun, such as *ba'i skyon gyis*, and a clause taking a connective formed by a case particle, such as *pas*, can thus be explained by the different function of the connectives. The former is a subordinate causal connective with the meaning 'by reason of', while the latter is a coordinate causal connective conveying the meaning 'and thus'. The meaning 'and' is implied by the iconicity present in clause chaining, and the meaning 'thus' is given by the case particle -*s*.

---

[14] A similar iconicity of condition and response in a clause chain in Vietnamese was shown in above in example (16) from Bisang.

Example (33) from modern Amdo Tibetan literature is written in a literary style close to Written Tibetan. In addition to the coordinate connectives introduced above, it presents sentence particles, which show the mood of the sentence, and chain particles, which show chaining of clauses or verbs. Both particles form a coordinate linkage, where the verb taking the particle on it is medial and unable to form a sentence on its own. Example (33) presents the simultaneous connective *pa la*, the continuative particle *ste* and the chain particle *shing*:

(33) *de   ni   stong.snang   gi   zhing.khams   shig **ste**/ dkar.gsal   zla.ba*
      that TOP empty   GEN   field   SPEC CONT bright   moon
      *nam.mkha'i   dbyungs   su   mngon   par   'phags   **shing**/   rab.dkar*
      sky:GEN   area   LOC/ALL emerge PURP   rise   CHN   white
      kha.bas   g.yogs   pa'i   khor.yug   thams.cad   gsal   lhang.nger
      snow:ERG   cover   NZR:GEN surroundings all   clear   clear:LOC/ALL
      *mngon **pa**   **la**/   rab.rib   kyi   ldog.'od   cig   kyang   'tsher   bzhing*
      emerge NZR   SIM   dusk   GEN   reflection SPEC   also   radiate   PROG
      gda'/
      exist
      'That was an empty field, *and* a bright moon emerged in the sky, *and* all the surroundings covered by bright white snow were made clearly visible, *and at the same time* had a reflection from the dusk.' (Chebrtan 1999: 27, analysis mine.)

The above analysis of nonfinal verb forms in Tibetan as analogous to coordinative converbs with a narrative function is supported by the fact that coordinative converbs are prevalent in the east of Eurasia (Nedjalkov 1995: 129). It also connects the Tibetan structures with the Chinese structures formed by chains of coordinate clauses bound by verb serialization.

Finally, I will consider the nominalizer *pa* in (24), repeated here:

(24) a. *(kong)   'jug   ba   yin/*
      (he)   enter:PRS NZR   be
      '(He) is *(in) entering*.' (Hahn 1974: 147, analysis mine.)

   b. *grong.khyer de   dag dang yul.'khor de   dag kyang kun.tu*
     city   that PL SOC territory that PL also   completely
    bsrung   bar   'gyur   ro/
     guard:FUT NZR:PURP become:FUT[15] DCL
     'Those cities and territories are *to be guarded* completely.' (Hahn 1974: 150,
     analysis mine.)

In (24a), the verb takes the durative present marker *pa yin*, formed by the nominalizer *pa* and the auxiliary *yin* 'be', and in (24b), it takes the necessitative future marker par *'gyur*, formed by the locative/allative (terminative) case on the nominalizer *pa*, and the auxiliary *'gyur* 'become'. Before proceeding to the interpretation of the verb form, I will consider oppositions found in clause internal verb–verb structures in Amdo Tibetan.

    In (34a), the verb *bshad* 'say' and the verb *btang* 'send; make, cause' form a serial verb construction, where the verb *bshad* functions as the main verb and the verb *btang* gives it a past completive meaning. Both verbs are unmarked and both can form a sentence on their own.

(34) a. *ngas   khur.ge 'a   **bshad   btang**   nga/*
        I:ERG   he   LOC say   CAUS.CMT SUBJ
        'I told it to him.' (Dorje 2004: my notes, analysis mine.)

In (34b), however, the first verb *bshad* 'say' takes the simultaneous particle *la*, and thereby the structure has a future completive meaning. Even though the first verb in (34b) is neither unmarked nor able to form a sentence on its own, the structure is analogous to (34a) and should be analyzed in a similar way as a linkage of two serialized verbs.

(34) b. *ngas   khur.ge yong   na   **bshad la   btang/***
        I:ERG   he   come   LOC say   SIM CAUS.CMT
        'When he comes, I will tell him.' (Dorje 2004: my notes, analysis mine.)

Moreover, in (35a), the verb *khyer* 'take' and the verb *song* 'go' form a serial verb construction, where the verb *khyer* functions as the main verb and the verb *song* marks a movement away and gives the main verb a past completive interpretation:

---

[15] Auxiliary *'gyur* 'become' is used in translating the Sanskrit passive (Hahn 1974: 152). Notice that, as mentioned above with reference to Vollmann (2007: 367–368), the auxiliary *'gyur* 'become' makes explicit the resultative viewpoint and the patient orientation of the verb, and suits thus to represent the passive function.

(35) a. *ngas*   *za.ma*   ***khyer***   ***song***   *nga/*
           I:ERG   food   take   go:RES.CMT   SUBJ
           'I took the food away.' (Dorje 2004: my notes, analysis mine.)

In (35b), the main verb *khyer* 'take' takes the simultaneous particle *la*, whereby the structure gets a future completive meaning. In a structure containing the purposive particle *la*, the verb *yong* 'come' marks a movement towards and also gives the main verb a future completive interpretation:

(35) b. *ngas*   *khyod*   *'a*   *ja*   ***khyer***   ***ra***   ***yong/***
           I:ERG   you   LOC tea   take   SIM come:RES.CMT
           'I will bring you tea.' (Dorje 2004: my notes, analysis mine.)

In (35b'), the verb *yong* takes the imperative form *shog* and gives the main verb an imperative interpretation:

(35) b'. *za.ma*   ***khyer***   ***ra***   ***shog/***
           food   take   SIM   come:IMP
           'Bring the food.' (Dorje 2004: my notes, analysis mine.)

In (35c), the main verb *khyer* 'take' takes the sequential particle *nas*, whereby the structure gets a durative completive meaning. In a structure containing the sequential particle *nas*, the verb *song* 'go' marks a movement away and gives the main verb a durative completive interpretation:

(35) c. *ngas*   *za.ma*   ***khyer***   ***ras***   ***song***   *nga/*
           I:ERG   food   take   SEQ   go:RES.CMT   SUBJ
           'I went taking the food away.' (Dorje 2004: my notes, analysis mine.)

In (35c'), the verb *yong* 'come' marks a movement towards:

(35) c'. *ngas*   *za.ma*   ***khyer***   ***ras***   ***yong***   *nga/*
           I:ERG   food   take   SEQ   come:RES.CMT   SUBJ
           'I came bringing the food.' (Dorje 2004: my notes, analysis mine.)

The above oppositions indicate that clause internal verb–verb structures, such as those in (24) as well as those in (34) and (35), are best analyzed as verb serialization. In the above verb–verb structures, however, the first verb often takes a case particle and thus violates the condition that only allows two unmarked verbs which are able to form a sentence on their own to occur

in verb serialization. Notice that a similar situation also arises in Mandarin in cases where structural particles occur in serial verb constructions, as shown in (36) and (37).

In (36),[16] where (36a) is a positive and (36b) a negative structure, the first verb takes the structural particle *de*, which gives the construction an interpretation of qualitative evaluation as opposed to a resultative interpretation, which is conveyed by zero marking on the first verb in (36c):

(36) a. 他寫得好。
        ta   **xie-de**   *hao*
        he   write-STR   be.good
        'He writes well.'

    b. 他寫得不好。
        ta   **xie-de**   *bu*   *hao*
        he   write-STR   NEG be.good
        'He writes not well.'

    c. 他寫好了。
        ta   **xie**   *hao*   *le*
        he   write   be.good   PRF
        'He got (it) written.' (My own examples.)

In (37), where (37a) is a positive and (37b) a negative structure, the first verb takes the structural particle *de* in (37a), and the negative particle *bu* in (37b). Both give the construction a modal interpretation of ability.

(37) a. 这件事我做得到。
        zhe   *jian*   *shi*   *wo*   **zuo-de** *dao*
        this   CL   thing   I   do-STR reach
        'I am able to do this thing.'

    b. 这件事我做不到。
        zhe   *jian*   *shi*   *wo*   **zuo-bu** *dao*
        this   CL   thing   I   do-NEG reach
        'I am not able to do this thing.' (My own examples.)

---

[16] Examples (36) and (37) have been discussed with Huang Hua, who is a native speaker of Mandarin graduated from the Chinese language department of Nanjing University.

Thus, as the above examples show, clause internal serial verb construction may involve structural particles that convey meanings of temporal-aspectual or modal interdependences between the serialized verbs and lead to the deranking (detransitivization) of the first verb in some degree. However, since similar interdependences are present with zero marking on the first verb, certain degree of deranking of the first verb can be expected regardless of the presence or absence of an intermediating particle.

Finally, it can be noticed that *nas* in clause internal serial verb constructions in (35c) and (35c') is the same particle which is taken by the nonfinal verb and marks sequentiality in a sequence of two coordinate clauses in (23), and likewise *la* in clause internal serial verb constructions in (34b), (35b), and (35b') is the same particle that marks simultaneity in a sequence of two coordinate clauses in (33). It seems, therefore, that it is the coordinate nature of the particle which makes it fit to occur between clause internal serial verb constructions also. Similar correlation can be seen in Mongolian, where the same coordinative converbs occur both in clause internal and interclausal linkages, as shown in (38) and (39). In (38), the coordinate converbs, marked by *-ju/-cи* (*-ж/-ч*) and *-ɣad* (*-аад*), are used in clause linkage:

(38) *эрдэмтэн*   *Татунга*   *улс-ын*   *алтан тамга-а*   *хүзүүн-д-ээ*
       scholar   Tatatunga:NOM   country-GEN   golden.seal-POSS neck-DAT-POSS
       батла-н   ***уя-ж***   *тулалтаан-ы*   *үймээн дунд*
       protect-MOD.CONV   tie-IMPRF.CONV   battle-GEN   tumult middle
       хаан   *эзн-ээ*   ***ол-ох***   *гэ-ж*   ***бачимда-н***
       khan   master-POSS   seek-FUT.PTCP   say-IMPRF.CONV   worry-MOD.CONV
       яв-аад   *монгол-ын*   *цэрэг-д*   ***баривчла-гд-жээ***
       go-PRF.CONV   mongolian-GEN   army-DAT   take.prisoner-PASS-PRF
       'The scholar Tatatunga tied the nation's golden seal around his neck to protect (himself), *and* amidst the tumult of battle, tried to find the Khan his master, *and* went around worried, *and then* was taken a prisoner by Mongol troops.' (Sanders & Jantsangiin 1999: 205, analysis mine.)

In (39) the same converbs are used between two serialized verbs:

(39) a. *ном-оо*   ***захиал-ж***   ***ав-ч***   ***бол-ох***   *уу*
           book-POSS   order-IMPRF.CONV   take-IMPRF.CONV   can-FUT.PTCP   QST
           'Can I order the book?' (Sanders & Jantsangiin 1999: 195, analysis mine.)

b. *нама-йг*   *эмнэлэг-т*   ***хүрг-ээд***   ***өг-*** ***нө*** ***үү***
  I-ACC   hospital-DAT/LOC   take-PRF.CONV   give-PRS   QST
  'Take me to hospital!' (Sanders & Jantsangiin 1999: 189, analysis mine.)

Examples (38) and (39) show that some converbs, such as the modal converb *-n*, always depend on the immediately adjacent verbal form, while others, such as the imperfective converb *-ju/-cu* (*-ж/-ч*) and perfective converb *-ɣad* (*-аад*), can be used both in clause internal serial verb structures, where they depend on the adjacent form, and in clause linkage, where they depend on the final predicate.

   In summary, I have shown in this chapter that Tibetan is much like Chinese in its organization of sentence structure. The mapping of the multiple predicates in the semantic representation on the syntactic structure follows the basic relation of topic–comment both in simple and in complex sentences. Thus, like in Chinese, topic is the basic relation in Tibetan, while ergativity is a surface feature that plays the same role as word order does in Chinese, distinguishing the agent from the patient.

7.   Conclusions

In this article, I have shown that the same indeterminacy in distinguishing between a verb and a noun that is present in Chinese due to its lack of morphology is found in Tibetan, where the same verb form can often take both a verbal and a nominal function. Unlike in Chinese, in Tibetan clause linkage there is an asymmetry between non-final and final verb forms, but since both forms are inherently verbal and preserve their verbal features in forming a clause chain, no asymmetry in terms of finiteness vs. non-finiteness is created.

   I have shown that indeterminacy in terms of finiteness vs. nonfiniteness, or verb vs. noun, originates from the type of the basic relation of subject–predicate or topic–comment in the sentence structure. Subject-prominent languages tend to integrate the secondary predicates into the syntactic argument structure of the primary predicate. The integrated predicates must take a nonfinite verb form for their nominal status in the structure of the finite verb. In topic-prominent languages, on the other hand, the secondary predicates tend to be concatenated with the primary predicate forming a serial verb construction. The status of the concatenated predicates is not marked by their form but by their position as a part of a serialized verb

construction. Formal distinctions in the axes of the degree of finiteness are thus irrelevant in these languages, and indeterminacy in terms of finite vs. nonfinite is inherent in them irrespective of the amount of morphology they may possess.

As stated by Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 22), languages should be analyzed in their own terms and categories that they do not promote should not be imposed upon them. I agree to Bisang's (2001: 1408) division of languages into finite and nonfinite, in the sense that nonfinite languages are neutral to the finite nonfinite distinction. I will, however, extend this division to those languages where the formal asymmetry does not create a functional asymmetry in terms of verbal vs. nominal function as well.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2006) Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), pp 1–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, A. Y. & Dixon R. M. W. (eds.) (2006) *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bickel, Balthasar (1991) *Typologische Grundlagen der Satzverkettung und des Färtenlegens*, Arbeiten des Seminars für allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Zürich 9. Zürich: Universität Zürich.

Bielmeier, R. & Haller, F. (eds.) (2007) *Linguistics of the Himalayas and Beyond*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bisang, Walter (1991) Verb serialization, grammaticalization and attractor positions in Chinese, Hmong, Vietnamese, Thai and Khmer. In Hans-Jakob Seiler & Waldfried Premper (eds.), *Partizipation: Das sprachliche Erfassen von Sachverhalten*, pp. 509–562. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

—— (1995) Verb serialization and converbs – differences and similarities. In Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König (eds.), pp. 137–188. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

—— (2001) Finite vs. non finite languages. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raibe (eds.), *Language Typology and Language Universals*, pp. 1400–1413. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Bosson, J. E. (ed. and tr.) (1969) *A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels*. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Cherbrtan, Padma (1999) *Gangs* [Snow]. *Sbrangchar* 2: 26–36.

Chi, Li (2002) *Shui yu Huo de Chanmian* [Lingering of Water and Fire]. Beijing: Huayi chubanshe.

Crowley, Terry (2002) *Serial Verbs in Oceanic: A Descriptive Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Denwood, Philip (2007) The language history of Tibetan. In Roland Bielmeier & Felix Haller (eds.), pp. 47–69. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dorje, Lhundrub (2004) *Basic Course of Amdo Tibetan*, personal notes. University of Helsinki, East-Asian studies.

Fan, P.;Liu, X. & Tian, S. (eds.) (1988) *Xiantai Hanyu Jinxiu Jiaocheng* [A "Brush up" Course in Modern Chinese]. Beijing: Beijing yuyan xueyuan chubanshe.

George, Christopher S. (1974) *The Candamaharosana Tantra*, a Critical Edition and English Translation, chapters 1–8. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.

Grønbech, Kaarle & Krueger, John K. (1955) *An Introduction to Classical Mongolian*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Hahn, Michael (1974) Lehrbuch der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache. Bonn: Michael Hahn.

Hale, Austin (1980) Person markers: finite conjunct and disjunct forms in Newari. In R. Trail et al. (eds.), *Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics* 7: 95–106.

Haller, Felix (2007) Stem alternation and verbal valence in Themchen Tibetan. In Roland Bielmeier & Felix Haller (eds.), pp. 85–95. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haspelmath, Martin (1995) The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. In Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König (eds.), pp. 1–55. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haspelmath, M. & König, E. (eds.) (1995) Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms – Adverbial Participles, Gerunds. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kuno, Susumu (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: MA: MIT Press.

Lao, She (2003) *Lao She Juzuo* [Lao She's Plays]. Hangzhou: Zhejiang wenyi chubanshe.

Laufer, Bertold (1898) *Klu-'bum bsdus-pa'i snying-po*, Eine verkürzte Version des Werkes von den Hunderttausend Naga's, Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der tibetischjen Volksreligion, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, vol. 11.

Lefebre, C. (ed.) (1991) Serial Verb Constructions: Grammatical, Comparative and Cognitive Approaches. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lee, Sookhee (1994) Serial verb constructions in Korean. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 4 (2): 445–493.

Li, Charles N. & Thompson, Sandra A. (1973) Serial verb constructions in Mandarin Chinese: subordination or co-ordination? In Claudia Corum, T. Cedric Smith-Stark & Ann Weiser (eds.), *Papers from the ninth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp. 96–103. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

—— (1976) Subject and topic: A new typology of language. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*, pp. 457–489. New York: Academic Press.

—— (1981) *Mandarin Chinese. A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.

Li, Linding (1986) *Xiandai Hanyu Juxing* [Sentence Patterns in Modern Mandarin]. Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan.

Liu, Xinwu (1992) *Feng Guo Er* [Heard by the Wind]. Beijing: Zhongguo qingnian chubanshe.

Lord, Carol (1993) *Historical Change in Serial Verb Constructions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Muysken, Peter & Veenstra, Tonjes (2005) Serial verbs. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax: volumes I–IV*, pp. 234–270. Malden: Blackwell.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. (1995) Some typological parameters of converbs. In Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König (eds.), pp. 97–135. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nishiyama, Kuno (1995) *Serialization across languages*. Presentation given at 26th Annual Conference on African linguistics, Cornell University, Ithaca.

—— (1998) V-V combounds as serialization. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 7: 175–217.

Periviita, Pirkko (2002) *Basic course of Classical Tibetan*, personal notes. University of Helsinki, East-Asian studies.

Sanders, Alan J. K. & Jantsangiin, Bat-Ireedui (1999) *Colloquial Mongolian: The Complete Course for Beginners*. London/New York: Routledge.

Sebba, Mark (1987) The Syntax of Serial Verbs: An Investigation into Serialization in Sranan and Other Languages. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Smith, Carlota S. (1991) *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrect/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Stewart, Osamuyimen Thompson (1998) *The Serial Verb Construction Parameter*. Canada: National Library of Canada.

Sung, Kuo-ming & Rgyal, Lha Byams (2005) *Colloquial Amdo Tibetan: A Complete Course for Adult English Speakers*. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House.

Tashi (1987) *Textbook of Modern Colloquial Tibetan Conversations*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan works and archives.

—— (1990) *A Basic Grammar of Modern Spoken Tibetan*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan works and archives.

Thurgood, G. & LaPolla, R. J. (eds.) (2003) *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London: Routledge.

Tournadre, Nicholas & Dorje, Sangda (2003) *Manual of Standard Tibetan: Language and Civilization*. New York/Colorado: Snow Lion Publications.

Van Valin, Robert D. & LaPolla, Randy J. (1997) *Syntax: Structure Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vollmann, Ralf (2007) Tibetan grammar and the active/stative case-marking type. In Roland Bielmeier & Felix Haller (eds.), pp. 355–380. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

—— (2008) Tibetan grammatical categories and the notion of 'ergativity'. In Brigitte Huber, Marianne Volkart & Paul Widmer (eds.), *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek: Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Band 1: Chomolangma, Band 2: Demawend und Kasbek, pp. 335–358. Halle (Saale): IITBS - International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies GmbH.

Wang, Qingshan (1995) *A Grammar of Spoken Amdo Tibetan*. Chengdu: Sichuan Nationality Publishing House.

Wheatley, Julian K. (2003) Burmese. In Graham Thurgood & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), pp. 195–207. London: Routledge.

Westerman, Diedrich (1930) *A Study of Ewe Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wu, Ching-Huei Teresa (forthcoming) Serial verb constructions and verbal combounding. Presentation given at the conference On the formal way to Chinese languages in U.C. Irvine.

Yue, Anne O. (2003) Chinese dialects: Grammar. In Graham Thurgood & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), pp 84–125. London: Routledge.

Zheng, Yide; Ma, Sheng Jingheng; Liu, Yuehua & Yang, Jiarong (1992) *Hanyu Yufa Nandian Shiyi* [Explaining Difficult Points of the Chinese Grammar]. Beijing: Sinolingua.

Zongtse, C. T. (ed.) (1990) *Udanavarga, vol. 3: der Tibetische* Text, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Sanskritexte aus den Turfanfunden X. 3. Göttingen: Vandenhofck & Ruprecht.

Appendix 1. Verb categories in Chinese, Classical Tibetan, Lhasa Tibetan, and Amdo Tibetan.

I will define the following verb categories in Chinese:

Aspect particles:
了 *le* = PRF (perfective)
着 *zhe* = RES (resultative)
过 *guo* = EXP (experiential perfect)

Sentence particles:
了 *le* = PHS (phase)

Structural particles:
得 *de* = STR (structural particle)
不 *bu* = NEG (negative)
的 *de* = STR (structural particle)

Topic and focus (disposal):
被 *bei* = PASS (passive, marks the resultative viewoint and the patient-topic)
把 *ba* = DISP (diposal, marks the causative viewpoint and the patient-focus)

Following Hahn (1974) with minor modifications, I will define here the following particles in Classical Tibetan:

Case particles:
kyis/gyis/gis	= INSTR (instrumental, as a case marker)
	= CAUS (causal, as a clause connective)
kyi/gyi/gi	= GEN (genitive, as a case marker)
	= ADVERS (adversative, as a clause connective)
tu/du/-r/ru/su	= LOC/ALL (locative/allative, as a case marker)
	= PURP (purposive, as a clause connective)
na/la	= LOC (locative, as a case marker)
	= COND (conditional)
	= SIM (simultaneous, as a clause connective)
nas/las	= ABL (ablative, as a case marker)
	= SEQ (sequential, as a clause connective)

dang   = SOC (sociative, as a case marker)
                = COORD (coordinative, as a clause connective)

Sentence particles:
ste/te/de = CONT (continuative, Hahn's semifinal particle)
'o/ro/lo/mo/bo/no/do/ngo/go = DCL (declarative, Hahn's final particle)

Other particles:
cing/zhing/shing = CHN (verb or clause chain, Hahn's coordinative particle)

Following Tournadre and Dorje (2003) with minor modifications, I will define here the following verb categories in Lhasa Tibetan:

Future tense (intentional aspect):
gi red (*red* 'be') = FUT:ASSERT (future assertative)
gi yin (*yin* 'be') = FUT:INT (future intentional)
gi = NZR (nominalizer)

Imperfective:
gi yod (*yod* 'exist') = IMPRF:EPHOR (imperfective egophoric)
gi yod red = IMPRF-ASSERT (imperfective assertative)
gi 'dug (*dug* 'exist') = IMPRF:TEST (imperfective testimonial)

Perfective (Tournadre's past simple perfective):
pa red = PRF:ASSERT (perfective assertative)
pa yin = PRF:INT (perfective intentional)
pa = NZR = (nominalizer)

Resultative (Tournadre's perfect):[17]
yod (*yod* 'exist') = RES:EPHOR (resultative egophoric)
yod red = RES-ASSERT (resultative assertative)
'dug (*'dug* 'exist') = RES:TEST (resultative testimonial)
bzhag (*bzhag* 'put, place') = RES:INFR (resultative inferential)

---

[17] Both perfect and resultative aspect focus on the result or effect that remains after the completion of an action. Perfect is agent orientated, while resultative is patient orientated.

Completive:[18]
song (*song* 'go; become') = CMT:TEST (completive testimonial)
byung (*byung* 'get; appear') = CMT:EPHOR (completive egophoric)

Future completive:
yong (*yong* 'come; happen') = FUT.CMT:EPHOR (future.completive egophoric)

Experiential perfect:
myong (*myong* 'experience') = EXP:EPHOR (experiential egophoric)
myong song = EXP-TEST (experiential testimonial)

Following Sung and Rgyal (2005) with minor modifications, I will define here the following verb categories in Amdo Tibetan:

Future tense (intentional aspect):
rgyus (*rgyu yin*) = FUT:SUBJ (future subjective)
rgyu red = FUT:ASSERT (future assertative)
rgyu = NZR (nominalizer)

Progressive:
gi yod (*ko*) = PROG:EPHOR (progressive egophoric)
gi yod gi (*ko gi*) = PROG-TEST (progressive testimonial)

Completive:
btang nga = CAUS.CMT-SUBJ (causative completive subjective)
btang gzig = CAUS.CMT-INDIR (causative completive indirect)
btang thal = CAUS.CMT-TEST (causative completive testimonial)
song nga = RES.CMT-SUBJ (resultative completive subjective)
song gzig = RES.CMT-INDIR (resultative completive indirect)
thal = RES.CMT-TEST (resultative completive testimonial)

(*btang* 'send; make, cause')
(*song* 'go; become')
(*gzugs*, here *gzig* 'put, place')
(*thal* 'undergo, arrive, become')

---

[18] Like resultative, completive is also patient orientated. It focuses on the completion and the final point of the action.

Durative (resultative):
yod = DUR:EPHOR (durative egophric)
yod red = DUR-ASSERT (durative assertative)

Focused perfect:
nis (*ni yin*) = FOC:SUBJ (focused subjective)
ni red = FOC:ASSERT (focused assertative)

Appendix 2. Abbreviations.

ABL = ablative
ACC = accusative
ADVERS = adversative
ALL = allative
ASP = aspect
ASSERT = assertative
CAUS = causal/causative
CHN = chain
CL = classifier
CMT = completive
COND = conditional
CONT = continuative
CONV = converb
COORD = coordinative
DAT = dative
DCL = declarative
DEM = demonstrative
DFP = different subject
DIR = directional
DISP = disposal
DUR = durative
EPHOR = egophoric
ERG = ergative
EXP = experiential perfect
FOC = focused perfect
FUT = future
GEN = genitive
HON = honoric
IMP = imperative
IMPRF = imperfective
INDIC = indicative
INDIR = indirect
INFR = inferential
INSTR = instrumental
INT = intentional
LOC = locative
MOD = modal

NEG = negative
NOM = nominative
NZR = nominalizer
P = person
PASS = passive
PHS = phase particle
PL = plural
POSS = possessive
PRT = preterite
PRF = perfective
PROG = progressive
PRS = present
PST = past
PTCP = participle
PURP = purposive
QST = question
RES = resultative
SEQ = sequential
SG = singular
SIM = simultaneous
SOC = sociative
SP = same subject
SPEC = specific
STR = structural particle
SUBJ = subjective
TERM = terminative
TEST = testimonial
TOP = topic

Contact Information:

Marja Kaurila
Department of Modern Languages, General Linguistics
University of Helsinki
Laivalahdenkaari 12 A 11
FI-00810 Helsinki
Finland
e-mail: marja(dot)peltomaa(at)helsinki(dot)fi, mapeltom(at)gmail(dot)com