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ABSTRACT

There are at least two kinds of N+V sequences in Lhasa Tibetan. One is an ordinary object verb sequence (OV) and the other is a complex predicate (CP). This thesis describes the properties of complex predicates in Lhasa Tibetan and provides diagnostic tests to differentiate N+V sequences. Compare these two sentences:

1) ngas khyed.rang la dngul ster pa.yin 1SG ergative 2SG dative money give PRF
I gave money to you.

2) khos khong.tsho la mgo.skor btang ba.red 3SG ergative 3SG plural LOC deception do PRF
He cheated them.

The N+V sequences in question are dngul ster ‘money give’ in (1) and mgo.skor btang ‘deception send’ in (2).

Previously there were no structural tests that could be used to differentiate OV's from CP's. Speakers and researchers have mostly relied on intuition or (non-) compositionality. This thesis offers 20 tests to apply to N+V sequences in order to
differentiate CPs from OVs. Some tests prove definitive and others prove inconclusive. There are three main categories of tests. These are tests focused on the nominal (host) component, tests focused on the verbal (verbalizer) component, and tests focused on the syntax of the construction as a whole. These tests yield three findings:

1. Unlike OVs, the CPs resist nominal modification (but this is not always the case).
2. Verbalizers behave syntactically just like a regular single stem verbs.
3. The CP as a whole resists reordering and separation by argument level constituents.

Both Mohanan (1994, 2007) and Butt (2003, 2010) have written on light verbs and complex predicates in other languages and some of their ideas are applied to N+V sequences in Lhasa Tibetan. CPs in Lhasa Tibetan consist of a host (the nominal component) and a verbalizer (the verbal component, often called a light verb). They can be both compositional and non-compositional. The majority of CPs in Lhasa Tibetan use one of the three most common verbalizers. Of more than 1100 verbal entries that make up the data used in this study, 70% were CP-like constructions; and of those, more than 70% used the most common three verbalizers. There are however, a large number of candidate constructions which use less common verbalizers.

According to the tests developed in this thesis, some constructions which have been called CPs are better labeled OVs and others which are borderline are shown to have the same properties as other prototypical CPs.
บทคัดย่อ

ในภาษาเปียงคาล้านสำหรับคำนำมและคำกริยาอยู่ในสองประเภทคือ ลักษณะของคำแสดงเชิงซ้อนในภาษาเปียงคาล้านและเสนอการทดสอบเชิงวินิจฉัยเพื่อแยกแยะลำดับ
คำนำมและคำกริยา ยกตัวอย่างสองประโยคดังต่อไปนี้

(OV)

1 งัส  กุ่ยง  ลา  ดงกุล  สเตอร์  ปายิน

2 ขัส  กุ่ยง  ทา  มโก  สอร  บตง  บาร์ยร

(CP)

เขำหลอกพวกเขำ
ลำดับคำนามและคำกิริยาที่ยกมาศึกษา คือ dngul ster ‘money give’ ในข้อ (1) และ mgo.skor btang ‘deception send’ ในข้อ (2)

เดิมไม่ปรากฏการทดสอบเชิงโครงสร้างเพื่อใช้แยกแยะระหว่าง OV และ CP ผู้พูดและนักวิจัย ส่วนใหญ่อาศัยเปรียบเทียบหรือหลักการแปลความหมายจากส่วนประกอบของประโยค วิทยานิพนธ์นี้เสนอการทดสอบ 20 ประเภทเพื่อการแยกแยะระหว่าง OV กับ CP ปรากฏว่า การทดสอบมีทั้งที่เกิดผลและไม่เกิดผล การทดสอบสามารถจำแนกได้เป็นสามประเภทหลัก คือ การทดสอบที่มุ่งไปยังส่วนประกอบ (ข้อ) การทดสอบที่มุ่งไปยังกลุ่มภิกษุ (ตัวเปลี่ยนประเภทของคำให้เป็นคำกิริยา) และการทดสอบที่มุ่งไปยังภาษาสัมพันธ์เชิงองค์รวม จากการทดสอบเหล่านี้ พบว่า

ก. CP แตกต่างจาก OP เพราะมีความต้นทางต่อการขยายคำนาม (แต่ไม่เป็นเช่นนั้นเสมอไป)

ข. ตัวเปลี่ยนประเภทของคำให้เป็นคำกิริยากว่าด้วยการรวมคำพัฒนาเมื่อภิกษุคำรากรื่องราวที่ไป

ค. โดยรวมแล้ว OP มีความต้นทางต่อการจัดลำดับใหม่ และการแยกออกจากกันโดย


กิริยาสามัญและภาคแสดงเชิงข้อในฐานะอื่น ๆ เน้นศึกษา นักวิจัยที่สื่อสู่อายุที่วิทยาศาสตราจารยศึกษา

ลำดับคำนามและกิริยาในภาษาอิเบตภาษาภาคแสดงเชิงข้อ ในภาษาอิเบตภาษาประกอบคำเรียก

(ส่วนประกอบคำเรียก) และที่เปลี่ยนประเภทคำให้เป็น คำกิริยานักวิจัย (ส่วนกิริยาสามัญภิกษุคำคือ

สำคัญ) ส่วนประกอบทั้งสองสามารถเป็นได้ทั้งแบบ Compositional และ Non-Compositional

ภาคแสดงข้อในภาษาอิเบตภาษาใช้ตัวเปลี่ยนประเภทคำให้เป็นคำกิริยาหนึ่งในส่วนคำ

ที่พบบ่อยที่สุดในการศึกษาข้อมูลภิกษุยักษ์มากกว่า 1,100 ตัวอย่าง พบว่าเป็นโครงสร้างคล้าย CP อยู่

ถึงร้อยละ 70 และพบว้มีการใช้ตัวเปลี่ยนประเภท คำให้เป็นคำกิริยาที่พบบ่อยที่สุดคำรูปกรกกว่า

ร้อยละ 70 อย่างไรก็ตาม พบว่ามีโครงสร้างที่เข้าข่าย พิจารณาจำนวนมากที่ใช้ตัวเปลี่ยนประเภทคำ

ให้เป็นคำกิริยาที่พบบ่อยน้อยกว่าต่อมาก

เมื่อผลจากการทดสอบในวิทยานิพนธ์ฉบับนี้ พบว่าโครงสร้างบางตัวที่เรียกว่า CP นำจะเรียกว่า

OV จึงจะเหมาะสมกว่า และพบว่าโครงสร้างตัวอื่นที่มีลักษณะที่สุดก็มีลักษณะเหมือนกับ CP

ต้นแบบอื่น ๆ
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Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 The Problem

In Lhasa Tibetan (LT) noun-verb sequences are described as falling into (at least) two categories. The basis for this distinction is usually only intuition. Sometimes more concrete (but still unsatisfactory) reasons are given. This thesis aims to provide additional structural “tests” that can be used to distinguish N+V sequences in Lhasa Tibetan.

Compare these two sentences:

1.1

ངས་

khos

khyed.rang

la

dngul

sterg.

pa.yin

1SG

ERG

2SG

self

DAT

money

give

PERF

I gave money to you.

1.2

ཁོས་

khos

khong.tsho

la

mgo.skor

btang

ba.red

3SG

ERG

3SG

PL

LOC

deception

send

PERF

He cheated them.

The N+V sequences in question are dngul ster ‘money give’ in (1.1) and mgo.skor btang ‘deception send’ in (1.2). These sentences both have three nouns, a verb and an auxiliary. The subject is in ergative case in both and there is a locative/dative case marker on the object. In both sentences the third noun is not overtly marked for case. The verbs and the nouns directly preceding the auxiliaries are the focus of this problem.
While there are admittedly simple differences between the two sentences they are used here to illustrate the main question of this thesis. What is the difference between the N+V in (1.1) and the N+V in (1.2)? Is there a difference? Why is (1.1) intuited as a normal object (specifically an indirect object) plus simple verb construction while (1.2) is usually given a special status as a unique (though extremely common) construction, labelled various things (e.g. complex predicate) by various researchers?

No clear diagnostic exists to distinguish constructions like (1.1) from constructions like (1.2). This thesis remedies this lack by providing grammatical tests which distinguish them and by showing their different properties. By comparing what is possible and what is not possible, and how the various components of these sentences are limited, differences have been found. Speakers’ intuition is proved correct and (1.1) and (1.2) are shown to be structurally different and to have different properties.

1.2 Background on the language and speakers

Lhasa Tibetan is a Tibeto-Burman language in the Central Tibetan sub-group. It is often called U (dbus) or combined with Tsang (gtsang), a very closely related dialect, into Utsang (Tournadre 2008) (Tournadre & Dorje 2005) (Bradley 2002).

Central Tibetan has also become a lingua franca of the Tibetan community in exile (albeit a modified version) and is often just called pod.skad or ‘Tibetan’ when it is actually just the most prestigious and widely understood variety of Tibetan. This thesis specifically studies the linguistic variety spoken in the capital of Tibet, Lhasa.

According to the Ethnologue (18th edition) there are about 1.2 million central Tibetan speakers with over a million of them actually in China. The dialect designation of ‘central Tibetan’ is not without problems and perhaps it is best to call it a ‘Tibetic Language’ or ‘major dialect group’, borrowing from Tournadre’s terminology (2008:283). There is also the problem of accurate statistics on numbers of Lhasa Tibetan speakers because of the political situation. Compounding this, many speakers of other dialects erroneously report that they are speakers of Lhasa Tibetan for reasons of prestige. The bulk of this thesis is concerned with Lhasa Tibetan.
1.3 Research Goals

This thesis examines N + V sequences in Lhasa Tibetan in order to:

1. Provide clear descriptions of syntactic patterns of Lhasa Tibetan verbalizers.
2. Create diagnostics to distinguish CPs and OVs.
3. Find any syntactic and semantic differences between the major verbalizers, the minor verbalizers, and full verbs.

This research leads to at least partial answers to many questions. What are the differences between verbalizers and simple, single stem verbs (SSV)? What is the difference between the two main kinds of N + V sequences? How do we know what a complex predicate (CP) is and therefore what a verbalizer is. Where do all the lesser verbalizers fit? If there is a spectrum with full lexical verbs on one end and the three major verbalizers (‘big three’) on the other end (see Figure 1), then where do the ‘minor verbalizers’ fall. Could some of them be classed as ‘full verbalizers’? Do some constructions share more in common with one side or the other? Are the others just regular verbs which can sometimes be used in a similar way as the main verbalizers? What kind of properties do verbalizers have that delineate them from lexical verbs?

Following Mohanan, this thesis seeks “structural properties [that] may then be used to construct diagnostics to determine the complex predicatehood of unclear instances” (1994).

Figure 1 shows a hypothesized continuum that the lesser verbalizers could be described with. Even some CPs which use ‘big three’ verbalizers may be located closer to OVs depending on the diagnostics.

```
VERB--------?----------‘lesser VBZRs’----------?----------‘big three VBZRs’

Figure 1 Continuum from simple verb to ‘big three’ verbalizers
```

This study is a contribution, helping, as Mohanan says, to “make possible the emergence of a theory of the light verb construction” (2007:465).

Some of the tests examined proved more definitive (at distinguishing N + V structures) than others. The tests are organized into three main categories. These are tests focused on the nominal component, tests focused on the verbal component and tests focused on the overall structure (how both components interact). Hopefully some of these tests can be used cross linguistically (especially in other Tibetic language varieties).
1.4 Data Source

The vast majority of data for this thesis is from Bailey and Walker’s *Lhasa Verbs: A Practical Introduction* (LV), with permission from the author (Geoff Bailey). LV is a verbal dictionary which has more than 1100 verbal entries and more than 6000 example sentences (many from dialogues). Of the 1100+ entries only 30 percent are single stem verbs and a number of those have multiple entries for polysemous uses. Of the other 70 percent, 93 percent are CPs and the rest are compound verbs. Of the CPs 69 percent use one of the three main verbalizers. Others have noticed that CPs outnumber single stem verbs in LT. Denwood says “where ever one draws the line, phrasal verbs would seem greatly to outnumber non-phrasal verbs in the lexicon, no doubt because there seems to be no way of creating new verb stems in the language” (1999:109). The LV data has not been glossed or described in other studies (to the best of this author’s knowledge). The glossing strategy is explained in Appendix A. A smaller percentage of the data came from elicited sentences based off of ideas from LV. Example sentences labeled from the corpus of data are from LV. Elicited examples are usually variations of the LV data. The language resource people were all from Lhasa.

1.5 Methodology

The corpus was analyzed using FLEx. Data was examined on a test by test basis with reference to possible constraints and exceptions to those. After analyzing the corpus data, ungrammatical or unacceptable sentences were elicited and checked by LRPs using variations of the data to confirm the hypotheses.

Much of the analysis was done using the theories and principles of Dixon’s Basic Linguistic Theory (2010). As much as possible, the descriptions and analyses have tried to remain “theory neutral” so as to be useful both cross-linguistically and cross-theoretically. Of course, there is no such thing as "atheoretical" research, but I have aimed to make this as applicable to any theory as possible.

1.6 List of tests

Here is a list of the diagnostics developed in this thesis. Some of the terminology is explained further below:
Table 1 List of Tests

Tests on host: These tests are based on the hypothesis that the nominal element (host) is not a full NP (or is a defective NP)

1) ADJECTIVE CONSTRAINT TEST
2) NUMBER CONSTRAINT TEST
3) DEMONSTRATIVE CONSTRAINT TEST
4) CASE TEST
5) TOPICALIZER TEST
6) PROPER NOUN TEST
7) PRONOUN TEST
8) HOST DROP TEST
9) HOST/COMPONENT SEMANTIC DEPENDENCY TEST
10) TENSE TEST

Tests on VBZR: These tests are based on hypothesized differences between single stem verbs and VBZRs

11) ADVERB TEST
12) NEGATION TEST
13) TAM TEST
14) REDUPLICATION TEST
15) CONJOINING TEST

CP Structural Tests: These tests are based on hypothesized differences between OV structure and CP structure

16) JOINT PREDICATION TEST
17) RELATIVE CLAUSE TEST
18) OBJECT FRONTING TEST
19) QUESTION WORD SWITCH/INSERTION TEST
20) TRANSPARENCY TEST

Not all of the tests are tested to the same extent. Some have been thoroughly examined and others provide only preliminary results. There is scope for future research here.

1.7 Hypotheses of tests
It is hypothesized that the host of a CP resists NP modification (such as adjective, number, demonstrative and case marking). By hypothesis the host is a defective NP (*NP), and as a result, it is rarely found with NP modifiers. This is further developed in Chapter 3.
It is also hypothesized that the host and verbalizer resist separation by argument level constituents and reordering. This is because the semantics of the CP is based on both the host and the verbalizer\(^1\). This is further developed in Chapter 4.

In the existing literature a small number of tests or criteria have been briefly mentioned by a few researchers. Here is a table summarizing their suggestions:

**Table 2 Other researcher’s criteria**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGHA’S TESTS</td>
<td>-Non-compositional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Absolutive test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARTEE’S TESTS</td>
<td>-Non-compositional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Speaker’s Intuition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Intonation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGONIOT’S TESTS</td>
<td>-Dictionary test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Tense test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.8 Terminology overview**

The terminology used in this thesis is further defined in section 2.1 but for now just an overview is given.

**Verbalizer:** “a semantically empty verb that draws semantic content from the word it verbalizes” (Bartee 2007:143). “Verbalizers are ‘meaning-free’ verbs such as ‘to do’ which are combined with nouns to create a wide range of verbs” (Tournadre & Dorje 2005:152). Tibetan: bya-tshig stong-pa or ‘empty verbs’. Abbreviated as VBZR in this thesis.

**Verbalization:** “a process which derives verbs from roots or stems of other categories” (Kroeger 2005:258).

**Light Verb:** “verbal licenser for nouns” (Butt 2003:1) or “those verbs which are less semantically rich than others in a language and whose main function is to combine with other lexical items (usually nouns) to form predications” (Ahland 2006).

**Host:** Usually the noun part which is being verbalized but in Tibetan it is also sometimes an adjective, adverb, or a ‘nominal’ derived from two verbs. It can also be a combination of those (adjective and verb, adverb and verb etc.).

---

\(^1\) The verbalizer is the syntactic head and the host is the semantic head of the CP construction in LT.
**Complex predicate**: “a construction that involves two or more predicational elements (such as nouns, verbs and adjectives) which predicate as a single element, i.e., their arguments map onto a monoclausal syntactic structure.” (Butt 2003:2). Abbreviated as CP in this thesis.

**Serial verb**: “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.” (Aikhenvald & Dixon 2006:1).
Chapter 2
Previous Research

Linguists have used different labels for N+V sequences that use verbalizers. A brief overview of their terminology is given below. First the terminology used by researchers studying Tibetan is presented and then terminology developed by research in non-Tibetan languages is presented. The discussion in each case proceeds in chronological order.

Following a discussion of the many terms used for N+V sequences, is a more general review of relevant prior research.

2.1 Terminology Review

2.1.1 Terminology used by researchers on Tibetan

Goldstein, one of the earliest to describe these constructions calls (1.2) (repeated here as (2.2)) “noun-verb compounds” that use “verbalizers” (1991:90). His research (though more pedagogical) presented in Essentials of Modern Literary Tibetan has been referenced in many other researcher’s works including Kopp’s thesis on Lhasa Tibetan verbalizers (1998).

1.

ངས་ཁྱེད་རང་ལ་དངུལ་སྱེར་པ་ཡིན
ngas khyed.rang la dngul ster pa.yin

1SG ERG 2SG self DAT money give PRF

I gave money to you.

2.

ཁོས་ཁོང་ཚོ་ལ་མགོ་སོར་བཏང་བ་རྱེད
khos khong.tsho la mgo skor btang ba.red

3SG ergative 3SG plural LOC deception do PRF

He cheated them.
Agha calls this category "phrasal verbs" (1994:105). Kopp calls these constructions “verbal compounds” (1998:5). Denwood labels constructions like (2.1) “non-phrasal verbs” and like Agha, calls things like (2.2) “phrasal verbs” (1999). Tournadre calls them compound verbs and includes a small section explaining these constructions (2001:54). Bailey & Walker call (2.1) single stem verbs and (2.2) verbalized compounds (2004:xxix). They also label a third kind of data, shown in (2.3) compound verbs. Data like (2.3) are discussed briefly in section 3.7.6.

2.3

ngas khyed.rang la ngo.shes pa.yin
1SG ERG 2SG self LOC acquainted.with PRF
I recognized you.

DeLancey calls the verbal component of constructions like (2.2) “light verbs” (2003:282). He also calls the whole constructions “complex predicates” in a different paper (1990). Tournadre and Dorje say (2.1) is a “simple verb” and (2.2) is a “compound verb” (2005:204). They call (2.3) “compounds that are difficult to analyse in synchrony” (2005:457) and also have further sub-categories (see 4.10.5). Finally, Kaurila uses “complex predicate” (2010:1).

2.1.2 Terminology used for complex predicates in other Tibetic language varieties

In her grammar of the Sde.ge dialect, Hasler uses the term “compound verbs” (1999).

Huber calls constructions like (2.2) “serial verbs” in her grammar of Kyirong Tibetan (2002).

Matthew & Sumi prefer the term “conjunct verbs” in their study of Spiti, a Tibetic language of north-west India (2005).

Ahland (2006) uses the term “light verb construction” (LVC) in her research on Kurtoep (a Tibetic language of Bhutan).

Bartee also calls (2.2) phrasal verbs and also uses the term verbalized constructions (2007:143,144). Although she is not discussing Lhasa Tibetan but a related Tibetic language variety called Dongwang Tibetan she has also written on Lhasa Tibetan.
2.1.3 Terminology used by researchers on non-Tibetic languages

Masica (like Matthew and Sumi) calls similar constructions in New Indo Aryan languages “conjunct verbs”\(^\text{2}\) Masica’s definition of “conjunct verbs” sounds very similar to what we find in Lhasa Tibetan. He says they are “compounds made up of a noun or adjective + a verbalizer such as do” (1991:368).

Mohanan (1994:197), Butt (2010:1), Liljegren (2010), and Seiss (2009) all use the term “complex predicate.”

Hook uses the term “vector verb” as the equivalent of “light verb” or “verbalizer” (1974), while Bahl (1967) uses “explicator”. Schmidt uses “denominative verbs” to designate such constructions (1999:95-96).

Karimi-Doostan (2005:1), Chae (1996:1), and Megerdoomian (2004) use “light verb construction” (LVC) but Megerdoomian also uses “complex predicate” in other articles. Part of the confusion is that the researchers are often referring to different but related constructions both cross-linguistically and within the same language. It seems in Tibetan that all CPs are LVCs but this isn’t the case with every language.

Below is a table summarizing the various terms used by researchers (Table 3).

Note: There is not an exact correspondence between the terms. Some researchers lump (2.2) and (2.3) together. Some researchers do not mention every category. The most important column to compare is what researchers call constructions that look like (2.2).

\(^2\) This could be easily confused with the “conjunct/disjunct” dichotomy that Hale proposed (1980) and was later (according to Tournadre), misapplied in some analyses of Tibetan (2008). Bartee uses the less loaded and more appropriate terms “self/other” for this particularly interesting but unrelated phenomena in Tibetan (2007).
Table 3 Terminology used for N+V sequences in the literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher/s</th>
<th>Constructions like (2.1)</th>
<th>Constructions like (2.2)</th>
<th>Constructions like (2.3)</th>
<th>Nominal element</th>
<th>Verbal element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tan et al (1989)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLancey (1990)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complex predicates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agha (1993)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phrasal verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopp (1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal compounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denwood (1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-phrasal verbs</td>
<td>Phrasal verbs</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasler (1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compound verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thonden (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serial verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournadre and Dorje (2005)</td>
<td>Simple verb</td>
<td>Compound verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Verbalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;S (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conjunct verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartee (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phrasal verbs or verbalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbalizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The term ‘complex predicate’ is widely used outside of Tibetan research but as this thesis shows, it is applicable to Lhasa Tibetan (or any Tibetic language). It is helpful to use similar terms (as much as possible) cross-linguistically. It seems that in some languages LVCs are a sub-type of CPs (some researchers also classify serial verbs as a sub-type of CPs (Zeisler 2013:1) but in this thesis, CP mostly refers to LVCs which are, by far, the most common CP in LT.
2.2 Review of Tibetan Research

Although much has been written on Central Tibetan in general and also on certain
interesting aspects of Tibetan grammar such as evidentiality, ergativity and
mirativity, there has not been as much specific research done on verbalizers in
Tibetan. Below is a brief, chronological overview of research on CP related issues in
LT and other Tibetic language varieties.

2.2.1 Hu Tan

Hu Tan compares Tibetan verbalizers to various Chinese constructions. He explains
they can also be used independently and also gives lists of verbalized constructions
(1989). Some of Tan’s examples contradict Agha’s examples as well as Bailey and
Walker’s corpus. Hu Tan considers both yi.ge “letter” btang “send” (“send a letter”)
and skad “voice” btang “send” (“invite”) verbalized constructions. Agha argues that
only the latter is a “compound verb”. This is elaborated in 4.5.2.5. This discrepancy
illustrates the need for syntactic tests as a diagnostic for differentiating CPs in LT.

2.2.2 Kopp

While Kopp (1998) did do a study on Lhasa Tibetan verbalizers, she focused on the
‘big three’, the three most common verbalizers (gtang ‘send’, rgyag ‘hit/make’, byed
‘do’). She analyzed them by looking for semantic reasons for choosing one of those
three in verb formation and did not examine the non-big three at all in her analysis.
Kopp uses “role salience spectrum and intensity spectrum” with rgyag being on the
active, more intense side, byed being on the opposite, stative side and btang being
somewhere in the middle (1998:41). Kopp also suggests, “A more thorough study
would require a data sample larger than that provided in this study. A larger sample
would provide a clearer picture as to what is taking place regarding grammatical
and semantic categorization” (1998:56). Kopp advises examining whether the non-
big three verbalizers have given way to the big three verbalizers (been incorporated
by them) as a way of learning more about the semantic content of the big three. To
my knowledge Kopp’s is the only specific study of Lhasa Verbalizers. This thesis
extends her examination of the phenomena of verbalizers by also looking at the
many ‘lesser verbalizers’ (non-‘big three’). However this thesis does not focus as
closely on semantics, but rather looks at the syntax of verbalizers, where they occur
in sentences and phrases, what things can separate the verbalizer from its host, how
they differ from normal verbs and if the big three differ from the lesser verbalizers.
None of these topics were covered by Kopp. Also Kopp only looked at verbalizers in
isolation although she did suggest “the use of verbalizers in discourse would be an excellent source for further investigation...” (1998:56). This study examines verbalizers within full sentences and short dialogues.

2.2.3 Bailey & Walker
As was mentioned, Bailey and Walker are a very good source of data on verbalizers and are in fact the main source of data being analyzed in this thesis (Bailey & Walker 2004). Their work is a collection of more than 1,100 verbal entries, each with 3 or 4 example sentences or dialogues. The data has been recorded, and written in Tibetan orthography along with English translations. Bailey and Walker include a lot of explanatory material also, some which is referenced in this thesis.

2.2.4 Bartee
Bartee briefly covers verbalizers in Dongwang Tibetan and mentions their use in Lhasa Tibetan. She compares them to ‘co-verbs’ in Chinese and gives three good “rationale for considering these constructions phrasal verbs... rather than... object-verb phrase” (2007:143). These are shown above in the List of Tests (section 1.6).

2.2.5 DeLancey
DeLancey is one of the few researchers on Tibetan who uses the term “complex predicate”. He explains that “modern Tibetan dialects encode a large number of concepts by means of lexicalized verb phrases, consisting of a lexically specific noun and one of a set of semantically very vague verbs” and that “these ‘complex predicates’ can be volitional or non-volitional” (1990:307).

2.2.6 Goldstein
Goldstein was one of the first to identify verbalizers in LT. He provides some good examples and makes sure to put verbalizers with the host in the glossary at the back of the book (397) (which was one of Kopp’s data sources). He has a small section on morphology which mentions verbalizers (1991).

2.2.7 Tournadre
Tournadre (2001) has a section called “The development of verbalizers” which is a paragraph of useful information. He mentions four non-big three verbalizers,
compares the phenomenon to modern Hindi and gives two examples of two verbs meaning a very similar thing where one is a verbalized compound and one is just a lexical verb (\textit{shed-snang byed} ‘be scared’ versus \textit{zhed} ‘be scared’ and also \textit{slob-sbyong byed} ‘to study’ versus \textit{sbyang} ‘to study’). He also mentions one case of separation of host and verbalizer (although he doesn’t use those terms) and a genitive version of the verbalizer in the footnotes.

\textbf{2.2.8 Tournadre and Dorje}

Tournadre and Dorje have a section on compound verbs and verbalizers (2005:204) which states that spoken Tibetan has “simple verbs (verbs comprising only one syllable)” and those which “consist of a noun and a ‘verbalizer’” (204). They mention some verbalized compounds contain up to 5 syllables, the “three basic verbalizers”, honorific versions of those, the choice of volition and non-volition, “syntactic flexibility… the noun… separated from the verbalizer”, and that they “must be followed by auxiliaries” (205). In appendix 5 Tournadre mentions verb composition including a subsection on compounds using verbalizers and kinds of hosts (with different terminology).

\textbf{2.3 Research on non-Tibetic languages}

Below are a variety of articles on CPs in non-Tibetic languages. They are helpful in cross-linguistic comparisons and CP theory in general.

\textbf{2.3.1 Carlin}

Carlin’s chapter on verbalizers in Trio (a Cariban language from Brazil) gives a good cross-linguistic example of the phenomenon of verbalization. Carlin examines aspectual semantic salience in Trio verbalizers (2006).

\textbf{2.3.2 Kaurila}

Kaurila includes definitions of converbs, medial verbs, finite/non-finite verbs, verb serialization and clause chains among other things. While the section on Chinese is useful for cross-linguistic examples the Tibetan section also has relevance, particularly the discussion of \textit{bdang} on 153 (2010).
2.3.3 Liljegren

Liljegren questions the dichotomy between verbalizers (which he equates with light verbs) and corresponding simple verbs which he suggests undergo “stretching” and “lack a lexical identity of their own” in Palula, an Indo-Aryan language (2010:1). He says the problem is trying to “define the syntactic status and lexical identity of the non-verb element in a complex predicate (CP)” and “describing the particular verbs in CPs” asking whether they are “in anyway significantly different from most other verbs in the language?” (2010:52). He asks, “What properties of CPs determine the argument structure of the whole clause and the case roles assigned to its arguments” (52). These are some of the very questions I ask in my thesis.

2.4 Review of general Complex Predicate theory

There is extensive literature on CPs and a bewildering array of terminology pertaining to them. In this section a CP is defined and an overview of some theory on CPs is provided.

As was said above, Butt defines a CP as “a construction that involves two or more predicational elements (such as nouns, verbs and adjectives) which predicate as a single element, i.e., their arguments map onto a monoclusal syntactic structure.” (2003:2). Mohanan says “the host of a light verb can be verb, noun, or adjective” and “some languages allow all three types of hosts” (2007:486). Only the latter two are allowed in LT. In Tibetan verbs cannot combine with verbalizers to make CPs. Verbs cannot be the host of a CP in Tibetan unless they are first nominalized somehow. In contrast, Denwood claims that “a phrasal verb consists of a verb or verb stem preceded by a separate word or words, usually a noun word, though sometimes an adjective word or another verb word” (1999:109). However, the only verbal host example Denwood provides was found to be not acceptable or at least very uncommon in LT. Agha states that “nouns can combine with certain verbs in LT to form idiomatic constructions which must be analyzed as phrasal verbs” and makes no mention of verbs (1994:105).

Mohanan says that light verbs are “an independent grammatical verb that forms a complex predicate together with a host” (2007:461). Both the host and the verb license arguments. Mohanan says a verbalizer “permits a non-verb to function as a predicate” (2007:464). The host and the verbalizer jointly predicate and the host can even change the valence of the verbalizer. Masica says that CPs are “the sole equivalent of simple verbs in other languages” (1991:369). Butt claims that the CP is
“always form identical with the main verb” (2010:3). Later she says “whether a given verb predicates as a light or as a main verb is determined by the syntactic environment” (2010:16). This is part of the motivation for this thesis. What is the syntactic environment in Tibetan that determines whether a verb is a verbalizer or not? When is an N+V a CP and when is it just an OV?

CPs in Tibetan are made up of two predicational elements. Both the verbalizer and host have a part in jointly predicking the sentence. Evidence of this is shown in the joint predication test. Although the verbalizer is form identical with the single stem verb (SSV) counterpart it does not “have the entire meaning content associated with its full counterpart” (Mohanan 2007:462).

There is often some level of equivalence between a CP and another single verb. Mohanan shows that to “take a bath” and “give a gasp” are the same as “bathe” and “gasp” in English (2007:463). These kind of pairs can be found in LT as well. A CP in LT sometimes has an SSV equivalent. As shown in the examples below, the same word can be used either as an SSV (1,3), as a part of the host (2,4), or as the verbalizer (2) in a CP.

Table 4 Single stem verbs and complex predicate equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single stem verb</th>
<th>Complex predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 སྐྱུག skyug</td>
<td>2 སྐྱུག་པ། skyug.pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to vomit</td>
<td>vomit vomit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 སྐྱུག skyug</td>
<td>4 སྐྱུག་བྱེད slob.spyong byed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to study</td>
<td>study+NMZ do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One difference between SSVs and CPs that use the same word, is that CPs in LT seems to have a more specific meaning (less semantically broad) while SSVs tend to be more vague and open to a wider range of meanings.

2.4.1 Languages that have CPs

There is a great deal of literature of CPs. Butt mentions “the vast literature on light verbs and complex predicates and the dizzying diversity of analyses and terminology,” adding that “one person’s complex predicate or compound verb is another person’s serial verb, composite predicate, auxiliary construction, or even
control construction” (Butt 2003:2). CPs have been documented in “most of the South Asian languages” (Butt 2003:2) and many others. These languages include Urdu (Butt 2010), Japanese (Grimshaw & Mester 1988), Korean (Chae 1996), Palula (Liljegren 2010), Kurtoep (Ahland 2006), Chinese and Tibetan (Kaurila 2010), Trio (Carlin et al. 2006), Malayalam (Mohanan 2007), Persian (Karimi-Doostan 2005), (Megerdoomian 2004), Bardi (Bowern 2004), and many others.

2.4.2 Historical development of CPs?
Some have claimed verbalizers came about from semantic bleaching as a result of grammaticalization (Hook 1974), (Hopper & Traugott 1993:108). Hopper and Traugott use this cline in Figure 3:

\[
\text{Full verb} \rightarrow (\text{vector verb}) \rightarrow \text{auxiliary} \rightarrow \text{clitic} \rightarrow \text{affix}
\]

**Figure 2 Hopper and Traugott’s grammaticalization cline**

In this cline ‘vector verb’ is their terminology for light verb (what is called a verbalizer in this study) and is an optional stage in verbal grammaticalization. Butt rejects this hypothesis showing that light verbs have existed in Sanskrit and Pali and “were used much as in modern Hindi” (2003:15). She says light verbs should not be considered a part of Hopper and Traugott’s grammaticalization cline. Other reasons she offers are that light verbs interact with auxiliaries (rather than forming a subclass) and that “they remain form identical to their main verb counterpart” not undergoing phonological reduction (Butt 2003:13). She says “the syntactic construction itself is relatively stable”. Mohanan, summarizing Butt, says “complex predicates have been around for at least two thousand years” (2007:485). She continues saying that “while old participle forms have grammaticalized to affixes in the tense-aspect system, light verbs have remained intact”. Butt argues that “the available evidence thus points to the idea that light verbs do not enter the grammaticalization cline... they are not main verbs which have been reanalyzed as light verbs and which are now prone to further reanalysis” (2003:16). Butt says light verbs are “inert for the purposes of historical change” (2003:16). She offers the revised cline in Figure 3 (Butt 2003:19):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Main verb} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Light verb}
\end{array} \rightarrow \text{auxiliary} \rightarrow \text{clitic} \rightarrow \text{affix(es)}
\]

**Figure 3 Revised cline of historical change**
2.4.3 What kind of verbs can be verbalizers?


Some properties of CPs that researchers have found in other languages are not true for LT. This is why the tests must be language specific. Referring to monoclausality, a defining property of a complex predicate, Butt says that it “can be established conclusively, but it must be done so on a language internal basis” (2003:6).

Mohanan also talks about “cross linguistic variability in N+V complex predicates” (2007:471). Tests that are conclusive in other languages may not be conclusive in LT and the reverse is also true.

Mohanan says that “in addition to being a predicate, and part of a complex predicate, a nominal host can also be an argument of the light verb” (2007:486). This is not true in LT. One of the motivations for some of the tests in this thesis is that the host is not a full argument and is a defective NP on some level. Complex predication is not to be confused with noun incorporation since valency is determined by the noun host and not by the verbalizer (see section 6.3). Also, in noun incorporation the nominal is an argument (Mohanan 2007:471) and while this is the case in some languages’ CPs, this is not the case with CPs in LT.³

Mohanan also says that in complex predicates “ellipsis in answers to yes-no questions” is ungrammatical in Hindi (1994:222) but this is grammatical in LT and quite frequent. In this thesis it is referred to as ‘host drop’ and is discussed in the host test chapter. As Agha says concerning LT “in certain discourse contexts, the

³ A third reason is that the CPs can be phrasal constructions (and are in LT) while an NI is purely lexical.
noun can be omitted from the predicate” (1994:106). Scrambling and conjoining are productive in Hindi but not in LT. It is possible for hosts to be internally modified in Persian but in LT there is resistance to some kinds of modification.

2.5 Review of diagnostics used by previous research

The tests used as a diagnostic for CPs, or just to determine their properties, must be evaluated on a language specific basis. Although, not all of the tests will work with every language, some of them should work. This pertains to one of Mohanan’s central questions which is “what are the parameters of variation among complex predicates, and what are the limits of variability” (2007:465). Here are some of the tests other researchers have used. Many of these were considered and some were adapted into this thesis. Some of the tests in the thesis were also my own ideas.

Mohanan uses passivization, agreement, argument licensing, host licensing and shows how the CP can change the case of its arguments. She says “the N in the N + V sequences...[CPs] has the capacity to constrain the number, meaning and case of the ARGs in the clause” which is “normally characteristic of predicates” (1994:200). She also uses scrambling, topicalization, adjectival modification, conjoining, wh-questions, relativization, gapping, ellipsis in answer to yes-no questions and agreement. Not all of these test work in LT but some were useful or gave ideas for other tests (e.g. scrambling provided the basis for the object fronting test).

Bartee gives three reasons for labeling an N + V sequence a CP. She says “the rationale for considering these constructions verbs (rather than, say, an object-verb phrase) is three fold: non-compositionality of meaning, speaker's perception and prosodic unity” (2007:143). She mentions that “speaker’s inability to define the component parts of a verbalized construction is a good clue” that it is a CP (2007:144). Examining the intonation of CPs would be useful for future research.

Tournadre says “the analysis of modern compound verbs is sometimes problematic since nouns retain some autonomy,” but he does offer tests when he continues saying “in the majority of cases, however, relativization, wh-questions and determination are not possible” (2001:54).

Hugoniot mentions that only the verbalizer can change for tense and any verbal components of the host should not be able to do so (2003). He also suggested checking various dictionaries to see if the purported CP or any of its parts are listed in an entry (perhaps this can be called a dictionary test). Goldstein’s dictionary has
many CP entries (though the basis for labeling them as such is presumably intuition) (1991). While this can be helpful it does not establish distinguishing criteria on the basis of structure (syntax, semantics or phonology in the case of the intonation test). It tells us more about the relative usage of the term than what it is and would not be helpful with newer terms or specifically colloquial terms as the dictionaries usually focus on literary Tibetan. This test was beyond the scope of this thesis but could be fruitful in future research. Comparing dictionary entries could yield good data on speaker’s intuition.

Finally Hugoniot offers an interesting idea that would only apply to honorific verbalizers. He says “the data indicates that zhu in the more lexicalized phrasal verbs loses some of its active indexing power” (2003:65). Future research could test for indexing power in different registers of Tibetan with reference to honorific and humiliative/humilific verbalizers.

Agha cites lack of compositionality⁴ as a reason for considering something a CP (1994:107). He also has a good syntactic reason. He shows how zero (Ø) case marking on the argument proves a nominal is not a host (Agha 1994:107). This useful diagnostic is elaborated in the case test (see 4.5.2.5).

Butt mentions clitic climbing, negative polarity items, negation, non-separability, object agreement, anaphora and control as tests others have used but stresses that “these tests must be applied on a language internal basis” (2010:10).

Chae starts with two tests: modification and movement (similar to object fronting and scrambling). Chae explains “true VN cannot be moved or focused” (1996:100). VN (verbal noun) are another term for hosts. Later Chae says “we can see that the VN phrase cannot be modified, scrambled, or relativized” (1996:104).

For Karimi-Doostan, progressive tense, addition of aspectual/temporal adverbs, imperative forms, and passivization are useful tests in Persian CPs (2008).

Also doing research in Persian, Megerdoomian says that CPs “display an idiomatic reading yet can undergo a number of syntactic operations such as scrambling, relative clause formation, and internal modification” (2004:1).

These tests gave useful ideas for the tests that were developed in this thesis.

---

⁴ Both Agha and Bartee cite "compositionality" as a factor in determining complex predicatehood. Sometimes it is not clear what makes the semantics of the host and verbalizer "compositional". This issue could be examined further with more in depth semantic analysis.
Chapter 3

Basic Description of Lhasa Tibetan and NV sequences

This chapter provides a brief overview of LT grammar, highlighting points salient to the analysis of CPs in Lhasa Tibetan.

3.1 Word order: SOV

Lhasa Tibetan word order is generally SOV (unmarked) but can be OSV. Tournadre & Dorje say the “verb always comes last in the clause... not only in the main clause but also in subordinate clauses (relative, causal, complementary etc.)” (2005:79).

The OSV order shows a special emphasis on the O. Goldstein says “word order between the subject and object segments of sentences can be inverted with change only in emphasis, not in referent meaning (1991:21). Tournadre and Dorje continue saying “the simple sentence may be broken down into three components: a subject noun phrase, an object noun phrase and the verb complex (or predicate)” (2005:79).

3.2 Tibetan Verb Phrase

A basic verb phrase in Tibetan can be represented as:

\[ \text{VP} \rightarrow (\text{ADV}) (\text{NEG}) \text{ V} (\text{TAM}) \]

**Figure 4 Basic verb phrase rule**

This is a simplified phrase rule representation but one which is sufficient for the purposes of this thesis. The adverb is actually an adverb phrase (it can have more than just one adverb) and negation can be moved to other places but this representation covers most of the data presented in this thesis.

TAM is used here to represent various auxiliaries and copulas which encode tense, aspect, modality, evidentiality, mirativity and volition. These important and interesting facets of Tibetan grammar have been covered in detail by Garrett (2001), Tournadre and Dorje (2005), Goldstein (1991), Denwood (1999), and others.

Goldstein says “there are four basic types of verbs in Tibetan (active, involuntary, linking, existential)” (1991:15).
Denwood gives two types of verb phrase which are related (and others which expand on those two). The first, he says is “typical for verbs of being” and the second for “lexical verbs” where one precedes a “homograph of a verb of being” (1999:115).

He gives a basic pattern of:

“(polar particle +) verb of being (+ modal particle)”

**Figure 5 Denwood's basic pattern of verbs of being**

In this, he defines a “polar particle” as “negative particle, a dubitatitive particle or zero” and a modal particle as just that. This is very similar to the VP given above. The “polar particle” is the “NEG” and the “modal particle” is the “TAM.” More is said about modality and TAM in general in section 5.1.3. Denwood has not included the “ADV” given above in this basic pattern.

An example of what this could be is given here:

3.1

\[\text{ma red pas}\]

\[\text{NEG is Q}\]

*Is that not so?/Isn't that it?*

In (3.1) red ‘is’ is a copula. Denwood calls this a ‘verb of being.’ Denwood explains that “all verbs other than verbs of being are lexical verbs” (1999:116).

He gives a more “expanded pattern” where a “lexical verb” is followed by what looks like a “verb of being” but in these cases is functioning as an auxiliary:

“lexical verb stem (+ linking particle) (+ polar particle) (+ auxiliary) (+ modal particle)”

**Figure 6 Denwood's expanded verb pattern**

This pattern expands what we called “TAM” above into four optional particles that follow the lexical verb stem. Denwood continues with other complex and informative patterns. The VP used in this thesis is not claimed to be superior to Denwood’s patterns but is sufficient for the data being examined. It is also
interesting that “ADV” is not in Denwood’s verb pattern. He does deal with adverbs in a separate section.

Bailey and Walker use a chart taken from Tournadre, Dorje and Garrett to explain verbal arguments (predicational types) in LT (2004:1). In it they list seven types of “verbal arguments”. These are direct ergative, indirect ergative, ditransitive ergative, affective, benefactive, intransitive/monovalent and zero valency.

Table 5 Lhasa Tibetan predicational types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb type</th>
<th>Ergative Case</th>
<th>Locative/Dative Case</th>
<th>Absolutive Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Ergative</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Ergative</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Indirect object</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditransitive Ergative</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Indirect object</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Indirect object</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefactive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intransitive/ Monovalent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Valency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows which kind of cases are licensed by which kind of verb. It is compiled from the information given in Bailey and Walker’s verbal argument section (2004).

3.3 Tibetan Noun Phrase

According to Denwood, Tibetan has non-phrasal nouns (consisting of monosyllabic nouns, disyllabic nouns and less common trisyllabic nouns) phrasal nouns, postpositional nouns (including rhyming terms, relative/interrogative nouns), nominalized verbs and honorific and respectful nouns (Denwood 1999:Chapter 7).

In my analysis, I have represented the basic noun phrase as:

\[ NP \rightarrow N \ (AP) \ (NUM) \ (DEM(PLURAL)) \ (CASE) \]

**Figure 7 Basic noun phrase rule**

Here is an expanded NP example:
Some of the components may be affixes but this is at least the order in which they appear. It is difficult to decide word boundaries in Tibetan because as Goldstein says “almost every syllable in Tibetan contains independent semantic meaning” (1991:14).

According to Tournadre and Dorje, “demonstratives function both as adjectives and as pronouns” and when they function as adjectives they always come post-noun phrase and “carry a case or plural marker as appropriate” (2005:80). They explain that “the case particle takes last place in the noun phrase (although it may happen that the case marker is followed by the topicaliser ni)”.

Tournadre and Dorje also say “word order within a noun phrase is as follows: the substantive head comes first, followed by the qualifying adjective, the article (or demonstrative adjective), the plural marker and the case” (2005:127).

Their simple phrase rule is as follows:


**Figure 8 Tournadre and Dorje’s simple NP phrase rule**

In their representation, Tournadre and Dorje have case as not optional. In my simplified phrase rule it is optional. This difference is because Tournadre and Dorje are counting absolutive (with zero marking) as case. This is a valid point. There are nominals that have zero marked absolutive case and nominals that do not have case including the hosts of the CPs we are studying. They are also arguably not noun phrases so this representation would not work for them.

Denwood gives a more detailed description as follows:

“Head (+ epithet) (+ deictic(s)) (+ numerator) (+ case marker) (+ topic marker)”

(Denwood 1999:98).

**Figure 9 Denwood’s expanded NP phrase rule**
Denwood explains the head can be a noun or an adjective phrase, the epithet is an adjective phrase, the deictic is a postpositional noun, the numerator is a noun particle, the case marker is an argument-marking noun particle or a genitive particle and the topic marker is just that. He offers an example of “near maximum in normal usage” which is shown below (I have added the Tibetan orthography):

3.3

3.3

3.4 Case

Tournadre and Dorje say “there are six cases: the absolutive Ø (unmarked), the agentive gis, the genitive gi, the oblique la, the ablative nas and the associative dang” (2005:99). This thesis only addresses the first five. There are various phonological and orthographical forms for the agentive (ergative), genitive, and oblique (locative/dative/benefactive) case markers.

3.4.1 Genitive

The genitive in Tibetan is used much like ‘s’ in English. It is used to mark a large range of relationships. The genitive modifies the noun (or noun phrase) it precedes by the noun (or noun phrase) which precedes it.
This is what Denwood calls “linking two non-nominalized noun phrases” (1999:101). Generally the genitive examples examined in this thesis have a possessive modifying function but there are other functions. Here are some elicited typical examples:

3.5

ངའི་བག་ལྱེབ

‘My bread’

3.6

དབིན་ཇིའི་ཡིག་ཚད

‘English exam’

3.7

ཁོང་གི་བྱེད་ས

‘His behaviour’

(3.5) is typical of possession. In (3.6) the genitive denotes “kind of”. (3.7) is used for characteristics of the noun.

The genitive is also used in subordinate clause constructions as in (3.8) and (3.9). First the whole verb phrase is nominalized with the very common *pa* “nominalizer/past tense” morpheme. This is in turn given the genitive -'i or forming *pa'i*. The noun phrase being modified follows this. This often functions much like “which” or “that” in English. Denwood calls it “linking a nominalized clause to a following noun phrase” (1999:102).

Examples (3.8) and (3.9) are from the Lhasa Verbs data and are used to illustrate a nominalizer and genitive joining to form a relativizer.

3.8

bris pa’i yi.ge

‘…letters which were written…’

3.9

ri.pin nas thon pa’i mo.Da

‘…Cars which were produced in Japan…’

---

5 Unless this NOM-GEN constructions is nominalizing and showing possession, *pa’i* is glossed as ‘which’, or REL in this thesis for simplicity due to the focus of the relativization test.
3.4.2 Ergative

The ergative (or agentive) case generally marks the agent of the verbal action. Vollman says “Tibetan ERG qualifies for being an Agent (AG) and Actor (ACT) marking device” (2010:2). According to Bailey and Walker’s verbal arguments (originally from Tournadre and Dorje) direct ergative, indirect ergative, and ditransitive ergative verbs all require the subject to take the ergative case (Bailey & Walker 2004). For affective, benefactive, and intransitive/monovalent sentences the subject does not take the ergative case (unless special emphasis is being made about the subject, in which case it functions somewhat like a topicalizer). DeLancey says “there are two conditions—volition and canonical transitivity—either of which is sufficient to license ergative marking” (1990:308). As with the other case markers in LT, however, there is some optionality in ergative case marking. Vollman says “one peculiar feature of Tibetan case grammar is the fact that ERG is ‘optional’ in most variants” (2010:2). Again DeLancey explains that ergativity “marks transitive subjects in perfective clauses and optionally in non-perfective clauses, and active intransitive subjects in perfective clauses and under limited conditions in non-perfective clauses” (2003:274).

3.4.3 Locative/dative/benefactive

The la particle in Tibetan has many functions. It marks the indirect object in indirect ergative, ditransitive ergative, and affective sentences, and it marks the subject in sentences predicated by benefactive verbs.

Tournadre and Dorje sum up case and show its relation to subordinate clauses succinctly with this: “Case markers in Tibetan have a range of functions that are not confined to the noun, but also relate to the verb. Thus all case markers have two basic functions: a case-related function and a connective function… When they follow a noun or noun phrase, they mark case, indicating the role of that noun or noun phrase in the clause or sentence. When the same forms are used after a verb or a clause, they serve as a connective function, indicating how two clauses are related (e.g. coordination, subordination, etc.).” (2005:100).6

6 For more in depth explanation of case in Tibetan refer to Tournadre and Dorje, Goldstein, Bailey and Walker, or Denwood mentioned above.
3.5 Subordinate clauses and Relative clauses

In LT a relative clause is usually inserted before the NP it is modifying.

Sentence schema: \[ S \rightarrow (\text{Relative Clause}) \; \text{NP} \; V \]

Relative clause schema:
\[ S \; O \; V \rightarrow [S \; \emptyset \; V \; \text{REL} \; O] \; V_{\text{final}} \]

The relative clause can modify any NP (except the host of a CP which is actually a defective NP).

Denwood says “a subordinate clause is non-final in the sentence” and gives the three most common patterns:

a) Lexical verb stem (+ topic marker)

b) Verb stem + subordinator (+ topic marker)

c) Verb stem (+ linker) + (auxiliary) + subordinator (+ topic marker)

(Denwood 1999:219)

The relative clause typically comes first and the matrix clause comes second.

3.5.1 Other clause connectors

LT has serial particles or clause connectors such as byas ‘then’ and nas ‘then’ (literary). Other subordinating clause connectors such as de.nas ‘after.that’, gar/gag ‘in.order.to’, tsang ‘since’, na _ ma.gtogs ‘unless’, yang/gyang/ang ‘but’ etc. are encountered in the data but it is beyond the scope of this thesis to describe their behavior. Because byas ‘then’ is form identical to byas ‘do’ past tense, special care must be taken in analysis. If byas follows a verb it is a clause connector or “non-final” marker as DeLancey says, “which serves primarily to mark a clause as non-final in its chain” (1991:3). If it follows a noun it is a verbalizer (or sometimes just a single stem verb).

---

As discussed in 3.4.1, what I have labeled a relativizer in LT is made up of a nominalizer and a genitive particle. While this could be glossed as NOM.GEN, I have chosen REL (in cases where it is clearly functioning as a relativizer) to keep the schema simple and the focus on the VBZR.
3.6 Additional Detail on N + V Sequences

Here are some additional issues that need to be considered when analyzing complex predicates in Lhasa Tibetan.

3.6.1 The major verbalizers (The ‘Big Three’)

The most commonly used and widely accepted verbalizers are byed/byas ‘do’, rgyag/brgyab ‘build/hit’ and gtong/bdang ‘send’. These are generally glossed as ‘do’ unless used as single stem verb (not in a CP). Example (2) uses the third of these, bdang ‘send’. Tournadre and Dorje call them “the three basic verbalizers” (2005:204) and also include their honorific register forms. Thoden says “in Tibetan nouns are converted into verbs with the use of verbalizers. rgyab, gtong, byed are common instances of verbalizers” (2002:26:1) Here is a table of the Big Three and number of entries using them in the data:

Table 6 Most frequent verbalizers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VBZR</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th># of hosts it forms constructions with in data entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>བྱེ</td>
<td>byed</td>
<td>བྱ</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འྲེ</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
<td>བརྒྱ</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བྱི</td>
<td>gtong</td>
<td>བཏང</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These verbalizers also have future tense and imperative forms. These are not as common in the data and are explained as they occur. However, these three verbalizers are not the only verbalizers, there are also numerous minor verbalizers.

3.6.2 Productivity of complex predicate formation

The process of CP formation is productive. This is shown by how new hosts enter into verbalized constructions. Any time verbs are borrowed from another language the complex predicate structure is used. Chinese verbs borrowed into Tibetan are often verbalized with a Tibetan verbalizer. Bartee says “sometimes Chinese verbs are
borrowed and then ‘re-verbalized’ using a Tibetan form” (2007:145). This is similar to how Hindi, Malayalam (Mohanan 2007:483) and Nepali verbalize borrowed English verbs. Riccardi explains that the Nepali verbalizer gar “combines with a number of nouns to create what are additional verbs with special meanings” and is “used widely for the many borrowings from English” (2007:271). Here is a CP in LT with a host borrowed from English:

3.10

མོ་ཊ་
mo.Ta btang
car do

drive a car (or vehicle)

In (3.10) the host mo.Ta ‘car’ is derived from the English word ‘motor.’ It is combined with the common verbalizer btang ‘do’ to make ‘drive’.

3.6.3 Less Common Verbalizers

The number of verbalizers is more than expected. There are many minor verbalizers which are not recognized as such because they can also be single stem verbs (like all light verbs). CPs formed with these minor verbalizers display the same coherent set of properties as prototypical LT CPs. Verbalizers in LT seem to be an open class (or at least a very large class). In the corpus of data there are more than 160 verbal entries with verbalizers used in 3 or less constructions (see 7.6) Including the more commonly used verbalizers there are more than 90 different verbalizers in the data.

The productivity of meaning among verbalizers is also more extensive than expected. This aligns with the large number of less common verbalizers and their respective functions. Many hosts can form CPs with multiple verbalizers, often with change in semantics (see 3.7.1 and Appendix B).

This thesis seeks to find criteria to differentiate any new datum that might arise. This would help classify every possible example including many very common examples which look like CPs but do not use either of the big three verbalizers.

Consider this example of a CP using a less common verbalizer:
Example (3.11) behaves the same in every way as (2.2) and should be labeled as such. Its components (nominal and verbal) have the same structural properties as (2.2). One property of verbalizers discussed in 6.3 is that argument valency is affected by the noun and not the verbalizers. In (3.11) dkrog.gtam ‘rumor’ licenses nga ‘me’, not directly, but through the verbal system as part of a complex predicate. The verbal component in this construction, bzos ‘make’ can also be a single stem verb. Here it functions as a verbalizer. There are many other such lesser verbalizers. Deciding which constructions are CPs and which are not is not always easy. There are, as Mohanan says “on the one hand... N+V sequences that clearly are not CPs...” and “on the other hand... instances of N+V sequences that are uncontroversially accepted as CPs” (1994:199). By accurately describing the three most common verbalizers they could be used as a baseline to compare borderline examples to. As Mohanan says, “providing an account of N+V CPs requires explicit criteria for telling apart N+V sequences that are CPs and those that are not” (1994:199). The proofs can then be applied to candidate CPs (those using minor verbalizers) such as (3.11).

Below, Table 7 lists some of the minor verbalizers in the data. The table just counts constructions that have been given entries in the data. There are also independent usages (where the verbalizer is being used as single stem verb) and possibly other CPs (which could be proved with further research and the tests in this thesis) but the table serves as a general overview of the most common possible verbalizers. Entry headings are always given in present tense. In CPs the verbalizer is the only component that changes according to tense. Honorific forms are also given but as with tense entries are headed by the standard register (neither honorific (H) nor humilific (h)).
Table 7 Minor verbalizers in LV data with unique host counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VBZR</th>
<th># hosts</th>
<th>gshu</th>
<th>phye</th>
<th>sprod</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zhu</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>'strike'</td>
<td>'open'</td>
<td>'give'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shod</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bzo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thebs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skye</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'gro'</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slog</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'glod'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bzhag</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sometimes morphemes which are verbalizers in some constructions can occur inside the nominal host in other constructions. If this is the case, (as in bzo ‘make’ of ngom.bzo ‘boasting’ + rgyag ‘do’) it is not counted as a verbalizer. Some more
abstract analyses could make the case that it is a verbalizer but in this thesis it is not
analyzed as one. If there is already a verbalizer heading the host then the host’s
components are not labeled verbalizers (even if they are verbalizers in other
constructions). So while ngom ‘boast’ and bzo ‘make’ are both verbal, when they are
joined into ngom.bzo ‘boasting’ they are nominal and cannot predicate anything
without a verbalizer like rgyag ‘do.’ Kopp supports this saying “verbal compounds
consist of simple Noun + Vb, Adj + Vb, and Vb + Vb combinations… or compound
+ Vb combination” and “the resultant compound is a nominal which can then be
used with a verbalizer” (1998:32). Referring to the host she states “they are unable
to function as verbs independent of verbalizers” (1998:33).

Some of these volitional verbalizers have non-volitional counterparts. These are not
counted together. They have separate pronunciation, spelling and separate entries in
the data so are counted separately. Examples are given in Table 7.

These numbers are useful in that they give a rough idea of the most commonly used
verbalizers in CPs in LT.

The minor verbalizers generally have more semantic content than the three most
common and may not have undergone as much semantic bleaching (but Butt would
argue this as was seen in 2.4.2). Alternatively, they may just be inherently broader
in semantic domain and this may have little to do with historical change. This
semantic difference explains the need for them but does not answer the question of
whether or not they are different syntactically.

Lesser verbalizers that are used fewer than 3 times are not shown. There are many
other possible verbalizers which are only used once or twice in the data but maybe
be structurally identical to other CPs.

While not as widely used as the big three these lesser verbalizers are role players
which fill semantic/pragmatic needs (explained in 3.7.1 and 7.8). In the data there
are more than 200 entries which use one of these minor verbalizers. Tournadre and
Dorje call them the “other verbalizers” (not the “three basic verbalizers”) and say
some of them are “only rarely used” (2005:204). Here are the only minor verbalizers
they mention:
Table 8 List of minor verbalizers from Tournadre and Dorje

| བློ་ | bzo   | to make          |
| ཉུ་ | zhu   | (h) to say, to take |
| བཞེས་ | bzes | to take          |
| བཞྱེས་ | bslangs | to lift      |
| དང་ | lang  | to get up        |
| ཀྱོ་ | ‘gro’ | to go            |
| སྒྲོ་ | shor  | to let go        |
| བཞིན་ | thebs | to get caught, or hit |
| རོ་ | ‘khor’ | to circulate     |

Denwood lists two “verb stems” which are “virtually drained of independent meaning in a large number of phrasal verbs” (1999:109). These are two of the three of the most common verbalizers, “rgyab/rgyag ‘strike’ and btang ‘send’”. Surprisingly he does not include the most common verbalizer, byed “do”, with those but includes it in a different group of “verb stems” with “less loss of independent meaning than in the case of rgyab and btang” (Denwood 1999:110). It is not clear how byed “do” has less loss of meaning than the other two most common verbalizers. Denwood lists these in the second category, which are analogous to minor verbalizers in this thesis:

Table 9 List of minor verbalizers from Denwood

| བོད་ | byed | Do             |
| བློ་ | bzo  | Make           |
| ཉུ་ | zhu  | Submit, request |
| དང་ | lang | Arise          |
| སྒྲོ་ | shor | Break out, escape |

Denwood also mentions that “various other verb stems are used only in one or a few compounds, which might in some cases better be regarded as simply idiomatic collocations of verb + noun” (1999:110), offering skyug.pa “vomiting” + skyug “vomit” and gnyid.sad “awake” as two examples. The former example is discussed in 2.4, 5.2.1.1 and 7.5.

---

8 Although according to the diagnostics of this thesis I would label gnyid.sad “sleep.rouse” as a compound verb.
3.6.4 Potentially unclear examples

Two things make identification of CPs difficult. The first is that verbalizers in LT seem to be an open class (though Mohanan, talking about light verbs in general, would disagree (2007:460). At any rate, there are far more verbalizers than just the three most common. If it were just rgyag, byed and gtong ‘do’ analysis would be much easier.

The second problem is that even the three most common verbalizers are not always verbalizers. Sometimes they function as single stem verbs. In such cases there may be semantic differences (more content than their light verb usages) whereas in a CP the host provides the verbalizer its “semantic core” (Hugoniot 2003:64). As single stem verbs they are not as restricted and occur in grammatical constructions that CPs cannot. This is true cross-linguistically as Butt (2010:5) and Mohanan (2007:464) attest.

3.6.4.1 Sometimes Verbalizers but not always Verbalizers...

Consider this example:

3.12

ках khos khong.tsho la yi.ge btang ba.red
3SG ERG 3SG PL LOC letter send PRF

He sent a letter to them.

Example (3.12) has one of the big three verbalizers being used as a regular verb. It is not forming a CP with yi.ge “letter.” The N + V constructions in (1.2) and (3.12) have the same surface order and the same verb/verbalizer but different structure.

3.7 Other observations that any analysis should explain

This section briefly explains more information on CPs which is pertinent to this thesis and relevant to the analysis.
3.7.1 The semantic contribution of verbalizers

While this thesis does not focus on the semantics of verbalizers (Kopp has already done that (1998)) it is necessary to briefly explain some points related to the semantics of verbalizers.

The semantic contribution of verbalizers is light (hence, light verbs) but not empty (Butt 2003:1). CPs take the majority of their semantics from the host (the “semantic core” (Hugoniot 2003:64) but the verbalizers also contribute.

However, the majority of hosts only take one possible verbalizer or, if they can switch verbalizers, the meaning also changes. In (3.13-3.18) are examples of the same host with different verbalizers and the attendant meaning change:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dka'.las khag</td>
<td>toil ?</td>
<td>dka'.las rgyag</td>
<td>toil do</td>
<td>dka'.las bzo</td>
<td>toil make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>to get tired</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>to work hard</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>to create difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grod.khog rgyags</td>
<td>stomach satisfy</td>
<td>grod.khog ltoqs</td>
<td>stomach hunger</td>
<td>grod.khog bshal</td>
<td>stomach purge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>to be full</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>to be hungry</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>to have diarrhea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One striking place where verbalizer switch causes meaning change is volitionality. DeLancey says that verbalizers “can be volitional or non-volitional” (1990:307) and explains how volitionality also interacts with TAM. Here are examples where the verbalizer itself changes the volition of the CP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>skul.lcag thebs</td>
<td>motivate</td>
<td>skul.lcag byed</td>
<td>motivate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>to be inspired</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>to inspire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This demonstrates the semantic content of verbalizers is not empty and is often predictable.

There are a small number of CPs that have two optional verbalizers, neither of which changes the meaning:
The complete table of hosts which have two or more verbalizers is given in Appendix B.

3.7.2 Verbalizers and VP modification
One way that verbalizers are not different to single stem/lexical verbs is that they also take VP modification. It seems from the data that every way a verb can be modified a verbalizer can also be modified. VP modification includes adverbs, negation, taking TAM and even grammatical reduplication. If the CP were studied purely by examining verbalizers structural differences would be hard to find.

3.7.3 The Non-Verbal Component (Host) of complex predicates
The “non-verbal element” (Liljegren 2010:58), which is generally called the “host” in this thesis is best analyzed as a noun. In many cases though, the English gloss makes it not seem like a noun. Sometimes, the glossing makes the host resemble a verb but this is not the case. Kopp says “although the English glosses make them appear to be verbs… they are unable to function as verbs independent of verbalizers” (1998:33). This is different to CPs in other languages such as Hindi, and Malayalam. There are some adjectival hosts but this is not nearly as common. Some of these examples are listed as adjectival hosts in Tournadre and Dorje (2005:458) but one could argue that even these are better analyzed as nominals.
Denwood explains that adjective phrases can also be the head or “epithet” of a noun phrase (1999:98). In this thesis the host has mostly been analyzed as a nominal and not an adjective. LT adjectives have some nominal characteristics even though they are not as referential as some nouns. Mohanan says the host has an “inherent abstract nature” (1994:210). Often this is true and is the basis for some tests but some hosts are quite ‘concrete.’ This is discussed in chapter two.

3.7.4 Hosts are not full NPs
The nominal elements of CPs do exhibit variance from the N of OVs. The data shows that hosts are Ns but not NPs or (or at least defective NPs). While there are some exceptions, the host generally cannot take NP modification. The host has restrictions on case, number, demonstratives, adjectives etc. These limitations can be generalized into and contrast neatly with the Tibetan noun phrase. Verbalizers are VPs but hosts are not NPs. This hypothesis is explained in depth in Chapter 4.

3.7.5 Hosts & verbalizers may form constructs that resist “separation”
While it is licit for certain elements (at least adverbs and negation) to make the CP discontinuous (up to a point), argument level components cannot separate the host and the VBZR. Also the reordering of the components is ungrammatical. Both of these points are explained more in the structural Chapter 6. Consider (3.35) and (3.36):

3.35

ngas khyed.rang la dngul mang.po ster pa.yin
1SG ERG 2SG self DAT money many give PRF
I gave a lot of money to you.
3.36

He cheated them a lot.

Structurally these two sentences look quite similar. (3.35) shows an OV construction and (3.36) shows a CP, both modified adverbially. This kind of separation in a CP is very common but other kinds of separation (such as separation by an argument, demonstrative or number etc.) are resisted.

3.7.6 Another Category? Or Same Old Same Old… Compound Verbs?

Before moving on we should consider compound verbs, the other kind of construction, mentioned as (2.3) above, given again below:

3.37

I recognized you.

The verb ngo.shes ‘recognize’ is a compound made up of ngo ‘face’ or ‘essence’ and shes ‘know.’ While similar to CPs, verbs in the same category as (3.37) exhibit some differences. One basic difference is that compound verbs do not use a verbalizer. Most verbalizers show some productivity but the word final parts of a compound verb do not often appear in a lot of constructions. This is similar to what Mohanan says talking about complex predicates “that involve a light verb and those that don’t” (2007:465). Bailey and Walker explain that “both elements of the compound are required in order for the verbal phrase to be meaningful” (2004:xxix) but with verbalized compounds (CPs) this isn’t the case. The host can usually be independent and the verbalizer can be independent (in which case it would be the single stem counterpart). (This is seen in the host/component dependency test.) Bailey and Walker go on to mention another kind of compound verb in which both parts (a
nominal and a verbal part) have an independent meaning but when put together, the meaning is quite different to the sum of its parts.

Some researchers lump constructions like (1.2) with constructions like (3.37). Others have labeled them differently. Bartee calls them compound verbs (2007:143) saying “occasionally only one element is known.” Bailey and Walker likewise call them compound verbs (2004:xxix). Tournadre and Dorje call this class “compounds that are difficult to analyze without historical perspective” and put them as a sub-class of “compound verbs” which are what they calls CPs (2005:458). They go on to say “the meaning of one of the components taken by itself is no longer comprehensible, or has been partially lost.” They have a separate section for “Compounds using verbalizers.” Denwood lumps them together with things resembling (1.2) calling them all “phrasal verbs” (1999:110). Some tests in this thesis show a difference between CPs and compound verbs, but they are not the focus of this thesis.
Chapter 4
Host tests

4.1 Introduction to the host tests
This chapter introduces 10 tests that are mostly focused on the host part of the complex predicate (or the noun part of the N + V sequence, in the case of a non-CP). When these tests yield different results for proposed CPs and regular OVs they are useful in differentiating the two. When they fail to yield different results they still clarify what the CP actually is (especially the host part). They may be productive in cross-linguistic CP comparisons where other language varieties do show differences in those tests. Some tests also show the difference between CPs and compound verbs.

4.1.1 What is the host?
As said in chapter one the host is the non-verbal component of the CP construction. The host is usually nominal, but sometimes adjectival. Denwood claims the host can also be a verb. I have not found any evidence for this and do not think the one verbal example he gives is actually used in Lhasa Tibetan (his example seems to be missing the nominalizer that it normally comes with). Examples 1-3 in the table below show how verbs must first be nominalized before they can be a host for a verbalizer.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>མཆོང་</td>
<td>mchong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>བཀྲ་ཤིས་</td>
<td>jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>མཆོང་རྒྱག་</td>
<td>mchong.rgyag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>རྒྱག་</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>བཀྲ་ཤིས་</td>
<td>jumping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>* མཆོང་</td>
<td>mchong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>རྒྱག་</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>བཀྲ་ཤིས་</td>
<td>jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>བཀྲ་ཤིས་</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>བཀྲ་ཤིས་</td>
<td>to jump</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) is a single stem verb, *mchong* ‘jump.’ (2) is a common CP. It begins with the single stem verb *mchong* ‘jump’ which is nominalized with *rgyag* ‘nominalizer’ to form a nominal host *mchong.rgyag* ‘jumping.’ This is then verbalized with *rgyag* ‘do’, one of the three most common VBZRs. (2) has two *rgyag* morphemes. The first *rgyag* is pronounced differently to the VBZR which shows it has undergone phonological
reduction, losing its coda, which suggests it has become an affix. The other rgyag ‘do’ is a VBZR and has not undergone such phonological reduction. It is still form identical with its single stem verb counterpart. There are 6 CPs like this in the data. (3) just consists of the single stem verb mchong ‘jump’ which is then verbalized (redundantly) with the VBZR rgyag ‘do.’ (3) was strange to my language resource people and may have been a mistake in Denwood’s data.

There is a small difference between (1) and (2). As Tournadre says in a similar example “there is a slight nuance between the two forms, linked to the Aktionsart” (2001:54). He explains “the form with a VBZR tends to indicate an activity while the simple verb is more appropriate for specific actions or processes” (Tournadre 2001:54). This is similar for many other single stem verb and CP pairs.

4.1.2 Brief overview of the tests
First a summary description of each of the tests is given, followed by each test with examples and schema, in more depth.

The first set of tests can all be grouped under the sub-category of noun phrase tests. Here the simplified NP phrase rules are given again:

\[
\text{NP} \rightarrow \text{N (AdjP) (NUM) (DEM(PLURAL)) (CASE)}
\]

The tests propose that a CPs structure is:

\[
\text{CP} \rightarrow \text{N} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{not} \quad \ast \text{CP} \rightarrow \text{NP} \quad \text{VP}
\]

And

\[
\text{Host} \rightarrow \text{N} \quad \text{not} \quad \ast \text{Host} \rightarrow \text{NP}
\]

The VP phrase is also repeated here:

\[
\text{VP} \rightarrow \text{(ADV) (NEG) V (TAM)}
\]

Because the N (the host) is not a noun phrase it is hypothesized that there are constraints limiting any of the bracketed constituents from the NP phrase rule. One of the main motivations of this NP Test generalization is that the host is typically deficient in specificity. It is non-referential.

\[9\] An interesting question is whether or not the CP is a VP. The CP contains a VP in it so if the CP is a VP there is a VP in a VP. How to represent this structurally is a good place for further research.
4.1.2.1 Adjective Constraint Test
This test seeks to address the hypothesis that the host should resist modification from an adjective (or adjective phrase).

4.1.2.2 Number Constraint Test
This test addresses the hypothesis that the host should resist being modified by numbers.

4.1.2.3 Demonstrative Constraint Test
This test addresses the hypothesis that the host should resist modification by demonstratives.

4.1.2.4 Case Test (ERG, LOC/DAT, ABL, GEN)
This covers a number of related sub-tests motivated by the hypothesis that the host lacks of argument status\textsuperscript{10}. Arguments here are those constituents that are licensed by the predicate. Arguments (and adjuncts) are able to take case marking. The host should not be able to take any case markers. This means if a nominal component has the ergative, locative/dative, genitive or ablative it would be hard to call it the host of a CP. Related to this but more motivated by perceived lack of specificity, the host should not be able to be possessed by a genitive connected to another noun.\textsuperscript{11}

4.1.2.5 Topicalizer Test
By hypothesis, the host is not a component which can be focused or topicalized with the topicalizer \textit{ni} in LT.

4.1.2.6 Proper Noun Test
The host can never be a proper noun. Perhaps this relates to the noun phrase in that a proper noun is a kind of noun phrase. The name “Tashi” can be replaced with a noun phrase if Tashi is “That tall teacher over there” but the name Tashi cannot be modified itself. The other arguments of the sentence can be proper nouns but not the host of a CP.

---

\textsuperscript{10} By argument I mean subject, object or secondary objects, but not adjuncts.

\textsuperscript{11} To confuse things LT does have an absolutive case which takes zero marking. See 4.5.2.5.
4.1.2.7 Pronoun Test
In this closely related test the host cannot be a pronoun. The other arguments of the sentence can be proper nouns or pronouns but not the host of a CP. This too could be related to the NP generalization since a noun phrase can be represented by a pronoun.

4.1.2.8 Host Drop Test
By hypothesis the host and the VBZR form an inseparable unit. They resist discontinuity, order switching and some kinds of modification. The construction will also resist anaphoric elision of the nominal component (the host). There is no resistance to this anaphora in regular OV sequences.

4.1.2.9 Host/Component Semantic Dependency Test
In OVs (N+V sequences which are not CPs) it is hypothesized that the nominal and verbal constituents are independent of each other. This is also (usually) true of CPs. With compound verbs however the components are often dependent on each other and have no meaning or changed meaning if they occur without their other component. It is possible for such components to be discontinuous but not completely independent of each other.

4.1.2.10 Tense Test
If a verbal morpheme changes form for tense we must doubt its status as a part of a host. In a CP only the VBZR is inflected for tense (and even this is often only in written Tibetan due to contrast reduction in tenses). Tense also does not change in deverbalized nouns. Many hosts are made up of a verb that has been nominalized. In such cases tense would not change. The tense of any of the morphemes in the host should not change.

Now each test is presented with data, analyses and conclusions.
4.2 Adjective Constraint Test

4.2.1 Introduction

By hypothesis the host of a CP is not a full noun phrase. Therefore it is not expected to take NP modifiers. Recall that in LT the head of an NP is optionally followed by an adjective. If a CP cannot contain an NP then no adjective phrase should occur within the CP.

Adjective phrase schema: CP → N *AP VBZR

While it is not in the least bit unusual for any argument NP in the sentence to be modified by an adjective it is uncommon for the host N of a CP to be modified in this way. Compare the adjective placement in these three examples:

4.1

Think about getting advice...

4.2

If old ideas are not able to be liberated...

The CP construction in (4.1) is the host bsam.blo ‘thought’ and the VBZR gtong ‘do.’ This is a very common collocation. In (4.2) however, bsam.blo is clearly modified by an adjective, rnying.par ‘old.’ This would be unusual but in this case the VBZR gtong ‘do’ is part of a different CP construction. The predicating component is the CP bcings.’grol + gtong ‘liberation do.’

Example (4.3) was elicited and found to be unacceptable. If bsam.blo ‘thought’ is the host of a CP it resists adjectival modification.
4.3

* བསམ་བོ་ རིང་པ་ གཏོང་
  bsam.blo  rnying.pa  gtong

thought  old  do

Intended: …to think old thoughts…

Example (4.3) shows the host being modified by an adjective. By hypothesis the host
is an N not an NP and adjectiveal modification is restricted to NPs.

4.2.1.1 A Caution about Surface Structure

This test focused on prototypical adjectives. By prototypical adjectives I mean
adjectives which are not normally also used as adverbs. The post-nominal adjective,
a part of the NP can often be confused with the pre-verbal adverb, part of the VP.
Simply put, sometimes it is hard to tell if the modifier is an adjective modifying the
noun or an adverb modifying the verb. Both can be in the same position, between
the N and the V. This general schema below could sometimes be analyzed two ways:

Surface level$\rightarrow$  N  modifier  V

Possible analysis$\rightarrow$  NP  V
  (N  ADJ)  V

Or

Possible analysis$\rightarrow$  N  VP
  N  (ADV  V)

Below an ambiguous example from the data is given to illustrate this:

4.4

མོ་ སྟབས་པའི་ སྤེན་པོ་ རབ་འི་ མ་ ཁ་ དབང་ ལྣ་ བསགས་
  mo.Ta  mgyogs.po  zhe.drags  btang  na  dpe  bsags  yong
car  fast  very  do  if  very  fall  come

If a vehicle is driven too fast, there will be an accident.
Example (4.4) seems to have an adjective phrase modifying the host but it is actually part of the VP. While it can be an adjective in other sentences, mgyogs.po ‘fast’ is an adverb here. It is modifying the VBZR, not the host.

### 4.2.2 Corpus Evidence

I looked for prototypical adjectives in the data of 6000 plus sentences and found very little evidence of adjectives separating the host and the verbalizer. There were many instances where the modifier could be analyzed as adjectival or adverbal and usually I chose the latter (yag.po ‘good’ or ‘well’ etc.).

This test is interesting because while it is marginally possible to elicit sentences with host + ADJ + VBZR structure it did not seem to frequently occur naturally.

### 4.2.3 Corpus conclusion

Only two naturally occurring examples of problematic adjective modification on the host were found. These are discussed in 4.2.6.

### 4.2.4 Elicitation evidence

Consider (4.5) from the corpus and the elicited variation of it (4.6) below:

4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nga'i</th>
<th>rma</th>
<th>rnying.pa</th>
<th>la</th>
<th>thug</th>
<th>tsam</th>
<th>byas.na</th>
<th>na.tsha</th>
<th>zhe.po</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>wound</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>meet</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>if.so</td>
<td>pain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If I bump my old wound even a tiny bit, it's excruciatingly painful.*

Example (4.5) shows the N rma ‘wound’ and V thug ‘meet’ or ‘touch’ being separated by an adjective, rnying.pa ‘old.’ These particular components do not form a CP.

Contrast this with na.tsha ‘sickness’ or ‘pain’ and gtong ‘do’ in the same sentence. The verb gtong is one of the big three VBZRs and this construction is a CP. It is discontinuous but is separated by an ADV which, being part of the VP, is
grammatically acceptable. If the host of this CP were modified by the same ADJ (4.6) it would be unacceptable.

4.6

\[ \text{na. tsha rnying.pa zhe.po g tong gis} \]

\text{sickness old very do TAM}

\text{Intended: A very old sickness}

Consider (4.7) from the corpus and the elicited variation (4.8).

4.7

\[ \text{khang.pa rnying.pa de.tsho bshig.dbral g tong bde.po yod ma red} \]

\[ \text{house old that PL demolition do easy TAM not TAM} \]

\text{It's not easy to demolish those old houses.}

Example (4.7) shows an object, \text{khang.pa} ‘house’ being modified by an adjective \text{rnying.pa} ‘old’. The verb predicking this nominal is a CP made up of \text{bshig.dbral} ‘demolition’ and \text{g tong} ‘do.’

There are three reasons why \text{khang.pa} ‘house’ is not a host in (4.7). First, and most obvious, there is already a host making a CP with \text{g tong} ‘do.’ Secondly, the DEM, \text{de.tsho} ‘those’, modifying the noun. (This is dealt with in the demonstrative constraint test). And thirdly, the adjectival modifier \text{rnying.pa} ‘old’ also adds a reason that \text{khang.pa} ‘house’ is not a host here.

4.8

\[ \text{bshig.dbral bde.po g tong yod ma red} \]

\[ \text{demolition easy do TAM not TAM} \]

\text{Intended: There is not easy-demolition to do...}

Speakers said it would not be acceptable to put a modifying adjective after this CP but not in the middle (splitting the host and the VBZR). So, in contrast to (4.7), (4.8) would be unacceptable.
Example (4.9) is from the corpus of data and (4.10) was elicited for this test:

4.9

\[
\text{khong mo.Ta gtong mkhan rnying.pa red byas.tsang blo bde.po gnang}
\]

3SG car do NMZ old TAM since mind easy do(H)

He's an experienced driver, so let your mind be at ease. (lit. 'he's an old driver.')

4.10

\[
\text{khong mo.Ta rnying.pa gtong mkhan red}
\]

3SG car old do NMZ TAM

He's a driver of old cars. (lit. 'he's an old car driver.')

Example (4.9) is an equative clause with two NPs (khong 'he' and mo.Ta gtong mkhan 'driver'). The phrase mo.Ta gtong 'car do' is a common CP. When CPs are nominalized they act as regular nouns and can be arguments. It is fine to have the adjective rnying.pa 'old' after the nominalized CP in (4.9). Contrary to my hypothesis, moving the adjective rnying.pa 'old' from outside the CP (4.9) to inside the CP (4.10) was acceptable. It is possible in this case to modify the host adjectively. Three speakers said the phrase was strange but acceptable (in spoken LT).

There are several possible explanations. One is that the host can be modified adjectively but that it is simply not common. Because of the semantics of the CP there is not normally a need to modify the host adjectively. Another possible explanation is that only certain CPs can take adjectival modification. It certainly appears that the more concrete and referential the host of a CP is the more easily it can be modified by an adjective. If the host is non-specific, what Mohanan calls the "inherent abstract nature" of the host (1994:210) it seems less likely to take adjectival modification.

4.2.5 Elicitation conclusion

In most cases modifying the noun with an adjective (inside CP) creates difficulties for speakers. Whereas adding an adjective phrase to other constituent level arguments is completely unremarkable.
4.2.6 Problematic data

Besides (4.9) and (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12) illustrate some of the few problematic examples which I found that naturally occurred in the data of 6000+ sentences.

4.11

\[ \text{I varnished those old desks} \]

4.12

\[ \text{The house has been painted white.} \]

Example (4.11) has a candidate CP made up of the host rtsi ‘paint’ and gtor ‘spray.’ This is similar to the more common CP rtsi ‘paint’ and gton ‘do.’ In (4.12) an adjective dkar.po ‘white’ is clearly modifying the kind of rtsi ‘paint.’ This shows that while adjectival modification of the host is unusual it is permissible in some CPs. It is possible that rtsi.dkar.po ‘paint.white’ is a compound noun, not an N modified by an adjective. However consider (4.13).

4.13

\[ \text{Since your hair has been plaited into (many) small plaits, you look like a nomad girl.} \]

Example (4.13) presents considerable problems for my hypotheses. In (4.13) the CP lhas.ma ‘plait’ + rgyag/brgyab ‘do’ is modified by the adjective chung.chung ‘small’
(among other things). This is an unusually heavily modified sentence in the corpus of data I examined. It could be explained as an NA compound (lhas.ma + chung.chung ‘little braids’). In which case, ‘little-braids + do’ would be a host and VBZR construction. While this phrase is more specific than just ‘braids + do’ it is still general enough when we consider it is talking about the general style of the hair of all nomad girls. This is shown in the second half of the sentence. Supporting this is the idea that in use, lhas.ma ‘braid’ and chung.chung ‘small’ still lack referentiality. It is as if “small-braiding” is construed as a specialized form of “braiding”.

Two words separating the host from the VBZR present more problems. The first is de.’dras ‘like.that’ which is made up of two morphemes de ‘that’ and ‘dras ‘resemble’ which have been grammaticalized into one word. The words de.’dras ‘like that’ and its counterpart ‘di.’dras ‘like.this’ are used very commonly in CP medial position. (4.14) is another example:

```
4.14
mi gzhen gyis slob.sbyong la hur.brton ‘di.’dras byas pa mthong
cs
person other ERG study DAT diligence like this do NMZ see

>dus bu rang gi sems la gyo.’gul ma thebs pa dpe red
dus bu rang gi sems la gyo.’gul ma thebs pa dpe red when boy 2SG GEN heart LOC movement not plant NMZ astounding TAM

Son, it is astounding that when you see others studying diligently, you are not affected at all!
```

In (4.14) the CP consisting of hur.brton ‘diligence’ and byas ‘do’ is separated by the adverbial ‘di.’dras ‘like.this’. This seems more adverbial than adjectival and thus modifies the verbalizer not the host.

It is fine to analyze them as adverbs modifying the way the whole CP is done. There is a second analysis which may be helpful. The words ‘di.’dras ‘like.this’ and de.’dras ‘like.that’ can also modify adjectives, acting as a kind of nominalizer on the adjective phrase as can be seen in (4.15):
4.15

What will become of the people in this poor place?

In (4.15) the adjective skyo.po ‘poor’ is modified by ‘di.’dras ‘like.this’ which serves to nominalize the preceding phrase. This nominalization process seems to be what is happening in (4.13).

The last modifier seems to give even more problems. The modifier mang.po ‘many’ comes after de.’dras ‘like.that’ and before the VBZR brgyab ‘do.’ Many modifiers in LT can be adjectives or adverbs depending on context and function. Recall that an adverb typically comes pre-verbally and an adjective comes post-nominally. If mang.po ‘many’ were analyzed as an adjective here it would be considerably problematic to the constructions status as a CP. It would be modifying a host which has already been modified by an adjective (chung.chung ‘small’) and nominalized by de.’dras ‘like.that.’ Having an adjective come again seems even more unusual. If it were still modifying the noun lhas.ma ‘braid’ it should have come before the nominalizing adverb de.’dras ‘like.that’ giving (4.16).

4.16

…done in the way of many small plaits…

Going back to (4.13) it is best to analyze mang.po ‘many’ in (4.13) as an adverb modifying how the verbal action is done. It is then part of the VP and is not violating the proposed NP restriction hypothesis.

4.2.7 Adjective modification with compound verbs?

Example (4.17) is interesting because it seems to show a component of a compound verb being modified adjectivally. As was explained in 3.7.6, compound verbs are a sub type of verbal compounds, similar to CPs in some ways but not usually as compositional.
Upon hearing that news, I was utterly shocked.

The compound verb in focus here is *hang.sang* ‘be.surprised’. Here it is split and its two parts are “difficult to analyze without a historical perspective” as Tournadre would say (2005:458). Usually *nag.po* ‘black’ is an adjective. In this case it is an adverb. It is LT slang for ‘very’ in informal speech. What looked like a compound verb having one of its components modified by a prototypical adjective is actually just adverbial modification, which is very common. The two syllables which are split by *nag.po* ‘very’ are not meaningful (at least not in this sense) independently. Together they make *hang.sang* ‘to be shocked.’ This is similar to infixation and some compound verbs allow this.

### 4.2.8 Final thoughts on the adjective constraint test

The structural hypothesis that the CP in LT is made up of just an N (not an NP) and a VBZR isn’t entirely stable. While there were very few examples from the natural speech examples in the corpus of data it does seem possible to marginally elicit sentences with the host of the CP being modified by an adjective. For some CPs this would be very strange or ungrammatical but for others it would be quite acceptable. This suggests that there are other non-structural factors at play (semantics). Or there could be a certain sub-class of hosts which can take adjectival modification.

Speakers seem to recognize on some level that the host is an N and therefore should be modifiable in the normal NP ways. In actual usage though, it seems there is rarely any call for such modification. The whole CP is used to explain a particular verbal action and the focus is not on the non-verbal component of the CP but the verbal action as a whole. By adjectival modification the focus is drawn towards the nominal element and away from the verbal action. This may explain why it is possible but unusual to modify most hosts with adjectives.

The host typically has less specificity than the other arguments. It is a part of a larger constituent. Some hosts are more deictic/referential than others. To the degree that they contain semantic specificity or are used in an unusual way they can be modified adjectivally. It is very uncommon to modify the hosts of non-
composition in Hindi Mohanan says “CP-internal nominals allow no modification, adjectival or otherwise, unless of course it is adverbial modification of the entire predicate” (1994:206). This doesn’t seem to be entirely true in LT. Concerning CPs in LT, Agha says “these constructions are not word compounds since adverbs and adjectives can be inserted between the noun and the verb” (emphasis added) (1994:105). Another possible analysis which is taken up in section 4.5.6, is that those ‘CPs’ which can take adjectival modification are either not CPs or a special sub-class of CPs. This will be evaluated after more tests have been examined below.

4.3 Number Constraint Test

4.3.1 Introduction

It is quite ordinary to modify any of the arguments, which are NPs (subject, object, indirect object) by a number. The host of a CP is a noun not a full NP. It is somehow defective perhaps as only an N and not an NP. It should not be modifiable by numbers and it is unusual to modify the host in this way. Recall that in LT the head of an NP is optionally followed by a number. If a CP does not contain an NP then no number should occur within the CP. This shows a structural difference which yields a test to distinguish CPs and other N+V sequences.

Number schema: CP→ N *NUM VBZR

Compare the number placement in (4.18) and (4.19):

4.18

Our plane was delayed for one hour.

12 Goldstein also supports this saying “the object of such sentences can be modified by adjectives” (1991:92). However, the example he gives is from the sub-class (direct ergative) where the host is arguably in absolutive case and therefore not even a host and the construction is also arguably not a CP. khang.pa gsar.pa zhih rgyag. DeLancey also agrees with Goldstein (1990:307).
4.19

\[\text{nga.tsho'i gnam.gru n.'gyangs gcig byas song}\]

1SG PL GEN plane delay one do TAM

\textit{Intended: Our plane had one delay.}

In (4.18) the NP headed by \textit{chu.tshod} ‘hour’ is modified by \textit{gcig} ‘one.’ In (4.19) an attempt is made to modify the host noun \textit{n.ar ‘gyangs} ‘delay’ (which is part of a CP) with \textit{gcig} ‘one.’ The result is unacceptable.

4.3.2 Corpus Evidence

In the data of 6000 plus sentences, very little evidence of numbers separating the host and the verbalizer was found. Some of the 5 apparently problematic examples are discussed below. It is shown that they actually support the hypothesis that the host is N not NP.

This test is interesting because while it is marginally possible to elicit sentences with host + NUM + VBZR structure it did not seem to frequently occur naturally.

Here are examples of number modification that are not inside a CP construction:

4.3.2.1 Non-CP examples (noun plus single stem verb)

4.20

\[\text{bzhed.tshal gnyis dang thang cig bzos tshar pa.yin}\]

vegetables(H) two and soup a make finish PRF

\textit{I have already made two vegetable dishes and a soup.}

This OV example (4.20) shows two objects conjoined as an argument of one verb. Both the objects are modified by a number. The construction \textit{bzhed.tshal} ‘vegetables’ and \textit{bzos} ‘make’ do not combine to make a CP. In other data, \textit{bzos/bzo} ‘made/make’ is best analyzed as a verbalizer but not here\textsuperscript{13}.

\textsuperscript{13} For the purposes of this thesis there are three related meanings of the the word \textit{cig} ‘a’ (which also has two other related allophonic forms \textit{shig} and \textit{zhig}). The first is as an indefinite article. The second is as the number one (spelled \textit{gcig} ‘one’ but most likely historically related and phonologically
Dialogue 4.21

ཀ ལུགས་གཞི་ལུགས་པ
spo.lo ga.tshod blugs pa
A: ball how_many score NMZ

A. How many goals did you score?

ངས་スポ.ロ 2ブッグスパ
ngas spo.lo gnyis blugs pa.yin
B: 1SG ERG ball two score PRF

B. I scored two goals.

In the above dialogue there is evidence suggesting the noun spo.lo ‘ball’ and the verb blugs ‘score’ are not a CP. In both the question and the answer of the dialogue the two words are separated by something. In the first construction they are separated by a question word. This is explained more in the question word test. In the answer the nominal is modified by gnyid ‘two’ suggesting it is not a CP but rather an ordinary OV.

In (4.22) mi ‘people’ and gso ‘support’ also does not seem to be a CP, for the same reason. The number modifying mi ‘people’ here is bzhi ‘four.’

4.22

མི་གཅིག་གིས་གཞི་མི་བཞི་གསོ་བགྱུར་འཕེབ་མི་
mi gcig gis gla.chas mi bzhi gso dgos byung na ar.brten e
person one ERG salary person four support need TAM if cope DUB

yong
come

If you have to provide for four people on one salary, I don’t think it would be possible.

identical). The third is as an adverbial modifier meaning the event is done ‘a little’ or ‘a bit.’ Only in its third meaning can it occur inside a CP.
4.3.2.2 Sentences with a CP where a non-host noun is modified by number.

4.23

(I) heard that (she) stayed unconscious for three days.

In (4.23) the CP *dran.pa* ‘consciousness’ and *thor* ‘lose’ is modified by an adjunct of time *nyin.ma* ‘day’ and *gsum* ‘three’. It is unacceptable to put just *gsum* ‘three’ after the host *dran.pa* ‘consciousness’ (as in (4.19)) but it is acceptable to put the whole adjunct (*nyin.ma* ‘day’ and *gsum* ‘three’) in between the host and the VBZR (as in (4.25)) as it is an adverbial adjunct. It would be modifying the whole clause headed by the CP. This is a rather interesting observation as it shows that the structural constraints on CPs are more related to the N than to the overall structure of the CP.

4.24

*Intended: …lost three consciousnesses…*

4.25

*…lost consciousness for three days…*

4.3.3 Corpus conclusion

Only three naturally occurring examples were found which are discussed below as apparently problematic data in 4.3.5.1.
4.3.4 Elicitation evidence

Here are some minimal pair sentences that were elicited for this test:

4.26

ང་ཚོའི་ རང་གནམ་ གནམ་གྲུ་ མ་་

Our plane was delayed for one hour.

4.27

*ང་ཚོའི་ རང་གནམ་ གནམ་གྲུ་ མ་་

Intended: Our plane had three delays.

4.28

འགོ་ཁྲིད་ རང་གྱི་ དེ་ང་ཚོའི་ རང་གཏོངས་ རང་ཐག་གཅོད

Our leaders will settle this situation.

4.29

*ང་ཚོའི་ རང་གྱི་ དེ་ང་ཚོའི་ རང་གཏོངས་ རང་ཐག་གཅོད

Intended: Our leaders will do three decisions.

Example (4.28) shows that thag.gcod ‘decision’ as the host of a CP with byed ‘do’ as its VBZR. (4.29) shows an unsuccessful attempt to modify thag.gcod ‘decision’ with the number gsum ‘three.’ The same pattern occurs in the pairs (4.26, 4.27) and (4.28, 4.29).
One language resource person said it would be acceptable to add the number gsum ‘three’ if it followed the adverbializer thengs ‘times’ as in (4.30) below.

4.30

Our leaders will make decisions three times.

The language resource person said this was true of any number that was put in between a CP’s host and VBZR. If it was preceded by thengs ‘times’ then it was acceptable. When the number occurs with thengs ‘times’ it is clearly forming an adjunct. This clearly shows that the number is not modifying the host but the whole CP.

4.3.5 Elicitation conclusion

The data shows that modifying the noun with a number (inside CP) is impossible unless an adverbial adjunct is formed. Whereas adding a number to most other constituent level arguments is completely unremarkable.

4.3.5.1 (Apparently) Problematic data (or interesting observations)

Consider (4.31) that looks problematic on the surface:

4.31

He got away with stealing once, so he’s now hooked on it.

Example (4.31) seems to show a clear example of a number modifying the host of a CP. The nominal element, rku.ma ‘thief’ is followed by a number gcig ‘one’ and the VBZR brku ‘steal’ (past tense of the first syllable of the host component). The host is not what is being modified here. The meaning is not ‘one thief stealing.’ Rather, the meaning conveyed here is ‘thief stealing one time.’ Clearly the number is being used adverbially, modifying the VBZR.
In addition, as was said, the adverbial adjunct *thengs* ‘times’ could acceptably be put before the number *gcig* ‘one’ giving more proof that it is in an adverbial role here and is not modifying the nominal host. There were other examples in the data of *thengs* ‘times’ and a quantifier forming an adverb phrase inside the CP and modifying the VBZR (not the host). Examples include *thengs* *mang.po* ‘many times’ and *thengs* *kha.shas* ‘few times.’ This is common.

Further evidence that *rku.ma* ‘thief’ or ‘robbery’ is being used as a nominal host and not an agent is that the whole CP is preceded by *kho* ‘he.’ While *rku.ma* can sometimes be used as a human participant ‘thief’ (agent, patient etc.) it would be better to gloss it as ‘steal-ing’ or ‘robbery’ in a CP.

4.3.5.2 An interesting strategy

Consider another possibly problematic example below:

4.32

*skud.pa* ‘thread’ *‘di’* la *lhas.ma* *bzhi* *lhas* ma *brgyab* na *mkhregs.po* chags kyi thread this LOC braid four braid not do if strong become TAM ma red not TAM

*If this thread is not braided into four plaits, it won't become very strong.*

Example (4.32) contains a CP *lhas.ma* ‘braid’ and *brgyab* ‘do’ which we have already encountered in the adjective constraint test. Here the CP is negated with *ma* ‘not’ and the host is shortened to just *lhas* ‘braid.’ The sentence also contains the noun *lhas.ma* ‘braid’ used again just before the CP containing it. This nominal is modified by the number *bzhi* ‘four.’ The number does not come after the host of this CP. The CP is kept as a unitary focused verbal action and the noun is repeated pre-verbally in order to modify it with a number. This sentence strongly supports the hypothesis that the CP makes one unified verbal construction, inseparable by NP modification and including a non-specific nominal host.

This example illustrates a common strategy. Speakers tend to keep the CP as a single construction and if there is need to modify the host it is used again,
independent of a CP. This strategy is also seen in the demonstrative constraint test, example (4.39) and case test, example (4.64), in this chapter.

4.33

\[\text{ngas} \quad \text{zhogs} \quad \text{ltar} \quad \text{re} \quad \text{bzhin} \quad \text{lus.rtsal} \quad \text{thang} \quad \text{la} \quad \text{skor.ra} \quad \text{gsum}\]

\[1\text{SG} \quad \text{ERG} \quad \text{morning} \quad \text{according.to} \quad \text{each} \quad \text{every} \quad \text{exercise} \quad \text{park} \quad \text{LOC} \quad \text{circle} \quad \text{three}\]

\[\text{gsum} \quad \text{rgyug} \quad \text{gi.yod}\]

\text{Every morning, I run three laps around the sports field.}

In (4.33) above, the noun \text{skor.ra} ‘circle’ and \text{rgyug} ‘run’ do not seem to form a complex predicate. The noun \text{skor.ra} ‘circle’ heads an NP and can be modified by the number \text{gsum} ‘three’ (which is reduplicated). The reduplication indicates an ongoing habitual action.

There is however, a very similar construction which is typically analyzed as a CP. This is \text{skor.ba} ‘circle’ plus the VBZR \text{rgyag} ‘do.’ This generally means ‘to circumambulate’ and is used for the religious practice of walking around holy places in a clockwise (or counter clockwise depending on one’s sect) circles. Here the verb is \text{rgyug} ‘run’ not \text{rgyag} ‘do.’

The majority of data that had problematic number phrases occurred with a time word such as \text{lo gsum} ‘three years’, \text{nyin.ma gsum} ‘three days’, \text{chu.tshod gsum} ‘three hours’ etc. or the previously mentioned adverbial \text{thengs} ‘times.’ This indicates these are all adverbial adjunct phrases which are modifying the clause or VBZR and not the host. The few instances where there is no temporal word it can be argued that this is implied and it is still modifying the VBZR not the host.

4.3.6 Final thoughts on the number constraint test

The structural hypothesis that the CP in LT is made up of just an N (not an NP) and a light verb or VBZR provides convincing results. Possible exceptions were explained as instances of adverbial modification.
4.4 Demonstrative Constraint Test

4.4.1 Introduction

The host of a CP is never found to be a full noun phrase. Therefore it is not expected to take NP modifiers like demonstratives. Recall that in LT the head of an NP is optionally followed by a demonstrative. If a CP cannot contain an NP then no demonstrative should occur within the CP.

Demonstrative schema: CP → N  *DEM  VBZR

While it is not in the least bit unusual for any NP in a given sentence to be modified by a demonstrative it is uncommon for the host N to be modified in this way.

Compare the demonstrative (de) placement in (4.34) and (4.35).

4.34

ངས་ནུས་ཤུགས་གང་ཡོད་བཏོན་ནས་ལས་ཀ་དྱེ་བྱད་ཀི་ཡིན

4.35

*ངས་ལས་ཀ་རྒྱབ་སོར་byed kyi.yin

I will support this work in whatever way I can.

In (4.35) the placement of the demonstrative between the host and the VBZR of the CP is unacceptable.
4.4.2 Corpus Evidence

For (all) examples using the three demonstratives (‘di ‘this’, de ‘that.near’ and pha.gi ‘that.far’) very little evidence was found of demonstratives separating the host and the verbalizer.

There are a few naturally occurring examples and it is marginally possible to elicit sentences with host + DEM + VBZR structure but it is unusual enough to be notable. The various motivations are discussed below in the conclusion and final thoughts sections.

It was extremely common to find the kinds of structures exemplified by (3x-3y) in the corpus.

4.36

sman 'di shog.chag brgyab
medicine this paper.wrap do
Wrap this medicine in paper…

4.37

sman 'di mid.khyur ma gtong
medicine this swallowing not send
Don't swallow this medicine.

4.38

'char.gzhi 'di lag.bstar byed
plan this implementation do
… (we) implement this plan.

In each of the examples (4.35) to (4.38) an object modified by the demonstrative ‘di ‘this’ precedes a CP construction. Examples (4.36) to (4.38) are all attested CPs. It
would be unacceptable to have demonstratives separating the host and VBZR in these constructions.

Sometimes if the speaker wishes to modify the host with a demonstrative (or adjective or number) but maintain the integrity of the CP a strategy like (4.39) can be employed:

4.39

\[
\text{Oh dear, he whipped this horse really hard.}
\]

In (4.39) the CP consists of the host `rta.lcag 'horse.whip' and the verbal component `gzhus 'hit.' It is modified by an adverbial intensifier (zhe.po 'very'). The 'horse' part of the host is repeated pre-CP as a nominal argument with a demonstrative and this NP is given the locative case clitic –r. The resulting phrase could be translated 'to this horse, horse-whip-hit'. It is interesting that the strategy of modifying the host of a CP with a demonstrative (4.40) was not used:

4.40

\[
\text{Intended: He whipped this horse really hard.}
\]

This would not only separate the host from the VBZR but also split the host itself.

4.4.3 Corpus conclusion

Only three naturally occurring examples of demonstratives inside CPs were found. They are discussed below in this section. (These are (4.41), (4.43), and (4.44), discussed below.)

4.4.4 Elicitation evidence

Here are some sentences that were elicited for this test:
CP (host DEM VBZR)

1(a)  
* བྲན་པ་ བྲིན་ཟོར
   dran.pa 'di thor

consciousness this lose

* Intended: …lost this consciousnesses…

1(b)  
* མི་ བྲིན་གསོ་ དགོས་བྱུང
   mi 'di gso dgos byung

classification this support need TAM

* Intended: …you have to provide for this person…

OV (N DEM V)

2(a)  
* སྐྲུན་བཤེ བཤེ བཀྲུང་༽ བྲོག་གིས
   na.tsha 'di zhe.po gtong gis

sickness this very send TAM

* Intended: Really got this sickness

2(b)  
* སྤྱན་ཚོར་ བཤེ བཀྲུང་བཅུའི་
   ngsa spo.lo 'di blugs pa.yin

1SG ERG ball this score PERF

* I scored this ball (in).

3(a)  
* ནད་མ་ བི་ བཀྲུང་
   bsam.blo 'di gtong

thought this do

* Intended: …to think this thought…

3(b)  
* སྔོན་འབྲུག་ བི་ ཕོན་་་་
   gsar.'gyur 'di gos dus

news this hear when

* Upon hearing this news…

4(a)  
* སྐྲུན་ བཤེ བཀྲུང་ ལམ་གྲུབ
   mo.ta 'di gtong mkhan red

car this do NMZ TAM

* Intended: (He)’s a driver of this car.

4(b)  
* སྐྲུན་ བཤེ སྤྱན་ནམ་... བརྒྱུད
   nang.chas 'di ga.par dbor

carpet this where transport

* …where …transport your old furniture?

5(a)  
* སྤྱན་བསྟན་ བི་ བྲིན་ཟོར
   lag.bstar 'di byed

implementation this do

* Intended: …do this implementation…
6(a)
* ལྷས་མ་འདི་བརྒྱབ་
lhas.ma 'di brgyab
braid this do

* Intended: …do this braid…

7(a)
* ལང་འདི་སང་བྱུང་
hang 'di sang byung

* Intended: …this shocked…

The same N+V constructions were used in previous parts of this chapter. In these elicitations demonstratives were added to modify the nominal component. This data clearly shows resistance to demonstratives modifying hosts. It also clearly shows that it is completely unremarkable to modify the nominal part of OVs in this way. 7(a) shows it is unacceptable to modify a compound verb in this way.

4.4.5 Elicitation conclusion
Modifying the host with a demonstrative almost always creates difficulties for speakers, whereas adding demonstratives to other constituent level arguments creates no difficulty.

4.4.6 Problematic data
The host in (4.41) is skad ‘voice’ and the VBZR is one of the three most common, rgyag ‘do.’ The primary meaning is ‘yell’ or ‘make loud noise’. This candidate CP is surprisingly split by a demonstrative:

4.41

སད་དང་དང་འདི་བརྒྱབ་
skad dang dang 'di brgyab
voice not do IMP 1SG GEN teeth hurt TAM

Please don’t make that noise. It grates on my teeth.
This seems to violate the demonstrative constraint test proposed but it is possible that the demonstrative is not so much deictic here as it is referring to the action of noise being made. This is an important distinction. In (4.41) the speaker is referring to a kind of annoying noise-making event that makes one's skin crawl. In this example de 'that' seems to be used in a similar way to the very common adverbial de.'dras 'like.that' or 'in.that.way.' It seems that de'dras 'like.that' is an event nominalizer. It can take a full NP and anaphorically refer to its characteristic event. It nominalizes the event and can do this within the CP. This resembles something adverbial (and is found in the adverb position) but it is actually a nominalizer.

Also, according to LV skad 'voice' + rgyag 'do' is a direct ergative verb. This is explained in 4.5.2.5 and 4.5.6 but just to say skad has case marking (albeit zero marked case) and therefore is probably not even a prototypical host.

Compare (4.41) with (4.42) below:

4.42

བྲུག་སད་ de.'dras བརྒྱབ་ brgyab ཀྱིས kyis
thunder like.that do if fear NMZ fear TAM
It is frightening when it thunders like that.

In this example the host is made up of 'brug 'dragon' and skad 'noise' again with the same light verb. The word which splits the CP, de.'dras 'like that', has de 'that' as a morpheme. I have chosen to analyze this as one adverb. In (4.41) it seems like de 'that' is functioning much like the more common adverbial de.'dras 'like that.' This is less referential and focuses more on the verbal aspect of the CP rather than the nominal aspect.

Below are more problematic examples from the corpus of data.

4.43

ལ་ la མཚོ་ pha.gi བརྒྱབ་ brgyab ལུང་པར་ lung.par སྐྱེབས་ slebs གི་རྫོང་ kyi.red
mountain.pass over.there do if 1SG PL GEN area LOC arrive FUT
If you cross that pass over there, (you'll) arrive at our district.
This sentence is quite problematic for my hypothesis. In (4.43) the host la ‘mountain.pass’ is clearly being referred to deictically with the demonstrative pha.gi ‘over.there’. The other two demonstratives (‘di ‘this’ and de ‘that’) were elicited and the language resource person said these were also acceptable. One explanation is that the more concrete the host the more easily it can be modified (with demonstratives but also other NP modification). Hosts which are less specific and less referential resist such modification. It was still remarkably uncommon in the data. The more a CP is construed as compositional, the more NP modifications it can take. To the extent speakers construe these constructions as compositional they can modify them.

Another possible explanation is that la ‘mountain.pass’ is not a host and that bryab ‘do’ here is not a VBZR but a single stem verb. This has the benefit of keeping the hypothesis intact but seems circular. A third explanation is that the resistance to modification is due to semantic reasons and not syntactic reasons. This is not based on syntactic facts but semantic facts (even though it looks syntactic in many cases).

4.44

khyed.rang gi ‘dod.pa desire’ de ngas skong gang thub zhus chog
2SG self TAM desire NMZ that 1SG ERG fulfill what able do(h) allow

I will do whatever I can to fulfill that wish of yours.

In (4.44) the potential CP consisting of ‘dod.pa ‘desire’ and skong ‘fulfill’ exhibits three problems. First, and pertinent to this test, the host is modified by a demonstrative de ‘that’. Secondly (and least problematic) the host is possessed by the pronoun khyed.rang ‘you’ (which is mentioned in the case test). Finally, the whole construction is split by an argument level constituent (ngas ‘I.ERG’) which is called object fronting in this thesis and explained in chapter four. The demonstrative acts as a NMZ here, combining the whole preceding object phrase. It would be acceptable to switch this phrase (khyed.rang gi ‘dod.pa de ‘that wish of yours’) with the subject (ngas ‘I.ERG’).

All three of these facts occurring in the same ‘CP’ suggest that it might just be an OV, a common collocation. It is after all, compositional and the VBZR it utilizes is not one of the big three (or even a common lesser VBZR) only occurring with one host in the corpus of data. If this construction was in fact not a CP, as the evidence suggests, then this example is not a problem.
Numbers (4.41), (4.43) and (4.44) show the only three examples which I found that naturally occurred in the data of 6000+ sentences.

Although these examples seem to violate the DEM constraint hypothesis they are very uncommon in the corpus of data. This test is fairly definitive and useful in distinguishing regular OV and CP constructions.

4.4.7 Final thoughts on the demonstrative constraint test
Once again the structural hypothesis that the CP in LT is made up of just an N (not an NP) and verb phrase mostly survives this test. The host of a CP lacks the specificity of other NP argument level constituents. Demonstratives are inherently referential. The specificity of this deictic function is at odds with the generality of hosts within a CP. However, with each nominal test so far (ADJ constraint test, NUM constraint test and now DEM constraint test) there have been exceptions in the corpus data and possible exceptions that have been elicited. With each exception to the tests constraining host modification the hypothesis based upon NP status becomes less and less tenable. But interestingly the exceptions are all direct ergative verbs, which probably means that they either are not even CPs or constitute a special, identifiable class. See sections 4.5.2.5 and 4.5.6 for more on this point.

4.5 Case Test

4.5.1 Introduction
Since the host of a CP is not an argument level constituent and because the CP is a predicate (of which the nominal host is a sub-part), the host is not expected to take case marking. LT optionally marks for ergative, locative/dative/benefactive, genitive, ablative and absolutive (although, as will be seen, absolutive takes zero marking). See section 3.4 for more on case in LT. The suggestion here is that if a nominal is marked for case it cannot be the host of a CP and the verb associated with it is not a light verb in that case.

Case schema: \textit{CP} \rightarrow \textit{N *CASE} \quad \textit{VBZR}

The NP can be given case marking to clarify the semantic roles of the sentences’ arguments. The host cannot be given case marking.

Compare the case marking placement in (4.45) and (4.46).
4.45

khos  rku.ma  brgyab  pa.red
3SG  ERG  thief  do  PST

He did thieving.

4.46

rku.mas  brgyab  pa.red
thief.ERG  do  PST

Intended: The thief did it.

In (4.45) the subject of the sentence (kho ‘he’) is marked with ERG case (-s). The host of the CP is rku.ma which is made up of the verb rku ‘steal’ and a nominalizing particle. This creates a noun which can sometimes be rku.ma ‘thief’ but in this case is best rendered ‘thieving’ or ‘robbery.’ It is used with a VBZR which is just a reduplication of the verbal root of the host, rku ‘steal.’ There is a small set of CPs like this which are discussed in section 5.2.1 and this particular CP is also discussed in 6.4.4.3. While rku.ma ‘thief’ can be an argument and take case marking, as the host in a CP construction, it cannot. This is illustrated in (4.46). The host is given ergative marking inside the CP and the sentence is ungrammatical.

4.5.2 Brief overview of case markers

For the purpose of this test the discussion on case is limited to these five case markers (and the last case discussed is zero marked): ergative, locative, dative, genitive, and absolutive.

4.5.2.1 Ergative

It is not possible to have the ergative marking on the host of a CP. Some hosts (like rku.ma ‘thief’, above) have more animacy than others when used independently of a CP construction. If the proposed host has ergative marking it is not part of a CP construction. The host is not an argument level noun and as such cannot take ergative case which is only for subject arguments.
Here are the ways to mark ergative case as shown in Figure 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gis</th>
<th>gyis</th>
<th>kyis</th>
<th>-s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Figure 10 Various ways to mark ergative case**

The choice of ergative is made depending on the preceding word's final consonant (or in the case of a final vowel, -s is used).

In the dialogue given below we can see a pronoun marked with ergative case (-s) in the reply:

**Dialogue 4.47**

A: ja grang.mo de mar shos dang
B: lags.so ngas bshos chog

A. *Please throw out this cold tea.*
B. *Yes. I will throw it out.*

The N V sequence of ngas ‘1ERG’ and bshos ‘throw’ do not constitute a CP. Two obvious reasons for this are that the N is marked with ergative case and also that the N is a pronoun. This may seem circular but there are other reasons also. For one the object is dropped in the reply but is implied as it is there in the dialogue's first question. Secondly the object ja ‘tea’ can acceptably be modified like any normal NP. Also shos/bshos ‘throw’ could be used in a relative clause with ja ‘tea’ and ja ‘tea’ could be fronted in an object fronting order. All these reasons together show that ja ‘tea’ and shos ‘throw’ do not combine to form a CP.

**4.5.2.2 Locative/dative/benefactive**

It is also not possible to have locative/dative/benefactive case marking on the host of a CP. Locative marking is given to full NP arguments and marks various semantic roles such as recipient, patient, beneficiary etc. In LT LOC case is shown by the two forms in Figure 11.
The form `la` is used following consonants and the form `-r` is usually used following vowels.

Even nouns that are prototypically high on the animacy scale (like a human) cannot take LOC marking when used as a host of a CP construction.

This example shows both `nas` ‘ablative case’ and `la` ‘locative case’ occurring with a single stem lexical verb:

4.48

```plaintext
ngawas nas rgyanag laspo yas yin
1SG Lhasa from China LOC move NMZ TAM
```

*I will move from Lhasa to mainland China.*

In (4.48) neither `lha.sa` ‘Lhasa’ nor `rgya.nag` ‘China’ are forming a CP with `sbo` ‘move.’ They both have argument status in this direct ergative sentence. A host does not have this status.

In (4.49) ‘`ben` target’ does not form a CP with `phog` ‘hit’. ‘`ben` target’ is marked by LOC case and is the object of `phog` ‘hit’, the predicate. They are not the respective host and VBZR of a CP. In a similar way `sems` ‘heart’ and `phog` ‘hit’ in 4.50 do not form a CP. `sems` ‘heart’ is also marked by locative case, showing it is an argument level constituent, not a host.

4.49

```plaintext
ngai mda de `ben la phog ma song
1SG GEN arrow that target LOC hit not TAM
```

*My arrow didn't hit the target.*
I was really hurt by what you said.

4.5.2.3 Genitive

The genitive case marker is mostly used to show possession. See section 3.4.1 for more on the genitive. Unsurprisingly, a host never possesses another N or NP. Once again this is because the host lacks full argument status and also what is possessed would be the head of the combined NP. Also, it is unusual for a host to be possessed by an NP. This is motivated by the host’s resistance to modification and specificity. The host cannot be the possessor or the possessed. However, as is seen below in the problematic data section, the latter claim is less certain.

4.5.2.4 Ablative

The ablative can be used to show the goal of the sentence. It precedes the noun that the subject is going towards. It can also show the origin or source. It follows the noun the subject is coming from. The example below was already given in (4.48) above. Consider the ablative case marking on lha.sa ‘Lhasa.’
4.52

I will move from Lhasa to mainland China.

Another reason both nouns (lha.sa ‘Lhasa’ and rgya.nag ‘China’) are not hosts is that they are proper nouns. Both proper nouns are pronouns cannot be hosts in a CP constructions. This is developed in section 4.1.2.6 and 4.1.2.7.

4.53

That deranged person jumped off the roof and killed himself.

In (4.53) thog.kha ‘roof’ and mchongs ‘jump’ are not the respective host and VBZR of a CP. The ablative case marking on the noun illustrates something an N+V sequence can have (case marking) that a host VBZR sequence cannot have.

4.5.2.5 Absolutive (the case of the invisible case)

The final sub test under the case test section concerns the absolutive case. This test was suggested by Agha (1994).

Absolutive case is zero marked in LT. Bailey and Walker say “the term ‘absolutive’ indicates that the object doesn’t take a particle (such as the dative or ergative)” (2004:xvi). According to Bailey and Walker four of the seven predicate types have an argument in absolutive case. These are direct ergative (subject-ERG, object-ABS, verb), ditransitive ergative (subject-ERG, indirect object-DAT, object-ABS, verb), affective (indirect object-DAT, subject-ABS, verb) and intransitive/monovalent (subject-ABS, verb). Some of these arguments are optional but Vollman says “the facultative omission of nominal constituents follows certain regularities, however, ABS marked constituents are the least likely to be omitted” (Vollmann 2008:08.03).

So, if there is dative case marking then there must be an absolutive marked NP in the sentence and often the only constituent it could possibly be is the candidate ‘host’. In such cases a strong argument can be made that this ‘host’ is not a host at all since it is taking case. Of Bailey and Walker’s seven predicate types, direct
ergative is specifically the most useful for this absolutive test. It is quite common and less complicated than ditransitive ergative. Bailey and Walker say the “indirect object is not implied or required when a verb takes a direct ergative construction” and this is what “sets the direct ergative apart from either indirect ergative or ditransitive ergative” (Bailey & Walker 2004:xvi).

As was said in the introduction (chapter one) not many researchers on Tibetan have given tests or reasons for calling one N+V construction OV and calling another CP. Of all the reasons given only one was based on syntactic evidence. This came from Agha (Agha 1994). He gives these two examples (I have glossed them again to make them consistent with the rest of my data) shown below:

4.54

 bkris kyis nga yi.ge btang byung
Tashi ERG 1SG DAT letter do TAM
Tashi sent a letter to me.

4.55

 bkris kyis nga skad btang byung
Tashi ERG 1SG voice do TAM
Tashi summoned (called) me.

Agha compares N+Vs yi.ge + btang ‘letter do’ and skad + btang ‘summon’ or ‘invite’ and claims that only the latter is a CP (although he doesn’t use that terminology). He says “there are important syntactic differences between the case marking of the arguments of btang ‘send/do’ in the two constructions” (Agha 1994:107). Agha shows that while in (4.54) yi.ge ‘letter’ is the zero case marked with Ø argument of btang, the noun skad ‘speech’ is not the Ø argument of btang in (4.55); rather, in (4.55) nga ‘me’ is the Ø argument of the predicate skad btang ‘call’” (Agha 1994:107) (numbers changed for this document). In (4.54) nga ‘I.DAT’ has the dative case marker –r (which could optionally be la). Because of this yi.ge ‘letter’ must be in absolutive case. In (4.55) nga ‘I’ is not marked so it must be the required absolutive
argument. This means that the nominal skad ‘voice’ is not an argument level constituent and is the host of a CP with btang ‘do’ as the VBZR.

When I compared Agha’s data to the LV data I was using I found surprisingly similar sentences:

4.56

khos  khong.tsho  la  yi.ge  btang  ba.red
3SG  ERG  3SG PL  DAT  letter  do  PRF

*He sent a letter to them.*

4.57

khong  gis  nga  skad  btang  byung  yin.na’i
3SG  ERG  1SG voice  do  TAM  but

*He invited me, but…*

Examples (4.56) and (4.57) from the corpus of data exhibit the same case markings as (4.54) and (4.55). In (4.56) khong.tsho ‘them’ is marked with the dative la. This means yi.ge ‘letter’ must be the argument in absolutive case with Ø marking. This shows yi.ge + btang ‘letter send’ is not a CP. On the other hand, in (4.57) nga ‘I’ does not have the dative/locative marking and must be the argument in absolutive case. This (plus the fact that it is less compositional) shows skad + btang ‘invite’ must be a CP.

Using Agha’s insight as a springboard, other direct ergative sentences which use btang as either a VBZR or single stem verb were examined. It was found that some of the entries in LV which are documented as CPs could in fact be analyzed as just common OV collocations (e.g. (4.59), (4.60), and (4.61)). This was especially true of sequences with concrete potentially referential nominals. In reference to the absolutive case test they look like other typical OV sentence (4.58). The less specific and more non-compositional sequences are likely still best analyzed as CPs (purely for the lack of compositionality reason). On the other hand, the semantically transparent sequences, with concrete ‘hosts’ are probably better not analyzed as CPs. A number of these sequences coincided with problematic data from other tests. This
problematic data can be resolved by the absolutive test. Some of these are listed in this test's conclusion.

4.58

government ERG area that LOC money very send

The government has spent lots of money on this area...

The N+V sequence dngul 'money' + btang 'send' (4.58) is claimed to not be a CP. The verb btang 'send' is not a VBZR here, rather it is the single stem counterpart. In terms of case this sentence aligns with these other problematic ‘CP’s (4.59)-(4.61) and this suggests that they are not, in fact, CPs at all since their ‘hosts’ are actually in absolutive case. (I have kept the ‘host’ underlined and ‘VBZR’ in bold for clarity).

4.59

She sang well and so people were envious.

4.60

If a vehicle is driven too fast, there will be an accident. (idiom. you are going to get it...)
On auspicious days, Tibetans make incense offerings.

Examples (4.59)-(4.61) all have ‘hosts’ which are in absolutive case. This is strong evidence that they not CPs (or if they are they should be classed as a different kind of CPs). They are all direct ergative verbs which require ERG and ABS arguments. In (4.60) the subject is implied. In (4.61) there is an adverbial adjunct phrase (tshes.bzang + la ‘on auspicious days’). These examples also happen to be more concrete, specific and compositional than many other CPs.

In (4.59)-(4.61) the ‘hosts’ could all be modified with NP modification (unlike most prototypical hosts) such as adjective, number and demonstrative.

Now consider (4.62) and (4.63):

4.62
kho phal.cher a.mas gces.lang btang ba'i
3SG maybe mother ERG spoiling do NMZ GEN
He is… whose mother has probably spoiled him.

4.63
a.mas phru.gu skyag.lang btang byed kyis
mother ERG child over.indulgence do almost do TAM
The mother is near the point of over-indulging (her) children.

Examples (4.62) and (4.63) both have verbal entries in LV. They are both direct ergative CPs. They both exhibit the required arguments in ERG (in both cases a.mas ‘mother.ERG’) and the required arguments in ABS (kho ‘him’ and phru.gu ‘children’ respectively). These means that the nominals gces.lang ‘spoiling’ and skyag.lang ‘over-indulgence’ don’t have any case marking, are not full argument level constituents, and are syntactically quite acceptably labeled hosts.
For this absolutive section I have focused on N+V sequences using *gtong/btang*. Expanding this idea to examine the other two of the big three and lesser VBZR should be productive but it beyond the scope of this thesis.

### 4.5.3 Corpus Evidence

I found very little evidence in the data of the host being marked for case. Case markers almost never separate the host and the VBZR. There is problematic data (three lexical entries) with the *la* ‘locative’ case marker however. There is also problematic data which shows the host being possessed. This is discussed below.

### 4.5.4 Corpus conclusion

No clear examples of an accepted host taking case marking inside a CP construction were found in the corpus of data. The few problematic examples can be explained. On the other hand it is completely normal for other nouns to take case marking in LT. If a noun has case marking it is easy to rule it out as a host and also by extension to rule out its predicating verb as a VBZR/light verb.

There were examples of ‘hosts’ taking absolutive case but since these N+V sequences also coincided with data that does other problematic things (like taking NP modification) it is best to not label these as CPs, or at least a sub-type of CPs. Tournadre says “for some verbs the status is ambiguous” (2001:54) referring to CP candidates like the sub-type discussed here. If these “ambiguous” CPs all display the same characteristic it could be argued that they are a sub-type of CPs, closer to OVs than most typical CPs.

### 4.5.4.1 An Interesting Strategy

Consider the subject and the host in this CP:

4.64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rku.ma</th>
<th>des</th>
<th>nyin.mo</th>
<th>lkog.lda</th>
<th>byas</th>
<th>nas</th>
<th>mtshan.mo</th>
<th>rku.ma</th>
<th>rgyag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thief</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>thief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td></td>
<td>TAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>exist</td>
<td></td>
<td>exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The thief stakes out a place during the day, with the intention of stealing at night.*
This example was used in the demonstrative constraint test section. Here we can examine it in light of the case marking on the demonstrative des ‘that.ERG.’ Contrast this sentence with (4.46), given in 4.5.1. If the speaker has pragmatic motivation to mention that the ‘thief was thieving’ (or the ‘robber did rob-ber rob’) then an acceptable (and commonly employed) strategy is to repeat the host element and give it the ergative case marker, not to put the ergative marking inside the CP, on the host. A similar pattern was seen in (4.32) in section 4.3.5.2 and significantly supports the hypothesis that the CP sanctions only limited separation (as N and VP) and that the N part of the CP is not a full sentential argument but is defective in the sense that it resists NP modification.

4.5.5 Problematic data
Below is some representative data showing problematic constructions. I have attempted to reconcile these data with my hypotheses.

4.5.5.1 Ergative

4.65

khyed.rang gis nyes.pa bsags med pa’i dpang.po ngs med pa’i dpang.po
2SG self ERG crime accumulate not that witness 1SG ERG do able

kyi red

TAM TAM

*I can bear witness that you didn't commit the crime. (lit. accumulate the offence.)*

This sentence causes deeper structural problems which will be dealt with in the structural Chapter 6. Here, the host of a common CP dpang.po ‘witness’ seems to be separated from its VBZR byed ‘do.’ This problem is explained in section 6.5 on object fronting.

In this section it is relevant because on the surface it shows a noun nga ‘I’ with ergative case marking followed by one of the big three VBZRs. The noun nga ‘I.ERG’ is not the host but its ergative marking appears between the verbalizer and the host. The VBZR byed is commonly used independently and also if the host is given already and clear from the context it can be dropped. For these two reasons (4.65) poses no problem (at least for the case marking test.)
Dialogue 4.66

A: work that 1SG ERG do able DUB come

A. I wonder if I will be able to do that work?

B: work(H) that now 2SG self ERG do(H) able and able

B. Of course you will be able to do that work.

Example (4.66) shows the pronoun with an ergative marking ngas ‘I.ERG’ followed by one of the big three VBZRs byed ‘do.’ These two words do not form a CP because, first, pronouns are never the host of a CP, second, the host of a CP cannot take case marking, and third, the example shows object fronting which is explained in the structural chapter in 6.5. There is already an object for byed ‘do’ and it is not ngas ‘I.ERG’ which is the subject.

4.67

That robber cut and stole the otter skin sleeve of my chuba.

Example (4.67) shows a possible host and VBZR being separated by almost an entire sentence. This would be problematic but it is probably not the best analysis. The candidate ‘host’ rku.ma ‘thief’, often occurs as an animate actor in sentences. It can occur independently of a VBZR. Here it is appositionally modifying the subject khos ‘he.ERG’. The VBZR at the end of the sentence could either be functioning independently (as a single stem verb) or, because the ‘thief’ part has already been mentioned it could just be anaphoric host drop. Because it has already been mentioned it does not need to be fully repeated.
4.5.5.2 Locative/dative

4.68

slob.phrug des slob.graA nas phyir.'bud byas pa.red
student that ERG school from expelling do PST

...he was expelled from school.

4.69

khongrgyal nang la phyir.log byas pa.red
3SG country in LOC go.back do PST

He returned to his country.

4.70

da.gin mi de.tsho kho.rang.tsho'i las.gungs la phyir.log byas song
just.now person that PL 3P.GEN work.unit LOC go.back do TAM

Those people just now returned to their work unit.

Numbers (4.68), (4.69) and (4.70) all show hosts which have locative (-r) marked morpheme phyi ‘out’ inside them. The host of (4.68), phyir.’bud ‘expelling’ has as its first syllable the morpheme phyir ‘outside.LOC.’ (4.69) and (4.70) have a host with the same first syllable. This poses no problem for our hypothesis though because the marking is inside the host itself, not on the host, separating the host and the VBZR. These particular hosts (and others like them) have been lexicalized and the locative morpheme inside the first syllable does not function as a case marker for these sentences. Furthermore, both (4.69) and (4.70) already have arguments marked with LOC (the postposition nang ‘in’ and the noun las.gungs ‘work.unit’ respectively). These sentences do not disagree with the hypothesis.
Compare these two examples below:

4.71

ང་ da.ga.ze ན་འོག་ ང་ gi.yod

I'm just playing.

4.72

ཁོང་ རྒྱན་བཙུགས་ yas rgyan.btsugs མ་ dga’ ma

He doesn't like betting games at all.

Example (4.71) has a common CP rtse.mo ‘playing’ and its VBZR rtse ‘play’ (which is another example of a verb nominalized and then verbalized again with the same original verb!). In this intransitive sentence there is no locative/dative marking. In (4.72) the same noun (which was the host of (4.71)’s CP) is used but here it has locative/dative marking. It is now used with a different lexical verb dga’ ‘like.’ This verb Bailey and Walker label an ‘affective’ verb which as a class are “transitive… non-volitional” (2004:xxii). In these kinds of verbs the indirect object normally takes the dative case (and the subject takes ABS Ø marking). These facts show us that rtsed.mor ‘playing.DAT’ is actually an argument in this sentence and is licensed by dga’ ‘like’ not subsumed under it as its host. Further evidence is that this ‘playing’ is possessed by ‘betting’ with the genitive case. The whole phrase ‘betting’s playing’ is marked by the case marking clitic –r ‘to.’ This example then, does not show a host being marked for case.

There are seven verbal entries in Lhasa Verbs that seem to have the la ‘locative’ case marker in the second syllable of the host itself (Bailey & Walker 2004). Some of these are more problematic than others. Another entry, 133, had a literary form of the locative case marker in the entry (du ‘locative’) but in one of its example sentences it was given as the more common spoken form (la ‘locative’) and with a different VBZR. These are listed below:

---

14 The LV numbers are used here, since this is referencing verbal entries, not example sentences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry #</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>VBZR</th>
<th>definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>མ་ལ་</td>
<td>ངོན་</td>
<td>To obey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kha.la</td>
<td>nyan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>listen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1092</td>
<td>བོ་ལ་</td>
<td>ཡིད་</td>
<td>To remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blo.la</td>
<td>nges</td>
<td>To stay or remain in one's mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>ascertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>བོ་ལ་</td>
<td>བབས་</td>
<td>To be appealing, attractive or agreeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blo.la</td>
<td>babs</td>
<td>To approve of something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>descend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To like something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1391</td>
<td>ལ་ལ་</td>
<td>རྒྱག་</td>
<td>To weld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tsha.la</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>welding</td>
<td>do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>བོ་ལ་</td>
<td>རྒྱག་</td>
<td>To plaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zhal.la</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plastering</td>
<td>do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>ལ་ལ་</td>
<td>བཞག་</td>
<td>To blame, to accuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ya.la</td>
<td>bzhag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blame</td>
<td>put</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>ལ་ལ་</td>
<td>ཐུག་</td>
<td>To face or meet death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>srog.la</td>
<td>thug</td>
<td>To come into a life threatening situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>life</td>
<td>meet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>མ་ལ་</td>
<td>བཏང་</td>
<td>To spoil, to indulge (volitional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ngan.pa.lang.shor.du</td>
<td>btang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indulgence</td>
<td>do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>མ་ལ་</td>
<td>རྫོང་</td>
<td>To spoil, to indulge (non-volitional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ngan.pa.lang.shor.la</td>
<td>gro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indulgence</td>
<td>go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Entry numbers 282 and 674 pose problems for my hypothesis. In 281 and 674 the hosts (kha ‘mouth’ and blo ‘mind’ respectively) are possessed by the genitive and marked for locative/dative. In 1092 (which is non-volitional and intransitive) no other argument is marked for locative case but intransitive does not require an object. This host then is probably a lexicalized phrase and as such is not actually locative case. The same goes for entry 906 which also has in its examples other nouns taking locative/dative case. This shows that while historically it would have been a locative case marker it no longer is. 133 seems to be lexicalized since it employs a written form of the locative which is rarely used in colloquial LT. Entry numbers 1391, 296 and 708 all have other arguments with the locative case in their example sentences and the la in their hosts should not be analyzed as a case marker. This means only 282 and 674 pose problems. Consider these two sentences below:

4.73

ཤིང་ wood
སྣང་མྱེད་ indifference
ལ་ LOC
བཏང་ do
ནས་ CONN
བཅད་ cut
དྲགས་ excessive
ན་ if
མཇུག་འབས་ end.result
ངན་པ་ evil
འཁོར་ cycle
ཡོང་ come
A terrible end result with cycle back if, through indifference, trees are excessively chopped down.

4.74

གནས་ཚུལ་ situation
དྱེ་that tsho
སྣང་མྱེད་ indifference
ལ་ LOC
མ་ not
gtong do
མ་གཏོགས་ except gtogs
མྱེ་ fire
ཆུང་ཆུང་ small chung.chung
གིས་ ERG
gnas.tshul de.tsho snang.med la ma gtong ma.gtogs me chung.chung
gis nags.tshal dang chu chung.chung gis lung.pa 'khyer mkhan yod.red.da
ERG forest and water small ERG area take NMZ TAM
If (you) overlook those circumstances, it will be like a small fire destroying a forest and a small stream eroding a whole area. 15

15 “The second part of this sentence is a proverb and means ‘if you do not take care of little things, they will become big problems’” (Bailey and Walker, 2004).
Both (4.73) and (4.74) feature the same candidate CP. It is given an entry in (Bailey & Walker 2004) as snang.med ‘indifference’ (the host) and one of the three most common VBZRs g tong ‘do.’ The two example sentences given in Bailey and Walker are reproduced above. In both of them snang.med ‘indifference’ and g tong ‘do’ are separated by a locative/dative particle. This is different to the seven verbs given above which all contain la ‘locative’ in the verb dictionary’s entry. This suggests that snang.med + la is not lexicalized but is actually being given case marking here. However, la is not being used in a typical way in these examples. It is not used for case marking (dative or locative) but is used to show emphasis. In these examples la is being used adverbially to focus on the action of being indifferent. As such, these examples are not problematic for the case marking hypothesis.

4.5.5.3 Genitive (possessed host)

4.75

phru.gu la na.tsha ma 'gos pa'i ched.du dus thog la sngon
child LOC sickness not infect which so.that when regarding LOC before

'gog gi khab rgyag dgos red
block GEN needle do need TAM

In order for children not to get infected by disease, (they) must get vaccinations on time.

In the problematic example (4.75) we see the candidate CP khab ‘needle’ + rgyag ‘do’ (‘vaccinate’) has its host modified with a genitive construction. While this does not have an entry in Bailey and Walker’s LV data it is given as an example in Lhosang Thonden (Thonden 2002). This would seem to violate the constraint against genitive host possession which is motivated by the proposed lack of specificity of the host.

However, it is possible that it is not a CP. It is after all compositional, it has specificity, can take NP modification and it can be rearranged structurally like some of the problematic data. Also in one of Thonden’s examples it is modified by number. This suggests it is not a CP.
In the corpus of data there were more than a dozen other sentences which seemed to have a host being possessed by something else. This is easily the weakest of the case tests but is still somewhat uncommon. Referring to CPs Tournadre says “it is possible to determine the noun with another noun in the genitive” (Tournadre 2001:54). Although it was not so common in the data, Tournadre does seem to be correct and this constraint seems to be the weakest in the case test.

### 4.5.6 Previous problematic data which can be resolved with the absolutive test

The data in this table comes from problematic data in the preceding tests. By examining them again in light of the absolutive test the case can be made that these N + V constructions are not CPs but are OVs. The nominal part is an object with the Ø marked absolutive case.

#### Table 11 Problematic data with absolutive case marking on the host

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective constraint test</th>
<th>Object in absolutive</th>
<th>Verb (direct ergative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mo. Ta</td>
<td>མོ་ཊ་ mo. Ta</td>
<td>གཏོང་ g tong do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car</td>
<td>མོ་ཊ་ mo. Ta</td>
<td>གཏོང་ g tong do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rtsi</td>
<td>རི་ rtsi</td>
<td>གཏོར་ g tor spray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paint</td>
<td>བྲྲེ་ rtsi</td>
<td>གཏོར་ g tor spray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lhas. ma</td>
<td>བྲྲེ་ rtsi</td>
<td>གཏོར་ g tor spray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>braid</td>
<td>བྲྲེ་ rtsi</td>
<td>གི་ཐྲི་ rgyag do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number constraint test</th>
<th>Object in absolutive</th>
<th>Verb (direct ergative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lhas. ma</td>
<td>བྲྲེ་ rtsi</td>
<td>གི་ཐྲི་ rgyag do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>braid</td>
<td>བྲྲེ་ rtsi</td>
<td>གི་ཐྲི་ rgyag do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khab</td>
<td>བྲྲེ་ rtsi</td>
<td>གི་ཐྲི་ rgyag do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demonstrative constraint test


These constructions are representative of a sub class of N+V that resemble CPs in some ways but can violate many of the tests.

DeLancey states “Tibetan complex predicates are syntactically transitive as far as valence is concerned; the object is clearly not incorporated into the verb, but remains a syntactically independent noun phrase” (1990:307). This seems to go against the hypothesis that the host is not a noun phrase, or is defective in some way. Here are some examples DeLancey gives (renumbered for this thesis):

4.76

ngar rmi.lam de yang.bskyar btang byung
1SG LOC dream that again do TAM

*I dreamed that dream again.*

4.77

nga hab.brid gsum brgyab pa.yin
1SG sneeze three do PRF

*I sneezed three times.*

DeLancey says these examples “show that the object remains syntactically independent and independently referential” (1990:307). This claim is problematic for the hypothesis that the host is a defective NP and generally not specific or referential. On further examination however, it can be seen that these examples are not problematic.
Example (4.76) shows the N+V sequence *rmi.lam* ‘dream’ and *btang* ‘do’ with the demonstrative *de* ‘that’ modifying the nominal *rmi.lam* ‘dream’. However, because the subject *ngar* “I.LOC” is in locative/dative case it seems like the nominal *rmi.lam* “dream” is in absolutive case and therefore is arguably not a host.

Example (4.77) shows a CP (*hab.brid* “sneeze” + *brgyab* “do”) “to sneeze”. The number *gsum* “three” separates the host and the verbalizer and seems to be modifying the host. Actually this number is modifying the whole CP and as such is adverbial. It means “three times” (and could be expanded as *thengs* “times” *gsum* “three”) so as such it is not NP modification but VP modification.

4.5.7 Final thoughts on the case test

The structural hypothesis that the host of a CP does not take case (because it is restricted to N not NP and case is a kind of NP modification) is almost always true. There were only 4 exceptions that were found. The case test is one of the simplest ways to determine which N+V sequences are not CPs.

Hosts do seem to be able to be possessed however, which while not taking case marking is still adding specificity.

The success of this test showing the properties of the host in LT further strengthens the general hypotheses that hosts are not specific or referential. They do not have argument level status in the sentence. They are nominal but are not full NPs.

4.6 Topicalizer Test

4.6.1 Introduction

The topicalizer *ni* ‘as.for’ is never used on just the host of a CP. In fact, if *ni* ‘as.for’ is used the whole CP is nominalized and then topicalized. It is done to the whole unitary construction, not a single part of the CP.

**Schema:** CP → N  *Topicalizer*  VBZR

The non-verbal component of the CP cannot be topicalized.

Compare the topicalizer placement in these two examples:

With no topicalizer:
4.78

ང་ ལ་ལས་ རྒྱག་ གི་ཡོད
nga dka'.las rgyag gi.yod
1SG toil do TAM
*I am working hard.*

With topicalizer added to non-host noun:

4.79

ང་ ལ་ལས་ རྒྱག་ གི་ཡོད
nga ni dka'.las rgyag gi.yod
1SG TOP toil do TAM
*As for me, I am working hard.*

With topicalizer added on host:

4.80

*ང་ ལ་ལས་ རྒྱག་ གི་ཡོད
nga dka'.las ni rgyag gi.yod
1SG toil TOP do TAM
*Intended: As for hard work, I do.*

With topicalizer on whole nominalized CP:

4.81

ང་ ལ་ལས་ རྒྱག་ པས་ རྒྱག་ གི་ཡོད
nga dka'.las rgyag yas ni
1SG toil do ERG TOP
*As for my hard work...*

These sentences were elicited and checked. (4.78) has a CP and no topicalizer. This is perfectly normal. (4.79) has the subject topicalized which is also unremarkable. (4.80) fails to put a topicalizer on the host inside the CP. (4.81) shows the commonly used strategy of nominalizing the whole CP and then topicalizing the sentence.
4.6.2 Corpus Evidence

All occurrences of ni ‘as.for’ were checked and nothing resembling a host was topicalized in any of them. Other NPs were topicalized. This shows further proof that the host is a just a noun, or at most a defective NP.

4.82

dge.rgan gyi dpung.khag ’dzugs.skrun yag.po byed yas ni mi.sna
teacher GEN group construction good do NMZ TOP personnel

gso.skyong byed pa’i grub.cha gtso.bo zhig yin
support do which element main a TAM

The main element involved in building the teaching force well is in supporting the teaching personnel.

The only topicalization done on CPs was after the whole construction had been nominalized, as is seen in (4.82) above.

4.6.3 Corpus conclusion

All other nouns can be topicalized but nominal hosts of CP constructions were not found with topicalization.

4.6.4 Problematic data

4.83

‘cham.nad ni ha.cang khyab bde.ba’i na.tsha zhig red
cold.disease TOP very spread easy.GEN sickness a TAM

The cold disease is very easily spread.

Example (4.83) has a N and VP where the noun is topicalized. The noun ‘cham.nad ‘cold.disease’ and the single stem verb khyab ‘spread’ do not constitute a CP. This N + V sequence does not contradict the hypothesis because it is not a CP. However it reinforces the claim that any other nominal constituent can be topicalized. In this case, khyab ‘spread’ is an intransitive/monovalent verb which licenses just one
argument. This is the subject which takes absolutive Ø case marking. The noun ‘cham.nad ‘cold.disease’ then is the absolutive subject of khyab ‘spread’ and not a host.

4.6.5 Final thoughts on the topicalization test
Topicalization brings tighter focus on key constituents of the sentence. Concerning Hindi, Mohanan says “the nominal host cannot be topicalized by itself” (1994:206). While the whole CP (as a constituent) can be topicalized its components cannot be. This reinforces the idea that it is one unitary structure. It shows that its nominal hosts lack the specificity required if something is to be topicalized. It supports the idea that the host is not a full NP (but is nominal) and furthermore does not have argument level status.

4.7 Proper Noun Test

4.7.1 Introduction
The host of a CP can never be a proper noun. Anytime the N part of an N+V sequence is a proper noun it is clearly not a CP. The proper noun is not a host and the verbal component is not, in that instance, acting as a light verb or VBZR.

Proper noun schema: \( \text{CP} \rightarrow \neg \text{Proper Noun} \quad \text{VBZR} \)

Proper nouns are commonly used in other N+V sequences but not CPs.

Compare the nouns chu.rags ‘dam’ and pe.cin ‘Beijing’ in these two examples:

4.84

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{chu} & \quad \text{ma} \quad \text{shor} \quad \text{gong.la} \quad \underline{\text{chu.rags}} \quad \text{rgyag} \quad \text{dgos} \quad \text{red} \quad \text{water} \\
& \quad \text{not} \quad \text{burst} \quad \text{before} \quad \text{dam} \quad \text{do} \quad \text{need} \end{align*}
\]

Before water bursts, a dam should be built.
* བོད་ཅིན། ཀྲན་པ་བོད་ སེང་
pe.cin rgyag dgos red
Beijing do need TAM
* Intended: Beijing should be built.

In example (4.84) the noun chu.rags ‘dam’ is the host of a CP whose VBZR is one of the big three rgyag ‘do’ or ‘build.’ In (4.85) chu.rags ‘dam’ is replaced with a proper noun pe.cin ‘Beijing’, and the resulting CP is unacceptable.

4.7.2 Corpus Evidence
There was no evidence of the host of a CP being a proper noun in the 6000 plus sentences of the data. There is plenty of evidence of proper nouns and verbs in non-CP N+V sequences.

4.7.3 Corpus conclusion
It is ungrammatical for a proper noun to be the host of a CP in LT.

4.7.4 Elicitation evidence
Here are some sentences that were elicited for this test:
4.86
* ག་ འོས་ཤེས་ གུང་ནས། གཙོ་བོ་འོག་
nga mtsho.mo byed gar 'gro gi.yin
1SG Tsomo do for.purpose go FUT
* Intended: I am going to go Tsomo-ing.

4.87
* ཞེང་སང་ ག་ བཀྲིས་ ཀྲན་འོག་
deng.sang nga bkris rgyag gyi.yod
recently 1SG Tashi do FUT
* Intended: These days I've been Tashi-ing.

Examples (4.86) and (4.87) are elicited examples with proper nouns as hosts and a big three VBZR. Neither is grammatically acceptable or semantically clear.
4.7.5 Elicitation conclusion
It is entirely ungrammatical to create CPs with proper nouns as the host.

4.7.6 Problematic data
No problematic data was found.

4.7.7 Final thoughts on the proper noun test
Proper nouns are much more referential than other nouns and the hosts of CPs are typically much less referential than other nouns. The CP in LT usually describes a generalized action and the host in the CP lacks specificity.

Proper nouns are also resistant to modification (adjective, demonstrative etc.). This is because they are structurally similar to an NP and potentially the host is an N but not an NP. This is another reason a proper noun cannot be a host.

4.8 Pronoun Test

4.8.1 Introduction
The host of a CP can also never be a pronoun. Anytime the N part of an N V sequence is a pronoun it is clearly not a CP. The pronoun is not a host and verbal component is not, in that instance, acting as a light verb or VBZR.

Pronoun schema: CP→ *Pronoun  VBZR

Pronouns are commonly used in other N + V sequences but not CPs.

Compare the nominal components, chu.rags ‘dam’ and khong ‘he’ in these two N + V sequences:

4.88

Before water bursts, a damn should be built.
4.89

* མོང་ རྣམ་ ཏོབ་ ནེ་
khang rgyag dgos red
3SG do need TAM

Intended: He should be hit/built/done.

4.8.2 Corpus Evidence

While there are N+V sequences of pronoun and verb these are not CPs. Recall that all light verbs have a full verb counterpart (that all VBZRs can also function independently as single stem verbs in LT). This is one way to analyze data like (4.90) below. Other possibilities include host drop and, less likely, object fronting (as is shown in 6.5) hosts are typically not fronted). Either way there are plenty of better analyses which do not claim the pronoun is the host of a CP. No evidence of pronouns functioning as hosts of CPs was found in 6000 plus sentences examined.

4.8.3 Corpus conclusion

This test, like the proper noun test, is entirely consistent. It is ungrammatical to have a pronoun as the host of a CP. Out of 6000 sentences, there was no evidence of this evidence of this occurring.

4.8.4 Problematic data

These examples were already seen in the case test:

4.90

བོ གོས་ བཞག་ བཞག་
ngas bzhag pa.yin
B: 1SG ERG put PRF
B. I did.

The pronoun ngas ‘I.ERG’ and the verb bshag ‘put’ do not form a CP. Here bzhag ‘put’ is a single stem verb. According to Bailey and Walker it is a volitional, direct ergative verb and as this is a reply (and its object has been previously stated) the object is elided.
4.91

I can bear witness that you didn't commit the crime. (lit. accumulate the offence.)

In this admittedly strange sentence (4.91) there is an N + V sequence consisting of ngas ‘I.ERG’ and one of the big three VBZRs byed ‘do.’ This is not a CP. It is a case of object fronting where the object of byed ‘do’ changes its usual order and precedes the subject. The byed ‘do’ is used as a full verb here. According to Bailey and Walker dpang.po ‘witness’ + byed ‘do’ is a direct ergative verb. In this sentence the subject in ergative is ngas ‘I.ERG’ and everything preceding that is the object (in zero marked absolutive case).

4.92

I wonder if I will be able to do that work?

Example (4.92) can be explained the same way as the previous example. Although it doesn’t have an entry in Bailey and Walker it is probably another direct ergative verb. Since the nominal element las.ka is therefore case marked (absolutive Ø) it is not a CP and since it is not a CP it can be fronted like any other object.

Even in the problematic data there is no compelling reason to choose an analysis which says that the host of a CP can be a pronoun.

4.8.5 Final thoughts on the pronoun test

The host of a CP lacks the specificity and referentiality of other nouns. Pronouns can be substituted for other nouns and noun phrases but not the host. This reinforces the
host’s unitary structure with its VBZR, that it is not a full NP and that it is more
general and less deictic than many noun phrases.

4.9 Host Drop Test

4.9.1 Introduction
The host and the VBZR are a unitary construction which resists discontinuity, order
switching and some kinds of modification. The construction should also resist
anaphoric elision of the nominal component (the host). There is no resistance to this
anaphora in regular OV sequences.

Host drop schema:

\[
\text{OV} \rightarrow \text{N V}
\]
or

\[
\text{OV} \rightarrow \_ \text{ V} \quad (\_ = \text{semantic gap})
\]

But not:

\[
\text{CP} \rightarrow \text{N V}
\]
\[
^*\text{CP} \rightarrow ^*\emptyset \text{ V}
\]

While a lexical verb (single stem verb) can optionally drop its arguments a VBZR
resists dropping its host.

Anaphora is common in LT in OV sequences. Depending on the context the object
may be dropped and/or the subject may be dropped with single stem verb predicates.
Within the CP construction the host may also be dropped (if it has already been
mentioned).

Compare these two dialogues. One contains a regular OV sequence (a lexical verb
and its object) and the other is a CP.
Dialogue 4.93

ཁོང་ ག་དུས་ སོབ་གྲྭ་ དེ་ རས
khong ga.dus slob.graA 'thon gyi ras
A: 3SG when school depart TAM Q
A. *When will he graduate from school?*

དུས་སང་ དེ་ རེད
dus.sang 'thon gyi red
B: next.year depart TAM TAM
B. Next year.

Dialogue 4.94

ཁྱེད་རང་ དོ་པོ་ རབྱུབ་ བུད་ཚོད་ བརྒྱབ་ ར་ ཨ
khyed.rang gis do.po ga.tshod brgyab tshar pa
A: 2SG self ERG sack how.many do finish NMZ
A. *How many sacks have you finished packing?*

གཉིས་ བརྱུབ་ ར་
gnyis brgyab tshar
B: two do finish.
B. Two.

In the dialogue (4.93), *slob.graA* ‘school’ and ‘thon ‘depart’ or ‘graduate’ are the object and predicate respectively. In the reply *slob.graA* ‘school’ is dropped. This is optional but very common. In fact, it is probably more natural to drop it in the reply than to include it again.

In dialogue (4.94), *do.po* ‘sack’ and *brgyab* ‘do’ are the host and VBZR respectively. They form a CP which is separated by a question word (this is not uncommon). In the reply *do.po* ‘sack’ is dropped and *brgyab* ‘do’ is left (along with the number two). This anaphora is also not uncommon in most CPs (although some may resist this for semantic reasons).

Contrary to the hypothesis there is no difference between an OV construction and a CP. In both the nominal component can be dropped when it is understood by the context.
4.9.2 Corpus Evidence

There were enough examples of host dropping in the data to make it clear that the example above is not unusual. It is common to drop the host with the majority of CP constructions.

This dropping of the nominal component (or the first part of the construction) also seems to occur in compound verbs (which can be less semantically transparent). Consider this example:

Dialogue 4.95

A: 2SG self sleep good sleep TAM Q

A. Did you sleep well?

B: good sleep TAM

B. I did.

The compound verb gnyid.khug ‘fall asleep’ is modified adverbially in the first part of the dialogue. This is not unusual. In the reply the first part of the compound verb gnyid ‘sleep’ is dropped and the second part khug ‘sleep?’ is left. This is interesting because khug ‘sleep?’ by itself is semantically unclear. Tournadre and Dorje say compound verbs like this are “difficult to analyse without a historical perspective” (2005:458). They go on to say the “meaning of one of the components taken by itself is no longer comprehensible, or has been partially lost.” The compound verb gnyid.khug ‘sleep’ is one example they offer. This kind of partial anaphora then, would only occur in a context where the whole verb has already been mentioned. The same goes for CPs and normal single stem verb and object constructions. Host dropping also occurs in CPs with minor verbalizers.

4.9.3 Corpus conclusion

Anaphora is widespread in LT. It is common with lexical verbs and their arguments. It is also common with CPs and their hosts (which are not arguments). It is common in the widely accepted CPs that use one of the three most common VBZRs and also in proposed CPs that use lesser VBZRs. It is even common in compound verbs.
4.9.4 Final thoughts on the host drop test

The structural hypothesis that the hosts of CPs are obligatory, and must not be dropped from their VBZR is proved incorrect. In this respect CPs behave the same way as other N+V sequences. This test is not helpful for distinguishing constructions.

4.10 Host/component semantic Dependency Test

4.10.1 Introduction

Most nominal hosts have semantic content and can operate with or without a VBZR. A small group of verbal constructions (compound verbs) have components which are semantically empty and are dependent on the other component or the whole construction to be meaningful. These are all disyllabic words. Either the initial or the final syllable can be semantically empty without its counterpart. These components could be nominal or verbal and are semantically “difficult to understand at the present time” (Tournadre & Dorje 2005:458) (see section 3.7.6).

Semantic dependency schemas:

N V → N (meaningful)
     V (meaningful)

CP → host (meaningful)
     VBZR (meaningful-but lighter)

CompV → first part (not always meaningful)
       Second part (meaningful)

Or

CompV → meaning together is different from meaning apart

This property of semantic compositionality provides a useful distinction between CPs and compound verbs. The host parts of CPs can operate independent of their VBZR but the initial syllable (or sometimes final syllable) of compound verbs either cannot operate independently or have a different meaning when they are independent.
Compare these examples:

4.96

*If you don't have a rest, you will get sore muscles.*

4.97

Did you receive permission to take a vacation rest?

Example (4.96) shows the CP `ngal.gso` ‘rest’ + `brgyab` ‘do’ in its entirety. (4.97) shows just the nominal part, `ngal.gso` ‘rest’ operating independently. It also has case marking (which hosts cannot have). It is meaningful with or without the VBZR.

Consider these compound verb examples:

4.98

*I don't know*

4.99

*I didn't hear.*
There is no need to show that regular objects have independent meaning from their predicate. This is obvious. This test is not useful for differentiating OV sequences with CPs. It is however useful for distinguishing CPs from compound verbs. (4.96) shows a noun that is commonly used as the host of a CP. It functions meaningfully without a VBZR in (4.97). (4.98) shows a common compound verb ha.go ‘understand.’ (4.99) shows that the final syllable of the compound can function independently (with a change of meaning) of the initial syllable. (4.100) shows that the initial syllable cannot function independently. Ahland used a similar test on Kurtoep, a related language of Bhutan (2006:9).

Tournadre and Dorje offer some other examples in this category of compound verbs (Tournadre & Dorje 2005:458). They give:

**Table 12 Compound verb examples from Tournadre and Dorje**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yid.ches</th>
<th>ha.las</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘to have faith’</td>
<td>‘to be surprised’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gnyid.khug</th>
<th>hon.thor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘to fall asleep’</td>
<td>‘to be astonished’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all of these examples either the initial or the final syllable is semantically unclear without the other part.

### 4.10.2 Corpus Evidence

4.101

* ང་ རབ་ ཉོམ་*  

ngai rbad.de ha.las song  

1SG completely be.astonished TAM  

*I am completely astonished*...
In the corpus example (4.101) the compound *ha.las ‘be.astonished’ is given. The first syllable, *ha ‘?’ is difficult to analyze synchronically. It is even difficult to say what the second syllable would mean in this context. It has other meanings in different contexts (like *las ‘work’) but it is hard to see how *ha ‘?’ and *las ‘work’ would combine to form the compound *ha.las ‘be.astonished.’

4.10.3 Corpus conclusion
No evidence was found for dependent CP hosts in the corpus of data. CP hosts can operate fully independently (albeit sometimes with a meaning change) in LT. Many cases of nominals that can sometimes be the host of a CP were found without a VBZR. On the other hand there is no evidence showing certain syllables of compound verbs working independently of the other syllable. Below, with elicitation we show evidence that it cannot happen.

4.10.4 Elicitation evidence
Compare (4.101) to (4.102) below:

4.102

* གང་ རྟ་ ཞོད
  nga  ha   yod
  1SG  ?  TAM

*Intended: I have _?*

The initial syllable *ha ‘?’ is meaningless without the final syllable *las (often ‘work’, but its meaning here is unclear) or go ‘hear’.

Other compound verbs have a different meaning when taken as a whole compared to the meaning of their parts (this is also true of some CPs). An example of this from the data is (4.103):

4.103

ང་ཚོ་ རྒྱ་ རྡོ་ ཉེན་ དཔོ་ བསར་ བསད་ པ་ཡིན
  nga.tsho  kha.sa  kha.bkram  byas bsdad  pa.yin
  1PL  yesterday  mouth  spread  then  stay  PRF

*We spread out (from each other) yesterday.*
In (4.103) we see a normal use of the compound verb \textit{kha.bkram} ‘disperse.’ Compare that to the two elicited examples below:

4.104

\* \text{ nga.tsho kha.sa kha mang.po bkram byas bsdad pa.yin }  
\text{1PL} \text{ yesterday mouth many spread then stay PRF}

\textit{Intended: We spread many mouths yesterday.}

4.105

\* \text{ nga.tsho kha.sa kha gsum bkram byas bsdad pa.yin }  
\text{1PL} \text{ yesterday mouth three spread then stay PRF}

\textit{Intended: We spread three mouths yesterday.}

In (4.104) and (4.105) we see that when the compound verb \textit{kha.bkram} ‘disperse’ is split, its respective components still have meaning but the meaning is different to the meaning they had when they were together. (4.104) shows \textit{kha.bkram} ‘disperse’ split with an ADJ/ADV. (4.105) shows the same compound split with a number. In both of them the parts now mean literally \textit{kha} ‘mouth’ and \textit{bkram} ‘spread’ and the resultant sentences are semantically unacceptable.

This is common with a subclass of compound verbs. Not all compound verbs behave in this way when occurring alone, but many do.

\textbf{4.10.5 Elicitation conclusion}

There are four divisions among compound verbs:

a. Compound verbs in which neither element is meaningful apart from its counterpart. An example is \textit{hang.sang} ‘be.surprised.’

b. Compound verbs in which one of the components has no meaning independently of the other component. Examples of this are \textit{ha.las} ‘be.astonished’, \textit{ha.go} ‘understand’ and \textit{ar.brten} ‘cope’ plus Tournadre and Dorje’s examples in Table 12.
c. Compound verbs in which the meaning changes (becomes more literal) if the compound is split. An example is \textit{kha.bkram} ‘disperse.’

d. Compound verbs in which neither of the above statements are true (both parts have independent meaning and the meaning stays the same when the parts are split. An example is \textit{gnyid.nyal} ‘sleep.’

Some compounds can be discontinuous. This includes, surprisingly, the first category. Here is an example of that which was already given in the adjective constraint test section:

4.106

\texttt{gsar.'gyur de.'dras go dus nga ni hang nag.po sang byung}

\text{news like.that hear when 1SG TOP ? very ? TAM}

\textit{Upon hearing that news, I was utterly shocked.}

\textbf{4.10.6 Final thoughts on the host semantic dependency test}

This test proves useful for distinguishing CPs and compound verbs but is not useful for distinguishing CPs and OVs.

\textbf{4.11 Tense Test}

\textbf{4.11.1 Introduction}

While it is best to analyze the host of a CP as nominal they often include verbal morphemes if the host is a nominalized VP. These verbal morphemes should never change for tense, they are non-finite. The only part of a CP that is inflected for tense should be the VBZR.

Consider (4.107), an LV entry, and (4.108) and (4.109) which were elicited:

4.107

\texttt{mchong.rgyag rgyag}

\text{jumping do}

to \textit{jump to or skip over}
The host of this CP consists of mchong ‘jump’ and rgyag ‘do.’ Together they form a nominal host constituent. The morpheme rgyag ‘do’ is used again as the VBZR of this CP construction. In this case both of the host’s morphemes are verbal but together form a noun. Neither mchong ‘jump’ nor rgyag ‘do’ in the host should change for tense. (4.108) shows mchongs ‘jump’ (past tense of mchong) and (4.109) shows brgyab ‘do’ (past of rgyag) inflected for tense. Furthermore, both of these components can be contrasted with other examples where tense change does occur.

The verb mchong ‘jump’ occurs as a lexical verbal and can have a different form for past tense (mchongs ‘jump’). The verb rgyag ‘do’ also occurs independently and with tense change (as brgyab ‘build’, ‘hit’ or ‘do’ for past etc.) as we have often seen.

A related point is that the morphemes in the host often undergo phonological change when inside a CP. The rgyag ‘do’ in the host has undergone phonological lenition and is pronounced differently to the rgyag ‘do’ used as the VBZR. While the VBZR still has its bilabial coda the second syllable of the host has lost this. The vowels are different as well. Inside the host the vowel has been lowered. I found four CPs exhibited this phonological change with rgyag ‘do’ as the second syllable of the host (entries 44, 1272, 729 and 920). There were also cases where rgyag ‘do’ was the first syllable of the host (entries 33 and 704) and rgyag ‘do’ was also the VBZR. These also underwent phonological change and do not show inflection for tense in their written forms. These are explained more in 3.6.3 and 5.2.1.1.
Consider this phonological representation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wylie Transliteration</th>
<th>mchong.rgyag</th>
<th>rgyag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>[tʃɔŋ gja]</td>
<td>[gjep]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12 Phonological change inside the host

4.11.2 Corpus Evidence
Consider these examples from the corpus of data:

4.110

\[\text{slob.phrug des lo.rim gnyis.pa bzhag nas thad.kar lo.rim gsum.par}\]

\[\text{student that ERG grade two remain from straight grade third.LOC}\]

\[\text{mchong.rgyag brgyab pa.red}\]

\[\text{jumping do PST}\]

*That student missed grade two and skipped straight to grade three.*

4.111

\[\text{khong thog.sa nyis thog nas mchongs song}\]

\[\text{3SG floor two on from jump TAM}\]

*He jumped from the second floor.*

In (4.110) the CP *mchong.rgyag + rgyag* ‘jumping + do’ is used and the VBZR *rgyag* ‘do’ is inflected for tense (*brgyab* ‘do’). Neither of the verbal morphemes that make the nominal host are inflected for tense.

In (4.111) the lexical verb *mchong* ‘jump’ is used independently of a CP construction and is inflected for tense (*mchongs* ‘jump’).

4.11.3 Corpus conclusion
Nothing in the corpus of data violated this hypothesis.
4.11.4 Final thoughts on the tense test

This test is not always useful when dealing with colloquial Tibetan. Many of the tenses have undergone phonological reduction and are pronounced the same way for all tenses (except imperative mood which is one of the traditional four Tibetan tenses that retains contrast). When examining literary Tibetan however this test can prove useful.

4.12 Host Test Chapter Conclusion

The host of a candidate CP proved a productive element to examine. Many of the tests focused on the host are definitive and show definitive syntactic differences between CPs and OVs.

The tests motivated by the hypothesis that a host is not an NP (or is somehow defective, resisting most NP modification) are best used in conjunction with each other. By itself, the adjective constraint test is only partially definitive. It is the weakest of the *NP tests. Used together with the number and demonstrative constraint tests however, it definitively differentiates CPs and OVs. The number constraint test is more definitive than the adjective constraint test but not as definitive as the demonstrative constraint test. This suggests that certain NP modifiers are more concrete and deictic than others (see 7.9).

The case test is definitive (hosts cannot take case marking) and provides a clear way of grouping the problematic data (data which violated the *NP hypothesis) by showing that the hosts in most of these problematic data take absolutive case. This demonstrates that the problematic data have a coherent set of properties and should be analyzed as a set. Genitive marking (specifically the host being possessed) is the least definitive of the case tests.

The topicalizer test shows that the host cannot be focused in the same way as the nominal of an OV. This test is definitive. The proper noun and pronoun tests demonstrate that the host of CPs cannot be either proper nouns or pronouns but this is more of a characteristic or property that can be observed and less of a reproducible test.

Host drop and host dependency tests inconclusive in differentiating between CPs and OVs. They do, however, indicate differences between the properties of CPs and compound verbs, having to do with semantic compositionality. The tense test is only useful in the written text, but it is definitive in that domain.
Chapter 5
Verbalizer tests

5.1 Introduction to the verbalizer tests
This chapter introduces some of the tests that are more focused on the verbal component of the CP. All the potential tests that attempted to distinguishing CPs and OVs on the basis of the V component failed. Rather than including them all, a short overview is given and the two most interesting are elaborated on. Even though these tests do not help distinguish CPs from OVs they still tell us some important things about what CPs are.

This thesis proposes that the CP is generally made up of a noun (not noun phrase) and a verb phrase. While the nominal component is defective the verbalizer is not. It can take any VP elements to modify it. It also occurs in all verbal structures (such as conjoining and reduplication). With this analysis VP elements should be allowed to separate the host from the verbalizer, but non-VP elements should not separate the host and its verbalizer. When this happens those constructions may not be complex predicates. Below the CP phrase rule is given again, slightly modified:

\[
\text{CP} \rightarrow \text{N} \ \text{VP}
\]

\[
\text{VP} \rightarrow (\text{AdvP}) \ (\text{NEG}) \ \text{VBZR} \ (\text{TAM})
\]

This then yields 5 tests on the VBZR. They are described below. Because they are not definitive, they are discussed more briefly than the host tests and the structural tests. Only the reduplication and conjoining tests are discussed more fully.

5.1.1 Adverb Test
The host is separated from the VBZR by an adverb phrase (which is assumed to be VP internal). This is possible with OV constructions and is also possible with CP constructions. This has already been seen in many data. Some of the compound verb constructions are also commonly separated by adverbs. Some of them cannot be separated by adverbs without losing their joint semantic meaning. The details of compound verbs are not discussed further.
5.1.2 Negation Test
The host is separated from the VBZR by negation. This is possible with OV constructions and CPs. This is not useful for distinguishing the two. Some compound verb constructions can also be made discontinuous by negation. Other compound verb constructions resist separated by negation.

5.1.3 TAM test
TAM attaches to the V in an OV construction and also attaches to the VBZR of a CP. It also attaches to the compound verb. This test is not definitive and is not expanded on below.

5.1.4 Reduplication Test
This test focuses on two kinds of reduplication in LT for the purposes of distinguishing CPs and OVs. Dealing with all the various forms of reduplication is beyond the scope of this thesis. See Vollman for a more detailed description of reduplication in Tibetan (2010).

It seems that all verbs (including VBZRs and auxiliaries) can be in reduplicated constructions. Two kinds of reduplication, lexical and grammatical are discussed in section 5.2.

5.1.5 Conjoining Test
Sometimes a V can have two Os. In CPs this is also possible. There can be two hosts for one VBZR. This test is not a good diagnostic for differentiating OVs and CPs but it does add to the knowledge of properties of CPs.

5.2 Reduplication Test
Two kinds of verbal reduplication are discussed here. First lexical reduplication is discussed and then grammatical reduplication.
5.2.1 Lexical Reduplication

5.2.1.1 Reduplicated Complex Predicates

Some CPs in LT exhibit an interesting form of reduplication. In LT nominalization is very common. As we are seeing in this thesis, verbalization is also very common. Often verbalizers and nominalizers occur in the same CP.

It seems that word categories (parts of speech) are very flexible in Tibetan. Grammatical constraints and pragmatic needs motivate speakers to use verbalizers and nominalizers to adjust the word classes of concepts. There is a small group of CPs which are made up of a single stem verb which was then nominalized which was then verbalized using the same single stem verb it started with as its VBZR. Tournadre and Dorje say they are a kind of verb “made up of a verb and an ‘internal’ object formed from the same root as the verb” (2005:458). Goldstein calls them “synonymic compounds” (1991:329-334).

Tournadre and Dorje offered the first 8 examples and I found 5 more in the LV data. These are listed in the table below.

Table 13 Complex predicates exhibiting lexical reduplication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical reduplication in CPs</th>
<th>Examples given by Tournadre and Dorje</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 རྱེད་མོ། rtsed.mo rtse playing</td>
<td>2 རྱེ་ rtse laughter NMZ laugh to laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ལྟས་མོ། lta mo lta look</td>
<td>4 རྐུ་ rku ma rku steal to steal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to watch a show</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 སོར་བ་ skor.ba skor circuit</td>
<td>6 དྲི་ དྲི་ dba ‘dri question question to ask a question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lexical reduplication in CPs

#### Examples given by Tournadre and Dorje

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>རྨི་ལམ་ rmi.lam rmi</td>
<td>dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>བཟ་མ་ za.ma za</td>
<td>food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Examples found in the LV data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>སྐྱུག་པ་ skyug.pa skyug</td>
<td>vomit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>རྒྱག་རྱེས་ rgyag.res rgyag</td>
<td>fighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ལྟ་ཚོད་ lta.tshod lta</td>
<td>experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>རྒྱག་གཏམ་ rgyag.gtam rgyag</td>
<td>sarcasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>བསྟོགས་འདུ་ tshogs.'du tshogs</td>
<td>meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example (5.1) illustrates 13 from the table above.

5.1

lo ltar nga.tsho phan.tshun skyon.brjod byed yas kyi tshogs.'du year every 1PL one.another critique do NMZ GEN meeting kyi.red meet(H) FUT

*Every year, we hold a meeting to discuss each other's short comings.*

<sup>16</sup> This is literary Tibetan.

<sup>17</sup> This is more Kham Tibetan and not common in Lhasa Tibetan.
In (5.1) we see the noun *tshogs.*’du ‘meeting’, as part of a CP with its initial syllable reduplicated to make the VBZR *tshogs* ‘meet’. This verbal component *tshogs* ‘meet’ can also be a full verb independently of a CP.

This kind of lexical reduplication is only seen in CPs. When this kind of reduplication is seen then the construction is likely a CP.

### 5.2.2 Grammatical Reduplication

In contrast to the limited lexical reduplication seen above, it seems that for every kind of verb grammatical reduplication is possible in OV and CPs. Consider this construction which signifies present continuing action.

#### 5.2.2.1 Continuing action reduplication

Reduplication schema:

```
OV: N V gin V gin
CP: host VBZR gin VBZR gin
```

OV example:

5.2

ལགས་སོ lags.so yes
ང་ nga
1SG
ལྟ་ lta look
གིན་ gin TAM
ལྟ་ lta look
གིན་ gin TAM
བྱད་ byed do
ཀི་ཡིན kyi.yin FUT

Yes. I'll be looking and see how things go.

Example (5.2) shows the independent verb *lta* ‘look’ in a reduplicated construction. Compare it with (5.3):

CP example:

5.3

ཕྲུ་གུ phru.gu child
འདིས ‘dis this
‘gag dri burp
brgyab gin TAM do
brgyab gin da.dung za eat
du.dung eat TAM
du.dung eat TAM
du.dung eat TAM
du.dung eat TAM
du.dung eat TAM

This child is burping, yet still eating.
Example (5.3) shows the CP consisting of ‘gag.dri ‘burp’ and bregyab ‘do’ in a reduplicated construction. The verbalizer is reduplicated with the continuous TAM marker gin. There is no apparent semantic difference between the reduplicated forms of (5.2) and (5.3). Thus continuing action reduplication is not definitive in differentiating OVs and CPs.

5.2.2.2 ‘Of course’ or ‘indubitative’ reduplication
Another kind of reduplication gives the meaning ‘of course’—as of the event denoted will occur as the speaker expects. It is the opposite of counter-expectation and also denotes certainty.

Reduplication schema:

\[
V \quad \text{dang} \quad V \\
\text{VBZR} \quad \text{dang} \quad \text{VBZR}
\]

Example (5.4) shows “of course” reduplication with a full verb.

5.4

spa.se rag na ‘gro chog dang chog
permit get if go allow of.course allow

If I get a permit, I can certainly go.

Example (5.4) shows the SSV chog ‘allow’ reduplicated grammatically to give the meaning “of course (I’m) allowed”. Surprisingly, this construction is also seen in some compound verbs:

5.2.2.3 With Compound Verbs
Dialogue 5.5

A: 1SG GEN voice essence decide TAM TAM Q

A. Do you recognize my voice?
Oh! Of course I do!

The second part of *ngo.chod* ‘recognize’ is reduplicated in the reply in (5.5) as *chod.dang.chod* ‘of course (I) recognize’. This is only possible in a context where the whole compound verb has already been stated.

Example (5.6) shows “of course” reduplication with a verbalizer in a CP.

(5.6) shows the same kind of reduplication with a CP (*gces.po* ‘cherish’ + *byed* ‘do’, one of the three most common verbalizers).

Example (5.7) shows the same kind of construction is also possible with CPs using lesser verbalizers. The host is *sens.’gul* ‘emotional.movement’ and the verbalizer *thebs* ‘be.done’ is reduplicated.
5.2.3 Final thoughts on reduplication tests

If verbal constructions exhibit lexical reduplication they are most likely CPs. This kind of reduplication is not seen in OVs. On the other hand, grammatical reduplication is acceptable in both OVs and CPs.

5.3 Conjoining Test

5.3.1 Introduction

Sometimes a verb can have two objects. In CPs this is also possible. There can be two hosts for one VBZR. This test is not a good diagnostic for differentiating OVs and CPs but it does add to the knowledge of properties of CPs.

Conjoining schema: OV: O (conjunction)O V
CP: host (conjunction)host VBZR

Two N+V sequences with different nouns but the same verbal component can be conjoined. Both nouns are left with a coordinating conjunction and the verb is only mentioned one time. This is true of both CPs and OVs.

There are semantic restrictions on this. The verbs must have the same semantic content (not just surface form) for conjoining to be acceptable.

First, some examples with SSVs are given and then some examples with VBZRs are given.

5.3.2 SSV conjoined examples

5.8

*deng.sang bod.pas skad.cha shod dus bod.skad dang*
recently Tibetan ERG speech speak when Tibetan.language and
*rgya.skad 'dres byas bshad kyis*
Chinese.language mix by speak TAM

These days when Tibetans speak, (they) mix Tibetan and Chinese together.
(5.8) has an SSV (‘dres ‘mix’) with two objects (bod.skad ‘Tibetan’ and rgya.skad ‘Chinese’). The objects are both predicated by the simple verb.

5.9
da.dung ja mar tog.tsam bsdog dgos yod
even more tea butter little pack need TAM
I still have to pack some tea and butter.

Example (5.9) also looks like conjoining. The verb bsdog ‘pack’ has two objects ja ‘tea’ and mar ‘butter’. (5.9) is different from (5.8) because there is no coordinating conjunction dang ‘and’ between the two objects. Because of this it could be argued that the two objects are actually a compound noun. This would also make sense because tea and butter are used together to make Tibetan butter tea.

5.3.3 CP conjoined examples

5.10
bod.rigs kyi phrag.dog byed mkhan la rma.bya zer gyi red
Tibetans ERG jealousy do NMZ LOC peacock say GEN TAM
Tibetans call a jealous person a peacock.

Example (5.10) is shown to illustrate the CP phrag.dog ‘jealousy’ + byed ‘do’ as used normally. Contrast (5.10) with (5.11) which is conjoined.

5.11
mtho ba la phrag.dog dang dma’.ba la mthong.chung byed pa’i
high NMZ LOC jealousy and lower LOC disdain do which
gnas.tshul ga.sa.ga.la yod.red
situation everywhere EXIST
Being jealous of people who are higher than you and looking down on people who are lower, is a situation that is everywhere.
Example (5.11) shows two hosts (phrag.dog ‘jealousy’ and mthong.chung ‘disdain’) being verbalized with just one verbalizer, byed ‘do’. In fact, it is more than just the hosts which are conjoined. Two NPs, headed by hosts are conjoined; ‘jealousy to higher (ones)’ and ‘disdain to lower (ones)’. (5.12) shows an elicited example with just the hosts:

5.12

\[
\text{phrag.dog dang mthong.chung byed}
\]

jealousy and disdain do

*Being jealous and looking down...*

Because the full CPs (phrag.dog + byed ‘be jealous’ and mthong.chung + byed ‘look down on (someone)’ have related semantic content they can be conjoined. Speakers said this was possible with many related CPs as long as they were rigs.gcig ‘one.kind’.

5.13

\[
\text{rnyid.to dang dus.bkag bzo}
\]

crumpling and limitation make

*Intended: make crumples and a deadline...*

Example (5.13) shows an elicited ungrammatical sentence. Conjoining is not possible in this CP because the hosts do not have related semantic content. The CPs rnyid.to + bzo ‘crumple’ and dus.bkag + bzo ‘make a time limit’ share verbalizers but are not close enough semantically to be conjoined. The host is the CPs semantic core and in this case the hosts are giving contrastive semantic content to the same verbalizer which is unacceptable.

5.3.4 Final thoughts on the conjoining test

While this test does not distinguish OVs from CPs it does show characteristics of CPs. The CP’s verbalizer gets most of its semantic content from the host. When two hosts are giving semantic content that is not related there is a clash and conjoining doesn’t work.
In cases of acceptable conjoining, the hosts seem to be forming one related macro event. This might solve the potential syntactic problem of the first host being separated from its verbalizer by another constituent (the second host).

This test shows cross-linguistic difference between Hindi and L.T. Concerning Hindi Mohanan says conjoining is “not possible when the entities to be conjoined are nominal hosts in CPs” (1994:207). Once again, in L.T, syntactically, anything a verb can do, the verbalizer can also do.

5.4 Verbalizer Test Chapter Conclusion
Syntactic diagnostics based on verb and verbalizer differences are not fruitful or definitive in L.T. Semantic diagnostics focused on the verb and the verbalizer prove more conclusive, as Kopp has shown (1998). This could be an interesting area for further research.
Chapter 6
Structural Tests

6.1 Introduction to the Structural Tests
In this chapter the tests presented are based on the structure of Lhasa Tibetan CPs. These tests are not focused on specific parts of the CP (host or VBZR) but on how the CP as a whole is constructed and what kind of ordering constraints it has.

Although the host and the VBZR can appear discontinuous in one sense, if the VBZR heads a VP that contains the host, it is clear that they are not actually discontinuous.

The claim in this thesis is that the CP in LT is one unitary construction. It resists reordering and splitting by argument level constituents. Some of these tests are based on those ideas.

The following is a brief explanation of each of the structural tests. Some are then more fully presented with data and final thoughts.

6.1.1 Joint Predication Test
This test can be used to show that the host is not an argument of the sentence or verbalizer. Furthermore, the host actually actively predicates and selects the other arguments in a sentence headed by the CP. The object in an OV has no such valence changing ability.

6.1.2 Relative Clause Test
In reordering a sentence to make a relative clause with an OV, the V comes before the O and a relativizer separates them. This cannot happen with CPs. VBZR cannot precede the host and be separated by a relativizer.
6.1.3 Object Fronting Test
Pragmatic considerations often motivate changing the regular order of SOV to OSV for the purpose of highlighting or topicalizing the object. With OV constructions this is possible; with CPs it is not.

6.1.4 Question Word Switch/Insertion Test
This test has two parts. The first inserts a question word into the CP (between the host and verbalizer). This is possible (and very common) in both OVs and CPs. The second replaces the host with a question word. So, in an OV sentence ‘I drank coffee’ could be yield ‘what did you drink?’ This is not possible with the components of CPs.

6.1.5 Transparency Test
The meaning of an OV constructions is roughly equal to the meaning of the O as it functions as an argument for the event denoted by the V. In other words, it is compositional in a canonical way. This is not always so with CPs. Often it is hard to deduce the meaning of the CP from just looking at its parts (the host and the VBZR). This test has been suggested by Bartee (2007), Denwood (1999), and Agha (1994). Agha says “the meaning of these phrases cannot generally be predicted from the localistic meaning of the noun and the verb used in the construction” (1994:107). This test is focused more on semantics and is beyond the purview of this study. Agha also says “when they occur with an associated noun in a phrasal verb construction, the meaning of the phrasal verb tends to lack compositionality, verging on the idiomatic” (1994:105). This test could be fruitful in future research and may represent how native speakers intuitively differentiate the two constructions.

6.2 The Structural Tests
Each of the structural tests (except the transparency test) listed above are now discussed in more detail.
6.3 Joint Predication Test

6.3.1 Introduction

As mentioned above the CP is made up of two elements, the host and the VBZR. The host (non-verbal component) is usually best analyzed as a noun, even though it may be made up of other morphologically combined components (see 3.6.3 and 4.11). Although these structures often look like an object followed by the verb predicate which selects for the object, this is not the optimal analysis. Nominal host elements are different from an object predicated by a SSV. The object is licensed by the verb syntactically and semantically. In a sentence like “I tea drink” the object “tea” is licensed by the verb drink. The agent is also licensed by the verb “drink”. The verb predicates, or licenses, the object and the subject. In a CP however, the host joins the VBZR not as an argument, but to form a (complex) predicate. Together the two components license arguments\(^\text{18}\) in the clause structure. Butt calls this monoclausality, defining that as when “two or more predication elements combine to predicate a single element” and claims it is a “central characteristic of complex predication” (2003:4). In this thesis it is referred to as “joint predication”.

One way to show that the nominal element is a host and the verbal element is a VBZR (that together they form a CP construction) is by demonstrating joint predication. This can be done by showing changes in transitivity based solely on changing the host. Changes in valence with varied hosts (but the same VBZR) can show that the host change the number of arguments licensed by the CP construction. If the VBZR can take multiple hosts to form CPs and some of these CPs have different number of arguments it demonstrates that the host is an active part in predication, as opposed to just another argument. Some hosts license more arguments than others regardless of the VBZR used.

Below, a variety of examples are given and compared, including SSVs, compound verbs, complex predicates (using the three most commonly accepted VBZRs), and candidate complex predicates using less common VBZRs. All of these are shown with multiple levels of valency.

\(^{18}\) By arguments I mean subject, object, and indirect object. By adjuncts I mean non argument constituents which are optional (location, time etc.).
6.3.2 Single Stem Verbs

6.3.2.1 Intransitive SSV

6.1

\[ \text{It is beneficial if a sick patient doesn't lie down all day but moves around a little.} \]

Example (6.1) shows the SSV **nyal** ‘rest’ with just one argument **nad.pa** ‘sick-person’. This illustrates a class of SSV which are limited to one argument. The SSV **nyal** ‘rest’ cannot change and license more arguments.

6.3.2.2 Transitive SSV

6.2

\[ \text{He reads the scriptures well.} \]

Example (6.2) shows the SSV **klog** ‘read’ with two with two arguments **khong** ‘he’ and **dpe.cha** ‘scripture’. This argument valence also cannot change.

6.3.2.3 Ditransitive SSV

6.3

\[ \text{I always take (my) son to school.} \]
Example (6.3) shows the SSV skyl ‘deliver’ with three arguments; ngas ‘1.ERG’, bu ‘son’ and slob.grar ‘school.LOC’. In this sentence slob.grar ‘school’ is not an adjunct as it is licensed by the predicate. Again, the predicate cannot change valence.

6.3.3 Compound Verbs
The following are compound verbs with different levels of valency.

6.3.3.1 Intransitive compound verb
6.4

khong gnyid.khug ma song
3SG fall.asleep not TAM
She did not fall asleep.

Example (6.4) has just one argument khong ‘he’ predicated by the verb gnyid.khug ‘sleep’. Other arguments cannot be added.

6.3.3.2 Transitive compound verb
6.5

ngas khong mig ngo.chod kyi 'dug yin.na'i su yin min gsal.po
1SG ERG 3SG eyes recognize TAM TAM but who TAM NEG clear
dran gyi mi 'dug
remember TAM not TAM
I recognise her, but can't clearly remember who she is.

In (6.5) the compound verb ngo.chod ‘recognize’ has two arguments; ngas ‘1SG.ERG’ and khong ‘her’. This verb cannot change its transitivity.
6.3.3.3 Ditransitive compound verb

Examples of ditransitive compound verbs were not found in the data. Further research may yield some examples. If they were found they would likely not be able to change valence.

6.3.4 Complex Predicates: Examples from the Big Three

To begin with it is helpful to show the three most common and widely accepted VBZRs with multiple levels of transitivity. These three VBZRs are rgyag/brgyab, byed/byas, and gtong/bdang.

6.3.4.1 Constructions with rgyag/brgyab

The VBZR rgyag ‘do’ is not ditransitive as a SSV (it is transitive as in (6.6)) but it can be part of a ditransitive CP like bgo bsha’ rgyag ‘to divide’, zero transitive like (6.7), or part of an intransitive CP like (6.8). This proves that the host is also a part of the predication. The host adds to the argument structure of the verbal component. The host licenses another argument which the VBZR by itself would not normally allow. Below, multiple levels of transitivity in CPs all using rgyag ‘do’ as their VBZR are given.

6.3.4.1.1 rgyag used independently (as a SSV)

Here is rgyag as SSV:

6.6

sman.khang rgyag yas kyi rnam.grangs de'i las.'gan
hospital build NMZ GEN project that GEN work responsibility
sus 'khyer gyi yod ras
who ERG take TAM TAM Q
Who is taking responsibility for the project of building a hospital?

The construction sman.khang + rgyag ‘hospital build’ is not a CP. The noun sman.khang ‘hospital’ cannot be a host for a number of reasons. First, CPs are usually institutionalized activities. This is too specific. Secondly (and related) it could be
modified by number, adjective or demonstrative. Thirdly, it could be reordered in a relative clause or fronted in an object fronting construction.

Hospital building is not a common, institutionalized activity. When rgyag/brgyab ‘do’ is used with the sense of ‘build’ it is often (but not always: see (4.84)) best analyzed as a SSV. This is especially true of famous buildings that were built just one time. Specific temples and monasteries and the Potala Palace would not be general or institutionalized enough to be the host of a CP with rgyag (even if many of them have been built more than once, as in the case of many historical buildings rebuilt after being destroyed in the Cultural Revolution). More generic building actions (roof building, house building) can be considered hosts of CPs with rgyag as the VBZR.

6.3.4.1.2 Zero transitivity complex predicate with rgyag
Example (6.7) doesn’t have any arguments. This seems to be functioning like a dummy argument in meteorological sentences in English. It is in fact also a sentence about the weather. This example shows the host and VBZR jointly (not) predicating because rgyag by itself would never be without an argument. The host is lowering the valence of the VBZR.

6.7

mdang.dgong ‘brug.skad shugs. chen rgyag dus nga zhe.po cig zhed
last.night thunder strength big hit when 1SG very a fear
byung
TAM

Last night when it thundered loudly, I was very scared.

Agha mentions the related zero transitive verb char.pa ‘rain’ + btang ‘do’, saying “this verb requires no arguments (it is a ‘subjectless’ weather verb)” (1994:108).
6.3.4.1.3 Intransitive complex predicate with rgyag (one argument)

Dialogue 6.8

A: 2SG self yawn very hit TAM stomach hunger past Q

A. You are really yawning. Are you hungry?

B: 1SG LOC noon food get not TAM

B. Of course (I’m) yawning. I didn't get any lunch.

In dialogue (6.8) a.stong rgyag ‘yawn’ does not license an object. It is intransitive and the only argument taken is khyed.rang ‘2SG’. The host in this CP is a.stong ‘a.yawn’ and the VBZR is brgyab ‘do’. The same VBZR is kept but the host is different, resulting in valence change.

Also in the reply part of the dialogue the argument is dropped. This zero drop is quite common in Tibetan especially when the argument has already been introduced into the discourse. In this reply the VBZR is reduplicated giving the meaning of ‘of course.’ See 5.2.2.2 for more on this kind of reduplication.

Example (6.9) has the argument nga ‘I’ and the CP goms.pa ‘walking’ + brgyab ‘do’.

Since I usually don't walk very much, I got completely worn out.
6.3.4.1.4 Transitive complex predicate with rgyag (two arguments)

6.10

Unless my sister pitches in some money, I will not be able to buy this computer alone.

The CP in (6.10) (snon.pa + brgyab ‘pitch.in’) has two arguments. The agent here is a.cag ‘older.sister’ and the theme is dngul ‘money’.

Dialogue 6.11

A: own ERG own LOC consciousness do if come FUT Q

B: realize NMZ TAM NMZ PL ERG self ERG self LOC consciousness

do FUT

Both the question and answer in (6.11) have two arguments, the agent and the goal. In the answer the agent is actually given twice (as can be seen by the two ergatives). This could be analyzed as agent rtogs.pa ‘realization’ yod.pa.tshos ‘having.ones.ERG’, rang.gis ‘themselves.ERG’ agent repeated, and rang.la ‘to.themselves’ as goal.
6.3.4.1.5 Ditransitive complex predicate with rgyag (three arguments)

Below is an example of rgyag ‘do’ (in the honorific register form of bskyon ‘do’) predicking three arguments. This is possible because the host, which, although nominal, jointly predicates in this CP.

6.12

paA.lags kyi nga dang co.cog la rngan.pa bgo.bsha’ bskyon byung
father(H) ERG 1SG IMP older.brother LOC snacks division do(H) TAM
(Our) father divided the snacks between myself and my older brother.

The CP in (6.12) has the host bgo.bsha’ ‘division’. This, together with the VBZR licenses three arguments. The paA.lags ‘father’ is the agent and has ergative case marking. The speaker and his older brother are co-beneficiaries of the action. The object being divided is the rngan.pa ‘snacks’ which have the role of theme. Because the speaker is talking about his father the register of the VBZR is raised to an honorific level and the polite version of rgyag is used, bskyon. Neither rgyag nor bskyon ‘do’ would normally be ditransitive. The host permits the VBZR to have extra arguments.

6.13

ngas sgor.mo gcig sprang.po kha.shas la bgo.bsha’ bryab byas ster
1SG ERG coin one beggar some LOC division hit then give
pa.yin
PRF

I divided one yuan between a few beggars and gave it to them.

Example (6.13) uses the same CP as the above and has three arguments, ngas ‘I.ERG’, sgor.mo + gcig ‘one coin’ 1 yuan, and sprang.po ‘some beggars’. This time the VBZR is not in honorific register. The VBZR alone could not predicate all three arguments. The host works with the VBZR to license these arguments. This shows the host and VBZR form a single complex predicate (joint predication).
6.3.4.2 Constructions with byed/byas

6.3.4.2.1 byed used independently (as SSV)

Dialogue 6.14

A: child crawling bend know TAM TAM Q
B: crawling bend know almost do TAM

A. Does (your) child know how to crawl?
B. He nearly knows how to crawl.

In (6.14) byed ‘do’ is not a host. While the only nominal, sgab.hu ‘crawling’, is a host, it already has a VBZR ‘gugs ‘bend’ and byed is an SSV here. byed ‘do’ is commonly used as an SSV.

6.3.4.2.2 Intransitive complex predicate with byed (one argument)

6.15

Those people from the countryside are smiling a lot.
Son, when it is time to study, don't avoid it.

Both (6.15) and (6.16) feature CPs with just one argument (mi ‘people’ and rang ‘you’ respectively). Both CPs kha.tsher.tsher ‘smiling’ + byed ‘do’ and slob.spyong ‘study’ + byed ‘do’ only require one argument.

6.3.4.2.3 Transitive complex predicate with byed (two arguments)

6.17

I respect you.

Example (6.17) is clearly transitive with the two arguments ngas ‘I’ and khyed.rang ‘you’ licensed by the whole CP, not just the VBZ.

6.18

Why do you hold a grudge against him?

Example (6.18) is also clearly transitive, containing two arguments (khyed.rang ‘you’ and khong ‘him’) both licensed by the non-verbal component gting.nad ‘grudge’ and the verbal component byed ‘do’.
6.3.4.2.4 Ditransitive complex predicate with byed (three arguments)

Example (6.19) has three arguments ngas ‘I’, khyed.rang ‘you’, and dge.rgan ‘teacher’. The VBZR is the same but the host is different. This shows the host is jointly predicing.

6.19

ngas khyed.rang la dge.rgan yag.po cig ngo.sprod byed kyi.yin
1SG ERG 2SG self LOC teacher good a introduction do FUT
I will recommend a good teacher to you.

6.3.4.3 Candidate complex predicates with minor verbalizer zhu/zhus demonstrating joint predication

If joint predication shows that CPs are a unified structure (as opposed to just object plus SSV collocations) then the minor VBZRs should also show evidence of changing valency with changing hosts.

Evidence given shows that changing the host with the same minor VBZR can change the number of arguments. Examples show that CPs with the VBZR zhu/zhus also have multiple levels of valence. After the big three, zhu is the next most commonly used VBZR.

6.3.4.3.1 zhu used independently (as SSV)

Dialogue 6.20

A: butter.tea drink(H)
A. Please have some tea.

B: no.thanks(H) 1SG say(h) TAM NEG
B. No thank you. I won't have any. (lit. 'I don't wish to request it from you.')
In (6.20) the VBZR in question *zhu* ‘say’ is used independently of a host. This is not a CP construction.

In (6.21) *zhus* ‘say’ is also an SSV (operating without a host) with two arguments. The object *khyed.rang* ‘you’ cannot be the host of a CP with *zhus* ‘say’ because it is a pronoun (see 4.8). Also, because of case restrictions (see section 4.5) the locative marker cannot be on a host. Thus, *zhus* ‘say’, in this case is transitive. This shows that even in single stem usage *zhu/zhus* is somewhat flexible. This does not take away from the fact that when in a CP the host is helping determine the number of permissible arguments.

6.21

ངས་ རེད་རང་ ཆོག་ཏོ་ ལ་ སུས་ པ་ཡིན དེ་དག་ དུས་ སྐབས་ གསན་ དུག
1SG ERG 2SG self LOC many say(h) PRF but listen TAM person

‘dug
TAM

*I told you many times, but you don’t listen.*

### 6.3.4.3.2 Intransitive complex predicate with *zhu* (one argument)

6.22

ལྷན་རྒྱས་ གཉིས་ བཅར་ དུས་ ཉང་ རྨིའི་ རྩི་ རྒལ་ བཅར།
lhan.rgyas gnyis 'khrung.sa ga.dus ras nga rten.'brel zhu gar
together two marriage when Q 1SG congratulations say(h) for.purpose

འདྲ་ དྲེལ་ རྣམ་འབྱེལ་ གཡི་ཡིན
bcar gyi.yin
go.visit FUT

*When will the two of you get married? I will come to celebrate it.*

Example (6.22) is good example of monovalent use. The only argument is *nga* ‘I’. (6.23) is also clearly monovalent, licensing the same argument. In each the licensed argument is not the host—the host is part of a joint predication with the verbalizer.
6.23

I will retire next year.

6.3.4.3.3 Transitive complex predicate with zhu (two arguments)

6.24

Please wait for him.

6.25

I need to go and ask that leader something.

Example (6.24) and (6.25) both have two arguments and use the same VBZR, zhu. In (6.24) they are khyed.rang ‘you’ and khong ‘him’. In (6.25) they are nga ‘1SG’ and dbu.khrid ‘leader’. The verbalizer component of the CP is the same as in (6.23) but the sentences in (6.24) and (6.25) explicitly predicate two arguments.
6.3.4.3.4 Ditransitive complex predicate with zhu (three arguments)

6.26

I will introduce you to her.

Example (6.26) shows zhu ‘say’ in a ditransitive CP. The CP ngo.sprod ‘introduction’ + zhu ‘say’ has three arguments; ngas ‘I.ERG’, khyed.rang ‘you’, and khong.la ‘her’. (6.27) is also ditransitive.

6.27

I will briefly acquaint you with some aspects of Lhasa.

Because the VBZR zhu ‘say’ is the same in all of the CPs in this section the semantics of the host must be the factor in determining valency. This proves the host jointly predicates in CPs and it also proves that zhu ‘say’ while not one of the most common three VBZRs, also jointly predicates in CPs.

6.3.5 Final thoughts on joint predication

Joint predication is a core characteristic of CPs. One way to check for joint predication is by showing how valence or transitivity changes with host switching. SSVs cannot change valence with different objects in the way that VBZRs can with different hosts. This test shows a distinctive property of some CPs.
6.3.6 Summary of Data

This table summarizes the joint predication test. The third of the big three VBZRs, *gtong/btang* ‘do’ is included even though examples were not given in this chapter. There are ditransitive examples of CPs using the other two but no examples of a ditransitive CP using *gtong* ‘do’. With *gtong* ‘do’ the opposite happens. As a SSV *gtong* ‘send’ is already ditransitive. When hosts are added and it is a VBZR it loses transitivity. This still shows that the host is important in licensing number of arguments in CPs.

Table 14 Predication with Single Stem and Compound Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB TYPE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>Zero Argument</th>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Ditransitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single stem</td>
<td>དབ་ nyal ‘sleep’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>མལ༔ klog ‘read’</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ཞྱེལ skyl ‘deliver’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound verb</td>
<td>གོའི་ད་ཁུ gnyid.khug ‘fall.asleep’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>སྟོག མཆོད ngo.chod ‘recognize’</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB TYPE</td>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
<td>Zero Argument</td>
<td>Intransitive</td>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>Ditransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single stem rgyag</td>
<td>rgyag 'build'</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP with rgyag</td>
<td>བྲུག་སྙིང་རྒྱག ‘brug.skad rgyag ‘to.thunder’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>འབྲུཅིག་སྤོང་རྒྱག ‘a.stong rgyag ‘yawn’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>སོན་པ་རྒྱག 'snon.pa rgyag ‘pitch.in’</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>བོག་ཤིག་དེ་རྒྱག 'bgo.bsha’ rgyag ‘divide'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 Joint predication with CPs headed by the VBZR byed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB TYPE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>Zero Argument</th>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Ditransitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single stem byed</td>
<td>དེ་ byed ‘do’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP with byed</td>
<td>བཀྲ་ཚེ་ར་ byed ‘smile’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gཏིང་ནད་ byed ‘begrudge’</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>གཞན་ཟོད་ byed ‘introduce’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single stem gton</td>
<td>གཞན་ gton ‘send’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 Joint predication in CPs headed by the minor VBZR zhu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB TYPE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>Zero Argument</th>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Ditransitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single stem zhu</td>
<td>जु zhu ‘say(H)’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible CP with zhu</td>
<td>རྒན་ཡོལ་ རྒན་ཡོལ་ zhu ‘retire’</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>དཔེབས་སྒུག་ དཔེབས་སྒུག་ zhu ‘wait(h)’</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ཆོས་པོ་ ཆོས་པོ་ zhu ‘introduce(h)’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Relative Clause Test

6.4.1 Introduction

The normal word order for a simple transitive sentence using a SSV in LT is SOV. Pro-drop is common in LT and is seen (6.28).

6.28

snang.ba bzhag nas yi.ge yag.po bris dang
attention put by letter good write IMP

Concentrate and write the letter well.

LT uses a relativizer and gap strategy for its relative clauses. The relativizer would follow the verb and immediately precede the object (or subject). This relativization strategy allows for a word order represented in the schema below:

Relative clause schema:
S O V → S Ø V REL O
An example of an object rearranged into a relative clause is:

6.29

...bris pa'i yi.ge...

write which letter

...letter which (was) written

This elicited example was made by reordering parts of (6.28) above.

This order is possible with sentences using SSVs and their objects but not with hosts and VBZRs in prototypical CPs. Compare (6.30) made by reordering parts of the same corpus example (6.28).

6.30

*...bzhag pa'i snang.ba...

put which attention

Intended: ...attention which was put...19

This can be shown in this schema:

**Relativization schema: Host VBZR ➔ *VBZR REL host ...**

If this order and separation of the host and VBZR is ungrammatical for CPs it could be used to decide whether other VBZR-like words should be labelled as VBZRs or SSVs. If these verbal components cannot be separated from their host like components in relativization then they too are VBZRs. If, on the other hand, they can be found in relativized constructions and can leave their ‘hosts’ behind then they must be labelled regular single stem (lexical) verbs and their ‘hosts’ should just be called NPs.

In this test, examples of relativized sentences from the data are given first. This includes SSV examples and examples from two of the three most common and widely accepted VBZRs. Finally, examples using less common, candidate VBZRs are examined to see which category they should be put into.

---

19 There was some disagreement among speakers as to how unacceptable this phrase was. Either way it is not at all normal or natural.
6.4.2 Examples from SSVs (non CP sequences)

Example (6.31) shows the verb ‘khrud ‘wash’ in normal sentence position. The verb comes sentence final followed by various TAM auxiliaries.

6.31

\[\text{I'm washing a quilt cover.}\]

Compare (6.31) with (6.32) using ‘khrud/bkrus ‘wash’ (present and past tense forms) in a relative clause. The verb is no longer the main predication element of the whole sentence. The relativizer pa’i ‘which’, appears post verbally and then the modified nominal element.

6.32

\[\text{The jacket you washed today has become really clean.}\]

Here, ‘jacket wash’ is rearranged to make ‘washed which jacket…’(literally).

6.4.3 Examples from complex predicates using the most common verbalizers

Contrast (6.31) and (6.32) with the VBZR most widely used. These are rgyag/brgyab ‘hit’, byed/byas ‘do’ and gtong/bdang ‘send.’ As VBZR these are all glossed ‘do.’

6.4.3.1 Examples from complex predicates using the verbalizer rgyag

Compare (6.33) and (6.34) below. (6.33) shows the host VBZR pair sa.yig ‘signature’ and rgyag ‘do’. In (6.34) the CP is in a relative clause and its host precedes the VBZR. The non-verbal component has not been separated from the VBZR in the same way that an object and SSV are separated.
6.33
have you not signed the contract yet?

6.34
no one will abide with this unsigned contract.

it is acceptable to separate the host and the vbzr with negation or adverbs but it is not acceptable to change the order of the host and the vbzr. it is not grammatical to have the vbzr be in the relative clause which modifies the host.

compare this simple intransitive cp (6.35) with the relative clause in (6.36).

6.35
the food has gone moldy.

6.36
unless moldy food is thrown out, eating it will make you sick.
In (6.36) the VBZR brgyab ‘do’ is followed by a relativizing particle and the host ham.spu ‘mold’ still precedes it. The object kha.lag ‘food’ is modified by the relative clause. This is evidence that the host and the VBZR are part of a unified construction conceptually and grammatically. (6.37) is ungrammatical and shows that the host cannot be modified by a relative clause which uses its VBZR.

6.37

* རྒྱུ་པའི་ཧམ་སྤུ་བརྒྱབ་

\[ \text{brgyab pa'i ham.spu} \]

\[ \text{do which mold} \]

\text{Intended: mold which has come}

In the corpus of data no examples of CPs using rgyag/brgyab as VBZR were found to be relativize clauses with the host following the VBZR. Speakers attested that this would usually not be grammatical.

6.4.3.2 Examples from complex predicates using the verbalizers byed and gtong

In (6.38) the CP consisting of khas.len ‘agreement’ + byed ‘do’ is given in a normal non-relativized form. The subject and object both precede the CP.

6.38

\[ \text{ngas rang la khas.len gang.yang byed rgyu ma byung} \]

\[ 1SG ERG 2SG LOC agreement even.any do NMZ not TAM } \]

\text{I didn't promise you anything.}

In (6.39) the same CP is in a relativized construction, ‘work which was promised.’ The components of the CP are still together when modifying the object las.ca ‘work’.

6.39

\[ \text{khas.len byas pa'i las.ca tan.tan bsgrub dgos red} \]

\[ \text{agreement do which work definitely complete need TAM} \]

\text{Work that has been agreed upon should definitely be completed.}
In all the data no examples were found where the host was being modified and separated from the VBZR. If the CP was found in a relative clause it always kept the host and VBZR together as in (6.39).

Consider these two *gtong/btang* examples and the following attempts at relativizing them:

6.40

rang gis rang la sems.gso **gtang** dgos red
2SG ERG self LOC consolation do need TAM

*You should console yourself.*

6.41

* *** རང་ གིས་ རང་ ལ་***

\[
\textbf{btang} \text{ pa'i } \text{ sems.gso}
\]

*do which consolation*

*Intended: ...consolation which has been done...*

6.42

deng.sang bslab.graA de'i cha.rkyen yar.rygas zhe.drags **btang** shag
recently school that GEN conditions improvement very do INFR

*The conditions of the school have been greatly improved recently.*

6.43

* *** རང་ གིས་ རང་ ལ་***

\[
\textbf{btang} \text{ pa'i } \text{ yar.rygas}
\]

do which improvement

*Intended: improvements which were done*
The CPs in both (6.40) and (6.42) cannot be put into relative clauses in the way shown in (6.41) and (6.43).

Consider the initially puzzling example below:

6.44

There is great benefit if you confess your previously committed non-virtue.

At first glance it looks like sdig.pa ‘sin’ + byas ‘do’ is a CP (host + VBZR) which has been rearranged in the relative construction. But actually the nominal component, sdig.pa ‘sin’ is connected to a different verbal component. While sdig.pa ‘sin’ is commonly collocated with byed/byas ‘do’ it is used here with bshags ‘confess’. The verb byas ‘do’ here is not a VBZR and is working independently as a full verb in relative clause modifier of sdig.pa ‘sin’. Thus it is not problematic data. It does not show the VBZR byas ‘do’ in a relative construction with its own host.

6.4.4 Examples from complex predicates using less common verbalizers

Below CP candidates using zhu/zhus ‘say’, thebs ‘plant’ and rku ‘steal’ are examined in relation to syntactic reordering in relative clauses.

6.4.4.1 Verbalizer candidate zhu/zhus

In (6.45) the verb zhu ‘say’ has full semantic content and is used in a relative clause as a SSV, not a VBZR.
Do you remember the situation I told you about before?

The OV sequence consisting of gnas.tshul ‘situation’ and zhus ‘say’ would not be considered a CP. Regarding zhu ‘say’, Hugoniot says it can be both a “verb stem” and that it “is one of the verb stems that is used as a VBZR to form phrasal verbs in combination with other words” (2003:48). This is what is seen in (6.46):

Who are we inviting to our banquet this year?

In (6.46) zhus ‘say’ is being used as a VBZR. Its host is gdan.’dren ‘invitation’. In (6.47) an attempt is made to put the VBZR and host in a relative clause. The result is unacceptable.

6.4.4.2 Verbalizer candidate thebs

The minor VBZR thebs ‘plant’ can be used to form involuntary or non-volitional CPs.
He related to me that he had come from a place ravaged by famine.

Here the CP mu.ge ‘famine’ and thebs ‘happen’ are used in a relative construction with sa.cha ‘place’. In its full verbal use thebs can be ‘plant’. It would be grammatically unacceptable to relativize the host of this CP as is seen in (6.49):

6.49

* ... དབྱང་ཞུལ། བས་ནས་འདྲ་འདྲ ... thebs pa'i mu.ge happened which famine

Intended: The famine which happened…

6.4.4.3 Verbalizer candidate rgu/rgus

In (6.50) the CP consisting of rku.ma ‘thieving’/‘thief’ and rkus ‘steal’ is given in a non-relativized form see section 4.3.5.1, 4.5.5.1 and 5.2.1.1 for more on this CP.

6.50

khos ngan.skul byas nas phru.gu de la rku.ma rku ru.bcug pa.red 3SG ERG instigation do by child that LOC thief steal cause.to PST

He incited that child and caused him to steal.

6.51

* ... ཕྱོན་པའི་ཤྱོག་ ... rkus pa'i rku.ma steal which thief

Intended: thieving which was stolen
Example (6.51) is ungrammatical and further supports the hypothesis that the nominal components of CPs cannot ordinarily be modified by a relative clause using just the VBZR.

### 6.4.5 Using the test to suggest some common collocations are not complex predicate constructions

The syntactic reordering test can be used to help decide if a construction is a complex predicate or not. Below is an example of very commonly occurring N + V construction. The collocation *skad.cha* ‘speech’ and *bshad* ‘speak’ occurs very commonly and it may or may not be a complex predicate.

6.52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>so.sos</th>
<th>bshad pa'i</th>
<th>skad.cha</th>
<th>lag.len</th>
<th>bstar</th>
<th>thub</th>
<th>mkhan</th>
<th>red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>speak</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>speech</td>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>apply</td>
<td>able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…someone who is able to put into practice what he himself says.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bshad pa'i</th>
<th>skad.cha</th>
<th>go</th>
<th>gi</th>
<th>mi</th>
<th>'dug gas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speak</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>TAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Don't (you) understand what I said?*

Example (6.52) and (6.53) show *skad.cha* ‘speech’ and *bshad* ‘speak’ rearranged in a relative construction. (6.54) shows the same collocation in the honorific register:

6.54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>khong</th>
<th>gis</th>
<th>gsungs</th>
<th>pa'i</th>
<th>bka'.mol</th>
<th>de.tsho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>speak</td>
<td>which</td>
<td>speech(H)</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The things that he said…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In (6.54) the collocation which has been rearranged is *bka’.*mol ‘speech’ and *gsungs* ‘speak’. Both components are in the honorific register. (6.52), (6.53) and (6.54) all suggest that *skad.cha* ‘speech and *bshad* ‘speak’ is not a CP.

6.4.6 Final thoughts on relativization

The data corpus of 6000 plus sentences supports the hypothesis that the host and the VBZR of a CP resist syntactic reordering in relative clauses. The elicited sentences also support this hypothesis.

There are three possible reasons this reordering of the VBZR and the host is resisted. First, because the VBZR is more closely bound (on the lexical level) to the host in a CP construction it cannot be rearranged in this way. Together they form one monoclausal unitary predicate (Butt 2003:4). Mohanan says “the failure of the nominal to relativize is… because it is internal to a CP” (1994:210). If one were to make a relative clause using the CP then the whole CP would be moved as one unit, not just a part of it. Because a VBZR is semantically ‘light’ and receives much of its meaning from the host, the “semantic core” (Hugoniot 2003:64), when this reordering occurs the meaning is unclear.

Secondly, because the host usually has less specificity than concrete objects and is representative of a general verbal action not an actual deictic referent it would make sense that the host cannot be relativized. That is, because the nominal part of the CP doesn’t usually refer to an actual specific object it cannot be further delineated by a relative clause. Its qualities cannot be referred to specifically in the same way a specific object’s qualities can be referred to specifically. Other tests also show the host is more resistant to NP modifications such as adjective, number and demonstrative.

6.5 Object Fronting Test

6.5.1 Introduction

In a SOV sentence (where the verb is single stem) the object can be fronted to give OSV order. While the host is nominal and sometimes the CP resembles an OV sequence the host cannot be fronted in the same way. The examples in (6.55)-(6.58) illustrate this pattern.
6.55

khos  phor.par  bcag  byung
3SG  ERG cup  LOC  break  TAM

He broke the cup

6.56

phor.par  kho  bcag  byung
cup  LOC  3SG  ERG  break  TAM

The cup he broke.

6.57

kho.tshos  rgyag.res  brgyab
3P.ERG  fighting  do

They fought (did fighting)...

6.58

rgyag.res  kho.tshos  brgyab
fighting  3P.ERG  do

Intended: fighting, they did...

Example (6.55) shows an SOV sequence where the V bcag ‘break’ is a lexical verb (SSV). (6.56) shows the same sentence with the object phor.pa ‘cup’ fronted. This is perfectly acceptable. (6.57) shows a subject and CP sentence. The host is rgyag.res ‘fighting’ and the VBZR is brgyab ‘do.’ In (6.58) the host is fronted (like an object would be fronted) and the result is ungrammatical.
Although the normal word order for LT is typically SOV (or AOV/SV) there can be some variation for pragmatic reasons. Tournadre explains “the object may precede the subject (OSV) in order to give emphasis to the latter, or in the case of certain questions” (2005:79). Mohanan offers a conclusive CP test for Hindi saying “in Hindi, all and only direct daughters of S may scramble” but “the nominal within the CP, however, is not free to scramble” and “all the nominals with the exception of the one internal to the CP enjoy freedom of word order” (1994:203). While the rearranging in LT can switch the order of the subject and the object there are constraints prohibiting any change of the verb’s final position. Tournadre says “in both Spoken and Literary Tibetan, the verb always comes last in a clause” (2005:79). Because the verb never moves out of final position this phenomenon should not be called ‘scrambling’. Instead of the full ‘scrambling’ of Hindi this phenomena in Lhasa Tibetan can be labelled object fronting and can also yield significant results. Here are two simple examples Tournadre and Dorje give (2005:79):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 འདི་ ཨེབ་ རྱད</th>
<th>2 ཨེབ་ འདི་ རྱད</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'di  deb  red</td>
<td>deb 'di  red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this book TAM</td>
<td>book this TAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a book</td>
<td>It's this book.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In simple V (SSV) sentences the object can be switched with the subject. This would change the clause from SOV to OSV. This can be motivated by pragmatic concerns such as topicalization. Often it is not a straight switch and demonstrative, locative or other morphemes are also added. In sentences on the more literary side of the spectrum, the topicalizer could be used. This can be represented by the following schema:

**Object fronting schemas:**

*(with transitive SSVs)*

Subject  Object  SSV

Can also become→

Object  Subject  SSV

*(with intransitive CPs)*

Subject  Host  VBZR

Cannot become→

*Host  Subject  VBZR
This test also gives us useful criteria for distinguishing compound verbs and OV constructions.\textsuperscript{20}

The following are examples of object fronting in simple sentences predicated by SSVs.

\textbf{6.5.2 Object fronting with single stem verbs}

\textbf{6.5.2.1 Simple single stem verb examples}

\textit{6.59}

\begin{verbatim}
rtar te khonl la 'drogs sng
horse that 3SG LOC frighten TAM
\end{verbatim}

\textit{The horse was frightened by his presence.}

Example (6.59) demonstrates normal word order. The main verb ‘drogs ‘frighten’ is a SSV. Obviously ‘he’ + LOC + ‘frighten’ would not be a CP. Usually the host of a CP does not take the LOC marker (or any other case marker) and as stated in the host test chapter the host of a CP cannot be a pronoun. The subject does not have an ergative case marker.

\textit{6.60}

\begin{verbatim}
khong la rta de 'drogs sng
3SG LOC horse that frighten TAM
\end{verbatim}

\textit{The horse was frightened by his presence.}

This rearranged, elicited sentence (6.60) is acceptable. Consider (6.61):

\textit{6.61}

\begin{verbatim}
mo.Ta'i skad la nga 'drogs byng
car GEN voice LOC 1SG frighten TAM
\end{verbatim}

\textit{I was startled by the sound of the car.}

\textsuperscript{20} Compound verbs are even less likely to have component order switched.
In (6.61) the object is already fronted. The subject has a different semantic role here, that of experient. There is no case marker on subject again. Again, the verb ‘drogs ‘frighten’ is single stem. This could be put into regular sentence order as shown in the elicited example (6.62):

6.62

ང་ nga mo.Ta'i skad la ‘drogs byung
1SG car GEN voice LOC frighten TAM
I was startled by the sound of the car.

These simple examples show switching of constituents is acceptable in OVs as long as the verb remains final.

6.5.2.2 Object fronting with SSVs in more complicated sentences (ditransitive or with adjunct clauses)

Analysis becomes more complicated in sentences with two arguments and adjunct clause/s or sentences with three arguments.

6.63

བཀིས་ bkris kyis khong gi rkang.par rdo bzhus byas bcag pa.red
Tashi ERG 3SG TAM leg.LOC rock throw then break PST
Tashi threw a rock and broke that person’s leg. (lit. ‘Tashi broke his leg’, but this is ambiguous in English.)

Example (6.63) displays normal word order. Tashi is the Agent/subject who acts on the ‘3S’ pronoun’s leg. There are case markers for the subject and the goal (ERG and LOC respectively). The clause ‘to his leg’ is an adjunct clause. The words rdo ‘rock’ + bzhus ‘throw’ would not constitute a CP. Both rdo ‘rock’ and rkang.par ‘to his leg’ can be moved to some positions.

An argument level NP could separate the object and verb in this sentence. This could not happen with a host and it’s VBZR.
6.64

Tashi threw a rock and broke that person's leg.

In (6.64) the NP *khong.gi rkang.par* ‘to his leg’ has been fronted. This is also acceptable.

6.65

Tashi threw a rock and broke that person's leg.

In (6.65) the subject is kept sentence initial but the object *rdo* ‘rock’ is switch with the location ‘to his leg’. This is acceptable. (6.66) show a final elicited rearranged order:

6.66

*Intended: Tashi threw a rock and broke that person's leg.*

This rearranged version is not acceptable. With this many rearranged constituents it became unclear to informants.

6.5.3 Object fronting with compound verbs

Compound verbs are made up of two verbs (or even a noun and a verb) diachronically joined at the morphological level. These verbs are different from CP constructions. They are generally less transparent than CPs. Order switching (like object fronting) is not possible with compound verbs. One part of the Compound verb cannot be separated from the other part by an argument level actor.
In the case of compound verbs made up of two verbal stems it would not make sense for one of the parts to be fronted as the object. In the case of compound verbs made up of a nominal and a verbal component object fronting would seem to be a possibility. This is not the case though. Their semantic content is unified and cannot be split but the arguments they are predicating can be switched as with SSV sentences. If the nominal and verbal components are switched the meaning of the compound would change because their semantic content is non compositional.

The following are examples of object fronting in sentences predicated by compound verbs.

Dialogue 6.67

A: 2SG self mouth satiate TAM Q

Has your thirst been quenched?

B: completely satiate TAM

Completely quenched.

In (6.67) the morpheme kha ‘mouth’ could not be fronted. Although kha ‘mouth’ by itself is a noun it cannot be fronted here because of its connection to ngoms ‘satiate.’ Unlike many other compound verbs kha.ngoms ‘quench’ cannot be separated by negation. None of the compound verbs formed with kha ‘mouth’ and something else were found to be separated by negation in any of the data. Here, in the reply however, kha ‘mouth’ is dropped completely. This is acceptable in a context where the whole verb has already been mentioned. But kha ‘mouth’ could not be switched with an argument level morpheme. (6.68) shows this ungrammatical example:

6.68

* 2SG self mouth satiate TAM Q

Intended: Has your thirst been quenched?
The object fronting test shows that the best label for *kha.ngoms* ‘quench’ (and other items like it) is not object and verb but compound verb.

6.5.4 Complex Predicate examples

6.5.4.1 Complex predicates with big three verbalizers

In most prototypical CPs (those using one of the ‘big three’ VBZRs) the object can also be fronted. This can be seen in transitive sentences where there is a subject, object and CP. However, although the host component of the CP is nominal it cannot be fronted. While it can be seemingly discontinuous with the VBZR (adverbs and negation can come in between them but actually are a part of the N + VP sequence) it cannot switch positions with an argument.

This becomes somewhat confusing when the sentence is intransitive and the nominal host looks like the object. The question then becomes is it an intransitive CP or a transitive SSV.

Object fronting schema (in prototypical transitive CP sentences):

Subject Object CP (Host + VBZR)

Can also become→

Object Subject CP (Host + VBZR)

But cannot become→

*Host Subject Object VBZR

Or

*Host Object Subject VBZR

Or

*Subject Host Object VBZR

Or

*Object Host Subject VBZR

In all of these ungrammatical schema the CP is separated by one of the arguments (either the subject, object or both subject and object). This shows that on some structural level the CP is one unified constituent.
6.5.4.1.1 Intransitive complex predicate examples

6.69

ང་ gcin.pa  གཅིན་པ་ gcin.pa 'gro gi.yin
1SG urination send for.purpose go FUT
I'm going to urinate.

In (6.69) the agent doesn’t have ergative case because the main verb ‘gro ‘go’ is
intransitive/monovalent, which does not require the subject ergative. The CP’s host
gcin.pa ‘urination’ cannot be fronted. This would be ungrammatical. The
ungrammatical elicited version is given below:

6.70

* གཅིན་པ་ gcin.pa  གཏོང་ gtong gar 'gro gi.yin
1SG urination send for.purpose go FUT
Intended: I'm going to urinate.

In (6.71) we see the same complex predicate but this time with an adjunct clause.
This fronted in the same way an object would be fronted and for the same pragmatic
reasons, topicalization and focus.

6.71

ས་གདན་ sa.gdan sgang.la khyis gcin.pa btang shag
carpet on.top.of dog ERG urination do INFR
The dog urinated on the carpet.

The fronted nominal here is sa.gdan ‘carpet’. The sentence could also be put in S
adjunct V order in (6.72), elicited below. Here the host is again adjacent to the
VBZR. While the host and the VBZR can be discontinuous with adverbs or negation
it cannot be split by an argument level constituent. It would be ungrammatical to
change the host ordering in this way.
6.72

The dog urinated on the carpet.

The S adjunct V order (above) is grammatical but separating the CP with the subject or the object in (6.73), elicited below, is ungrammatical.

6.73

Example (6.74) is also ungrammatical for the same reasons.

6.74

Example (6.74) shows that not only is it unacceptable for the host and VBZR to be separated by an argument but it is also unacceptable to be separated by an adjunct clause of location.

6.5.4.1.2 Transitive complex predicate examples

6.75

Dekyi does not pay attention to what her mother says.
Example (6.75) features a transitive CP. The VBZR in it is one of the big three. This corpus example shows object fronting. Dekyi is the subject, has ergative case marking, and comes after the object. The nominal host component *snang.ba* ‘attention’, (which is actually made up of a nominalized verb) cannot be fronted as is seen in (6.76).

6.76

a.ma lags kyi gsung la **snang.ba** bde.skyid kyis **gtong** gi mi ‘dug
mother POL GEN speak LOC notice Dekyi ERG send TAM not TAM

*Intended: Dekyi does not pay attention to what her mother says.*

6.77

khong gis nam.rgyun nas gnas.tshul de.tshor **do.snang** **byed** kyi.red
3SG ERG usually CONN situation those LOC attention do FUT

*He usually pays attention to those matters.*

Example (6.77) from the corpus shows the usual order of SOV. The CP is similar in meaning to the one above in (6.75). It is grammatical to rearrange the order and front the object as in (6.78) elicited below:

6.78

gnas.tshul de.tshor khong gis nam.rgyun nas **do.snang** **byed** kyi.red
situation those LOC 3SG ERG usually CONN attention do FUT

*He usually pays attention to those matters.*

Example (6.75) uses *bdang* ‘do’ as the VBZR. The VBZR in (6.77) and (6.78) is *byed* ‘do.’ Both are big three VBZRs. Just like the *bdang* ‘do’ example the host from this CP could not be fronted.
6.79

*དོ་སྣང་ཁོང་གིས་ནམ་རྒྱུན་ནས་དྱེ་ཚོར་བྱེད་ཀི་རྱད
do.snang khong gis nam.rgyun nas gnas.tshul de.tshor byed kyi.red
attention 3SG ERG usually CONN situation those LOC do FUT

*Intended: He usually pays attention to those matters.*

The elicited ungrammatical example (6.79) shows the host and its VBZR being separated by both the subject and the object, two arguments.

In intransitive sentences the host part of the CP sometimes looks suspiciously like an object. The host is often object-like and nominal. In these sentences the host cannot be fronted. This definitively distinguishes CPs and OVs. The subject cannot separate the CP. The subject cannot come between the host and the VBZR. And in transitive sentences, the same is true of the object—it cannot separate the host and verbalizer. This contrasts to the way the object can be fronted and the subject separates an object from its predicating verb in single stem and compound verb sentences. This test is a good way to determine which N+V sequences are CPs.

6.80

ཁོས་ང་ལ་ངན་པ་
khos nga la ngan.pa zhe.drags byed kyis
3SG ERG 1SG LOC evil very do TAM

*He is being cruel to me.*

Example (6.80) shows a simple and common construction. The word order is unmarked as agent, patient and predicate. The host *ngan.pa* ‘evil’ looks object-like but it could not be fronted the way *nga la* ‘I LOC’ could. It is, in this sense, inseparable from the VBZR. (6.81) was elicited and given below with the acceptable object fronting order. (6.82) was elicited to show unacceptable host fronting.

6.81

ང་ལ་ཁོས་ངན་པ་
nga la khos ngan.pa zhe.drags byed kyis
1SG LOC 3SG ERG evil very do TAM

*He is being cruel to me.*
6.82

* ལན་པ་ ཁོས་ ལ་ བོད་ མོའ་ གན་པ་

ngan.pa khos nga la zhe.drags byed kyis

evil 3SG ERG 1SG LOC very do TAM

Intended: He is being cruel to me.

In transitive sentences prototypical CPs do not exhibit separation of the host and verbalizer.

In all the data there was not any evidence of the host and the VBZR being separated by the subject or object.

6.5.5 Application of object fronting diagnostic

6.5.5.1 Candidate complex predicates using non-big three verbalizers

The objecting fronting test can be applied to possible CP constructions that use VBZRs that are not as widespread and productive as the big three, or cases where one is not sure if the verbal element is a VBZR or SSV in a particular context. Below are some constructions that use lesser VBZRs. As with the big three, all of these borderline VBZRs can also be used as SSVs.

6.5.5.1.1 Candidate complex predicates with lesser verbalizer bshad (does not permit object fronting)

Below, the object fronting test is used as a diagnostic on a candidate CP with a lesser VBZR.

6.83

ཁོང་ ཀིས་ ལ་ བརས་ བཅོས་ གིས་ འདྲེས spitefully

khong gis a.ce la brnyas.bcos zhe.po cig bshad kyis

3SG ERG wife LOC abuse very habitual speak TAM

He verbally abuses his wife. (zhe po cig here indicates habitual action.)
Contrast the regular word order of (6.83) with (6.84). In (6.83) the order is subject, object, host, VBZR.

6.84

\[
\text{ngar} \quad \text{khos} \quad \text{brnyas}\_\text{bcos} \quad \text{zhe}\_\text{po} \quad \text{bshad} \quad \text{byung}
\]

1SG LOC 3SG ERG abuse very speak TAM

*He bullied me a great deal.*

In contrast to (6.83), here, in (6.84), the order has been changed to O S V (where the V is a CP). The object is fronted (for pragmatic reasons). The host \text{brnyas}\_\text{bcos} ‘abuse’ (if indeed it is that) could not be fronted. The elicited unmarked word order (6.85) and the ungrammatical version (6.86) are below:

6.85

\[
\text{khos} \quad \text{ngar} \quad \text{brnyas}\_\text{bcos} \quad \text{zhe}\_\text{po} \quad \text{bshad} \quad \text{byung}
\]

3SG ERG 1SG LOC abuse very speak TAM

*He bullied me a great deal.*

6.86

\[
\text{*khos} \quad \text{brnyas}\_\text{bcos} \quad \text{ngar} \quad \text{zhe}\_\text{po} \quad \text{bshad} \quad \text{byung}
\]

3SG ERG abuse 1SG LOC very speak TAM

*Intended: He bullied me a great deal.*

Because (6.86) fails the object/host fronting test we can conclude that it is likely a CP. Other tests can also be used to confirm this.
6.5.5.1.2 Candidate complex predicate with lesser verbalizer

skong (permits object fronting)

6.87

Sponsors take care of all our needs during our stay in Tibet.

Example (6.87) looks like a CP with skong ‘fulfill’ as the VBZR. In fact there are three verbs in LV that form common enough collocations with ‘dod.pa ‘desire’ to warrant entries in their verb dictionary. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Verb 1</th>
<th>Verb 2</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>'dod.pa</td>
<td>skong</td>
<td>to satisfy, fulfill one's desires, needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>'dod.pa</td>
<td>byed</td>
<td>to wish, want, desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>'dod.pa</td>
<td>tshim</td>
<td>to be content, satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>'dod.pa</td>
<td>khengs</td>
<td>to be content, satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 and 4 have optional VBZRs (tshim ‘satisfy’ or khengs ‘fill) which do not change the meaning. This gives three different candidate CPs with the host ‘dod.pa ‘desire’.

Example (6.88) is rearranged and elicited to show that fronting the host of this candidate CP is acceptable:
Sponsors take care of all our needs during our stay in Tibet.

It would be utterly impossible if (we) had to fulfil the wishes of everyone.

Example (6.89) also behaves like a CP. It is somewhat unusual that the host is possessed (but in the case test it was shown that host possession was the least conclusive test). This suggests it is more on the specific side of the spectrum rather than generic as hosts typically are. Consider (6.90) below:

The office has met all our work needs.
In (6.90) the host is possessed again. This is mildly problematic. (6.91) makes it even less likely that ‘dod.pa skong ‘desire fulfill’ is a CP.

6.91

khyed.rang gi ‘dod.pa de ngas skong gang thub zhus chog
2SG self GEN desire NMZ that 1SG ERG fulfill what able say(h) allow
I'll do whatever I can to fulfill that wish of yours.

Example (6.91) from the corpus of data shows what we thought was the host ‘dod.pa ‘desire’ is being fronted. It is being separated by an argument level morpheme. It is acting a lot like an object and not much like a CP’s host. These properties are interesting because the collocation ‘dod.pa skong ‘desire fulfill’ occurs together frequently and in many ways resembles a CP. This test suggests otherwise. Other speakers attested (6.91) is a “very good sentence.”

One other possible explanation is that sometimes ‘dod.pa ‘desire’ and skong ‘fulfill’ form a complex predicate construction and at other times ‘dod.pa ‘desire’ has full nominal value as an argument and in such cases skong ‘fulfill’ is an SSV. This explanation undermines the value of the object fronting test and we could say this about any data we found that violates it.

6.5.5.1.3 The case of the common collocation las.kā byed
(permits object fronting)

6.92

las.kā de khyed.rang gis byas med na gnong.len dgos ma red
work that 2SG self ERG do not if remorse need not TAM
There is no need for remorse if you didn’t do it.

A very common collocation is las.kā + byed/byas ‘work do.’ Since this is so common and byed ‘do’ can be a SSV or a VBZR it is important to analyze what this is. In (6.92) we see las.kā ‘work’ as the fronted object. Consequently, this phrase ‘work-do’ is split by the agent. This shows that las.kā byed ‘work do’ is not a typical CP. Also the fact that las.kā ‘work’ is modified by the demonstrative de ‘that’ shows that it isn’t a
typical nominal element of a complex predicate. Hosts tend to be non-referential (see demonstrative constraint test). We have already seen *las.ka byed* ‘work do’ in the problematic data of other tests (4.4.1 and 4.8.4). Because of these reasons it is (surprisingly) best not to give *las.ka byed* ‘work do’ full CP status. Or at least not in this sentence. Instead, *las.ka* ‘work’ is a common nominal argument (as it often is) and *byed* ‘do’ is a SSV.

### 6.5.6 Final thoughts on object fronting

The object fronting test seems to be a conclusive diagnostic for CP status. The corpus of data strongly supports this and the elicited sentences also strongly support this.

This fact seems to be motivated by the connectedness of the host and the VBZR. Once again the CP functions as one unit on a semantic level but is partially separable on the syntactic level (eg. Adverbs and negation can separate the CP). Separating the host and the VBZR by argument level constituents and adjuncts of location is resisted again in this test.

In the case of candidate minor VBZRs this test can be applied as a diagnostic. If the ‘lesser VBZRs’ have a host that can be fronted then they seem less prototypical and more like simple SSVs with an object. That is, if the possible CP can be split by the subject (non-verbal component first, followed by subject, followed by “minor VBZR”) then it should not be classified as a fully-fledged VBZR. If on the other hand, there is no evidence in the data of borderline CPs exhibiting object fronting then they should be analyzed as proper CPs. This diagnostic is best used together with other tests.

### 6.6 Question Word Switch/Insertion Test

#### 6.6.1 Introduction

Ordinary OV sequences and CPs behave differently when interacting with question words. The nominal in the OV sequence can be replaced with a question word. The CP’s host resists being replaced with a question word. Dialogues consisting of question word and VBZR answered by host and VBZR are unacceptable.
Question word schema:

OV $\rightarrow$ Q: question word V
\hspace{0.5cm} A: N V

CP $\rightarrow$ *Q: question word VBZR
\hspace{0.5cm} #A: host VBZR

Compare these two question and answer dialogues:

OV

Dialogue 6.93

ཁྱེད་རང་ ལ་རེ་ བུད་ ཡིན།
khyed.rang ga.re 'thung gi.yin
A: 2SG self what drink FUT
What are you drinking?

ང་ བུད་ ཡིན།
nga ja 'thung gi.yin
B: 1SG tea drink FUT
I am drinking tea.

*CP

Dialogue 6.94

*ཁྱེད་རང་ ལ་རེ་ ཁམས་ བོ་
khyed.rang ga.re btang gi.yin
A: 2SG self what do FUT
Intended: What are you doing?

ང་ བུམ་མི་ ལ་རེ་ ཡིན།
nga bsam.mi ja 'thung gi.yin
B: 1SG thought do FUT
I am thinking.
It is acceptable to use the SSVs with a question word as in (6.93). On the other hand, it is very strange and usually unacceptable to have a dialogue where the question word is replacing or anticipating just a part of the CP (the host) as in (6.94).

**6.6.2 Corpus Evidence**

There was not any data illustrating anything similar to (6.94) above in the corpus. There were however, OV examples similar to (6.93).

Consider these examples of ga.re ‘what’ used pronominally with a SSV in (6.95) and with a potential VBZR in (6.96):

6.95

khong gis ga.re byugs pa yin na
3SG ERG what apply NMZ TAM Q
*I wonder what she has applied to her (face)?*

6.96

rang ga.re byed kyi.yod
2SG what do FUT
*What are you doing?*

Example (6.95) shows ga.re ‘what’ used pronominally in conjunction with the simple verb byugs ‘apply’. The answer to this question would be some kind of noun (like ‘cream’) which would make an N+V sequence that would not be a CP.

Example (6.96) again shows ga.re ‘what’ used pronominally but this time the verb byed ‘do’ is the predicate. The verb byed ‘do’ is the most common of the big three VBZRs. Mohanan claims “the equivalent of the verb ‘do’ appears to be one of the most pervasive light verbs across languages” (2007:483). It is also sometimes a full verb. While the answer to this question could acceptably be a CP it could just as acceptably be an OV. (6.96) is just the generic question phrase for ‘what are you doing’? It does not anticipate either a CP or an OV. When we try this same structure
with other VBZRs every instance is conclusively unacceptable. This is shown below in the elicitation section.

6.6.3 Question word insertion

It is quite common to use ga. re ‘what’ (and other question words) within the CP (rather than substituting it pronominally for the host). In this case the question word comes between the host and the VBZR. OVs and CPs show no difference in this regard. Consider these examples from the corpus:

OV

6.97

khyed.rang lha ga.re sgom gyi yod pas

2SG self deity what meditate TAM TAM Q

*What deity are you meditating on?*

CP

6.98

gnyid.lam ga.re btang byung ngas

dream what do TAM Q

B. *What did you dream?*

Example (6.97) is an OV sequence. The object is lha ‘deity’ and the verb is sgom ‘meditate.’ (6.98) shows a CP. The host is gnyid.lam ‘dream’ and the VBZR is btang ‘do’ (one of the big three). There is no structural difference between the placement of ga. re ‘what’ in the OV sequence and the placement of it in the CP. Since ga. re ‘what’ seems to be asking for information that will fill an argument position, this result is somewhat unexpected.

This kind of question word insertion can occur with other question words like ga.tshod ‘how.many’. Consider these examples:
OV

6.99

byis.pa'i thebs.rtsa lhan.tshogs de dbu.brnyes byas lo ga.tshod
children GEN foundation group that establish then year how.many

phyin pa ras
got TAM Q

How many years have passed since the Children's Foundation was established?

CP

6.100

dang.po nas chang btungs kyi med na mis u.tshugs
first from barley.beer drink TAM not if person ERG urging

ga.tshod brgyab na'i btung rgyu yod ma red
how.many do if GEN drink NMZ TAM not TAM

If, from the beginning, you didn't drink chang, no matter how persistent someone is, you shouldn't drink.

In (6.99) the OV sequence consisting of lo ‘year’ and phyin ‘went’ is split by the question word ga.tshod ‘how.many.’ There is no difference between this and the CP of (6.100). The host u.tshugs ‘urging’ and the VBZR brgyab ‘do’ are the respective nominal and verbal components split by ga.tshod ‘how.many.’

6.6.4 Corpus Conclusion

While OVs can be constructed in both pronominal noun replacement questions and question word insertion questions CPs can only be constructed in the latter.
6.6.5 Elicited Data

Question data was elicited, which attempted to anticipate a CP as the answer (shown below). In the question the host is replaced with a pronominal question word ga.re ‘what’ and the VBZR is the predicate. Multiple answers (all using the same VBZR) are given and each one is unacceptable as the answer to that question. Mostly, the language resource people had problems with the question and answer together.

6.6.5.1 With gtong/btang

Consider these elicited examples with one of the big three VBZRs btang:

6.101

* ཞེས་རི་ རྟེན་ རྒྱུད་ ཐུང་

khyed.rang ga.re btang gi.yod

A: 2SG self what do TAM

Intended: What are you doing?

6.102

ང་ རྗུན་ ཉེས་ སྐྱེས་

ga yi.ge btang gi.yod

B: 1SG letter send TAM

I am sending a letter.

6.103

#ང་ རྗུན་ ཉེས་ སྐྱེས་

nga mo.ta btang gi.yod

B: 1SG car do TAM

I am driving a car.
6.104

\[\text{nga} \, \text{sems.gso} \, \text{btang} \, \text{gi.yod}\]

B: 1SG consolation do TAM

*I am consoling.*

6.105

\[\text{nga} \, \text{bsam.blo} \, \text{btang} \, \text{gi.yod}\]

B: 1SG thought do TAM

*I am thinking.*

In (6.102) yi.ge ‘letter’ + btang ‘send’ is not a CP (see the absolutive test in chapter 4.5.2.5).

Whether or not mo.Ta ‘car’ + btang ‘do’ is a CP is debatable. It is usually labeled as such but fails the same absolutive test and is in a lot of problematic data which shows it is probably in a separate sub-class of CPs (if it even is a CP). With much reluctance, two speakers said that the dialogue consisting of (6.101) and (6.103) may be possible with very specific circumstances. They still said it was very strange and one was not entirely sure either way.

The N + V sequences in (6.104) and (6.105) are both CPs and these are also unacceptable in a question and answer dialogue with (6.101).

6.6.5.2 With rgyag/brgyab

Consider these elicited examples with another of the big three VBZRs, rgyag ‘do’:

6.106

\[\text{khyed.rang} \, \text{ga.re} \, \text{rgyag} \, \text{gi.yod}\]

A: 2SG self what do TAM

*Intended: What are you doing?*
6.107

 nga khang.pa rgyag gi.yod
 B: 1SG house build TAM

I am building a house.

6.108

 nga rgyag.res rgyag gi.yod
 B: 1SG fighting do TAM

I am fighting.

6.109

 nga lud rgyag gi.yod
 B: 1SG dung do TAM

I am fertilizing.

6.110

 nga bgo.bsha' rgyag gi.yod
 B: 1SG division do TAM

I am dividing.

In (6.107) khang.pa ‘house’ + rgyag ‘build’ is not a CP. This is also not an acceptable dialogue.

The N + V sequences in (6.108), (6.109), and (6.110) are all CPs and these dialogues are also unacceptable.
6.6.5.3 With a candidate verbalizer, zhu/zhus:
Consider these examples with a non-big three VBZR zhu ‘say’:

6.111
* མི་ཐུབ་རང་ ར་ ཁེལ་
  khyed.rang ga.re zhu gi.yod
A: 2SG self what say(h) TAM
*Intended: What are you doing/saying?

6.112
# མ་ ཏག་འདྲི་ ལ་ སྤྱོད།
  nga bka′.dri zhu gi.yod
B: 1SG question say(h) TAM
*I am questioning.

6.113
# མ་ ལུང་འདྲི་ ལ་ སྤྱོད།
  nga snyan.seng zhu gi.yod
B: 1SG report say(h) TAM
*I am reporting.

Neither the answer of (6.112) nor (6.113) would be acceptable with the question of (6.111). In these cases also switching the host with a pronominal question word is strange and unacceptable.

6.6.6 Elicitation Conclusion
While it is common to use a pronominal question word and a SSV in questions anticipating OV answers it is uncommon to do the same with a question word and a VBZR anticipating a host as the nominal answer.
6.6.7 Problematic Data
The only somewhat problematic data is (6.96) in the corpus data above. This shows a pronominal with a common VBZR. This problem is easily resolved. The question is a generic question phrase used in many situations. It does not anticipate either a CP answer or an OV answer and either could be acceptably given.

6.6.8 Final thoughts on the question word switch test
Unlike the nominal of an OV the host of a CP is usually not referential. A pronominal question word anticipates a referential, specific answer and this is often strange with a host. Like Mohanan says “nominal hosts in CPs do not yield wh-questions” (1994:208).

Furthermore, asking the question without the host implies more separability than is possible. The host and the VBZR form a (mostly) unified construction. Removing the host in this way is semantically strange and implies that their semantics are not as closely tied as they actually are. The host is the “semantic core” and the VBZRs meaning becomes too vague without it.

On the other hand it is perfectly acceptable to drop the host once the whole CP has already been mentioned. This has been shown above in 4.9. In this case the context allows for ellipsis. It is not acceptable to do the reverse, to drop the host before the CP is mentioned.

Once again the only slightly problematic data came from a possible sub class of ‘CPs’ which are more referential and specific than others. They are also more compositional.

6.7 Structural Test Chapter Conclusion
The structural tests proved to be generally quite definitive. The joint predication test shows that by changing the number of arguments licensed in a sentence the host is monoclausal with the VBZR. The relative clause test is also very conclusive. There is data that did not resist separation in a relative clause, but these same data have also been problematic in other tests and form a sub-type of CP. The object fronting test was strongly conclusive as was the question word test.
The joint predication test is more of a possible property of CPs than a reproducible test. Not all CPs exhibit joint predication but every construction with joint predication is a CP. Joint predication is a definitive characteristic of CPs.

The relative clause test, object fronting test and question word switch tests, are all mostly definitive in differentiating between CPs and OVs. Problematic data can be grouped into the sub class of direct ergative verbs, all which have the coherent property of their hosts all being in absolutive case.

These tests all suggest that the CP is a unified structure. It resists separation or reordering at the argument tier level. When we find elements that are not in the VP that are separating the verbalizer from the host we become suspicious of its status as a unified constituent.

These tests also support the hypothesis that the host of the CP is non-referential and lacks full specificity. This is similar to what Mithun says about noun incorporation. She says “since incorporated objects are non-referential, and thus non-individuated, these constructions are generally used to describe activities or events whose patients are neither specific nor countable” (Mithun 1984:850). These LT constructions are not noun incorporation though but there is a similar need for non-referentiality.
Chapter 7
Conclusion

7.1 Diagnostics
Through this thesis a clear focus on syntactic diagnostics has been kept. Following Mohanan’s lead, this study has shown “structural properties [that] may then be used to construct diagnostics to determine the complex predicatehood of unclear instances” (1994:200). These diagnostics provide a good basis for determining CPs in LT. In the future, they could be used in conjunction with semantic tests based on compositionality and phonological tests based on intonation contours.

7.2 CPs and OVs

7.2.1 Inconclusive tests
The verbal tests were the most inconclusive. Adverb (5.1.1), negation (5.1.2), reduplication (5.2) and conjoining (5.3) were all inconclusive (though further research may find a productive direction to follow up on these tests with reference to semantics. Host drop (4.9) and host dependency (4.10) were also not conclusive in differentiating N+V sequences.

7.2.2 Definitive tests
According to the data in this thesis the most useful and definitive tests for distinguishing OVs from CPs are the object fronting test (6.5), question word switch test (6.6), relative clause test (6.4), topicalizer test (4.6), case test (4.5), and finally the NP constraint tests (4.2, 4.3, and 4.4) in conjunction with each other. Of the NP constraint tests, the demonstrative constraint test (4.4) is most definitive followed by the number constraint test (4.3) and finally the adjective constraint test (4.2) which is the least definitive. The structural tests are the most definitive. The joint predication test (6.3) is definitive but has limited application. Not all CPs have different valency but if they do, it definitively proves the host is licensing arguments and shows the construction is not an OV. The transparency/compositionality test
(6.1.5) could be productive with some words but relies on vague semantics rather than structural differences.

7.2.3 The Most Definitive Tests—ones to start with when doing analysis

It is recommended that researchers (in Tibetic languages, or other languages) start with the object fronting test (6.5), the question word switch test (6.6) and the relativization test (6.4) when initially assessing constructions. As a sample, these is applied to a set of CP candidates headed by minor verbalizers below; along with the three main NP constraint tests (4.2, 4.3, and 4.4).

7.2.4 What do the results of these tests tell us about CPs in LT?

What is the difference between the N+V in (1.1) and the N+V in (1.2)? Going back to the original problem on the difference between (1.1) and (1.2) we can reasonably suggest some answers. Speakers' intuition proves correct. The CP (1.2) is a different kind of construction.

The best diagnostics are the structural tests, followed by the NP constraint tests. The verbalizer tests are not definitive. Here is what the tests tell us of the properties of CPs in LT:

1. The CP is a unified construction on a syntactic level. Changing this unification disrupts the cohesiveness of the host and verbalizer. Because the semantics of the construction come from both the host and the verbalizer it can be unclear or strange to take away one part, especially if it has not already been stated.

2. The host is generally non-referential, non-specific, non-individuated and therefore defective in terms of NP components. This is because it is a component of a verbal event and not usually an actual referent. Speakers use CPs to refer to verbal actions more than they use them to refer to the nominal component in the action. The focus is the action.

3. Because the focus is the action, it is important for the verbal component of the CP to be fully operational as a verb. Speakers use CPs to refer to verbal
events first and foremost and therefore the verbalizer can function in every way (syntactically) that a single stem verb can.

4. The CP in LT is a phrasal word. Mohanan says of Hindi that “the complex predicate... is phrasally concatenated, and is not a single categorical word” (1994:234). Agha says “although phrasal verbs are syntactically phrases, they are not semantically compositional, so that from the point of view of their function as predicates they must be treated as unanalyzable lexemes” (1994:108). Agha also claims “in phrasal verb constructions, the noun is semantically incorporated into the verb” (1994:108). But the joint predication of CPs in LT shows that CPs are different from noun incorporation. In noun incorporation the noun does not add to the predication (see 2.4.3).

7.3 For CPs and Compound Verbs
In distinguishing CPs from compound verbs the host dependency test, negation test, adverb test and conjoining test proved the most definitive, but even these had problems. It seems there are sub-types of compound verbs and these tests help distinguish them (from each other and from CPs). This was elaborated on in the host dependency test table 4.10.5.

7.4 Constructions Proven not to be CPs
There is a class of ‘CP’s which are referred to as direct ergative complex predicates (DECPs). These can be shown to have hosts which have zero marked absolutive case (and as such are probably not CPs) but have been labeled CPs (or phrasal verbs, or whatever equivalent terminology) by many researchers. Calling them DECPs continues to include them in the broad CP category but distinguishes them from prototypical CPs as a sub class. DECPs share a lot in common with single stem verbs. DECPs can take any NP modification. Not only are they commonly modified adjectivally but they can also take more specific modifications like numbers and demonstratives. Butt says “light verbs constitute a cohesive class on the one hand, but fall into differing subclasses on the other hand (2010:5). These DECPs form a subclass of CPs in LT. DECPs were dealt with in the absolutive case test 4.5.2.5, and 4.5.6 but here is a small list typical of that category:
This table is just meant to illustrate the proposed sub-class of DECPs. As was said, not all the direct ergative CPs should be in in this category (ones that are more non-compositional should be excluded). Semantics should also be considered. However, the CPs containing more referential hosts should be potentially classed as a sub-type of CP (DECPs) since they contain the same properties and routinely fail the same tests.

This proposal, of two types of CPs in LT due to shared properties is found to be remarkably similar to Haig's claims. He says there are “two distinct structural types of CPs depending on the syntactic status of the NVC [host], more specifically whether or not the NVC plays the role of the direct object or not” (Haig, 2002:63). Haig labels these distinct types as “non-incorporating and incorporating CPs” saying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object (in absolutive)</th>
<th>Verb (direct ergative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>མོ་ཊ་ m.o.Ta</td>
<td>དོ། ཁོང་ gton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>དོ། rtsi</td>
<td>དོ། གོར་ gtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བྲིས་ ma lhas.ma</td>
<td>དོ། དཔའི་ bgyab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བྲིས་ skad.cor</td>
<td>དོ། དཔའི་ bgyab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བུ་མ་ sbying bskyar</td>
<td>དོ། དཔའི་ bgyab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ཉེ་ khab</td>
<td>དོ། དཔའི་ bgyab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 Constructions proven not to be prototypical CPs

| འོ་ skad | དོ། ཁོང་ gton | 
| ཕ་ la | དོ། ཁོང་ gton | 
| དོ། gtor | དོ། ཁོང་ gton | 
| བྲིས་ ma lhas.ma | དོ། ཁོང་ gton | 
| བྲིས་ skad.cor | དོ། ཁོང་ gton | 
| བུ་མ་ sbying bskyar | དོ། ཁོང་ gton | 
| ཉེ་ khab | དོ། ཁོང་ gton | 

This table is just meant to illustrate the proposed sub-class of DECPs. As was said, not all the direct ergative CPs should be in in this category (ones that are more non-compositional should be excluded). Semantics should also be considered. However, the CPs containing more referential hosts should be potentially classed as a sub-type of CP (DECPs) since they contain the same properties and routinely fail the same tests.

This proposal, of two types of CPs in LT due to shared properties is found to be remarkably similar to Haig's claims. He says there are “two distinct structural types of CPs depending on the syntactic status of the NVC [host], more specifically whether or not the NVC plays the role of the direct object or not” (Haig, 2002:63). Haig labels these distinct types as "non-incorporating and incorporating CPs" saying
that "non-incorporating CPs are those for which the NVC [host] is considered part of the argument structure" (what I have labeled DECPs) and that "all non-incorporating CPs are transitive, and syntactically the NVC [host] is the direct object of clauses headed by such CPs" and "no additional direct object can occur in those clauses" (Haig, 2002:63). On the other hand, incorporating CPs, (what I have called prototypical CPs) are "those where the NVC [host] does not have argument status in the clause" (Haig, 2002:63). Haig's two categories of CP fit remarkably well with my own analysis,21 supporting the idea that complex predication is a cross-linguistic phenomenon.

21 I would apply his terminology but "non-incorporating" and "incorporating" sound confusingly similar to "noun incorporation", a phenomenon which is already similar enough to be confusing. I will leave future researchers to decide on a better label.
7.5 Application of Most Definitive Tests

Table 19 and table 20 show various N+V constructions being tested with the most conclusive diagnostics from this thesis. N means the construction does not permit object fronting, or demonstratives being inserted or whatever the diagnostic is. The more CP-like the N+V sequence is, the more Ns it exhibits in this table. A regular OV would exhibit all Ys.

Table 19 Application of tests on CP candidates with lesser VBZRs (used in 10 constructions or more)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate CP</th>
<th>Rel clause</th>
<th>Obj Front</th>
<th>Q word replace</th>
<th>NP phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE&amp;M  NUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>VBZR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>རྒྱུན་ཡོལ། (rgan.yol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. rgan.yol</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘retirement’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to retire’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>མུ་ཟླུ། (zhu)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘say’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘say’ (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>གྲང་དྲ་ (rnyog.dra)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. snyan.seng</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘report’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘give a report’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>མི་ཞོད། (shod)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. rnyog.dra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘annoyance’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘say annoying things’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>རུ་ཤོབ། (ud.shob)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ‘ud.shob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘boasting’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to boast’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate CP</th>
<th>Rel clause</th>
<th>Obj Front</th>
<th>Q word replace</th>
<th>NP phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>VBZR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. rnyid.to</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N N N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'crumpling'</td>
<td>'make'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to crumple'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. dus.bkag</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N N Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'time.limit'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'make deadline'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. rub.rub</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N N Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'gathering'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to gather'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ice.leb.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N N Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mdud.pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tongue.tying'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'get tongue tied'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. dbugs.sub</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'suffocation'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to suffocate'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 'dred.'dar</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N N Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'slipping'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to slip'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate CP</td>
<td>Rel clause</td>
<td>Obj Front</td>
<td>Q word replace</td>
<td>NP phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>VBZR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'phog.thug'</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'offense'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be offended'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 Application of tests on CP candidates with rarely used VBZRs (used in only 1 or 2 constructions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate CP</th>
<th>Rel clause</th>
<th>Obj. Front</th>
<th>Q word replace</th>
<th>NP phrase</th>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>NUM</th>
<th>ADJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host VBZR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ལྟེབ་རྟེ་དགེ་ བཤི དག སྐྱུག་པ་ 12. lteb.rtseg bshig 'demolish'</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>དཀ་ལས་ བཤི ཐད་སྣང 13. dka'.las bshig 'demolish'</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བཤི ཐད་སྣང 14. zhed.snang bshig 'demolish'</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བཤི ཐད་སྣང 15. kha.la bshig 'demolish'</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བཤི ཐད་སྣང 16. khog.pa bshig 'demolish'</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བཤི ཐད་སྣང 17. skyug.pa bshig 'demolish'</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Numbers 1-11 are the most common of the lesser verbalizers, each occurring with at least 10 hosts in the corpus of data. 12-17 are even less common. Each of their verbalizers only occurs once in the data. This illustrates how the tests can be used on very uncommon constructions. 17 is a reduplicated CP (as was discussed in 2.4, 3.6.3, and 5.2.1.1). 18 is a compound verb.

Usually when the answer was ‘yes’ for the adjective constraint column (adjectival modification being possible) there were a very limited number of adjectives which could be inserted between the host and the verbalizer. Almost every time it was limited to *mang.po* ‘a lot’ or ‘many’ which as we saw in 4.2.1.1 can be adjectival or adverbial. One speaker even said it implies *thengs* ‘times’ when *mang.po* ‘many’ is used. This is clearly adverbial. Sometimes the adjectival constraints were obviously due to semantics. This was the most specific and least helpful column.

### 7.6 Constructions Proven to be CPs

The results of this table strongly show that these candidate verbalizers have the same properties as the prototypical big three verbalizers. They must be verbalizers and the constructions they are a part of can be labeled CPs. This proves that complex predication is much more widespread than just constructions using the three most common verbalizers. Concerning LT Denwood lists less than 10 verbalizers (1999:110) and Tournadre and Dorje list 12 (2005:458). Concerning Bardi, Bowern lists about 11 (2004). Butt suggests there are “somewhere between 5 and 20 crosslinguistically” (2010:22). Granted Denwood and Tournadre and Dorje were not claiming their lists were exhaustive but according to these tests there are a lot more verbalizers (and CPs) in LT than was previously expected and also more than most languages crosslinguistically. These diagnostics validate Bailey and Walker's large number of “verbalized compound” entries. In their corpus of data
there seems to be upward of 90 verbalizers in LT. Complex predication is an extremely productive construction in LT.

7.7 Syntactic patterns of Lhasa Tibetan verbalizers.
In identifying candidate verbalizers we should first test the structure of the N+V sequence it is in. If it is shown that the sequence in question is a CP then we can surmise that the verbal element is a verbalizer. There are no syntactic differences between the major verbalizers and the minor verbalizers. There are not even any syntactic differences between verbalizers and verbs (although there are semantic differences). The syntactic differences are found on the structural and (to a lesser degree) nominal level of constructions. OVs and CPs are syntactically different as is shown by relative clause, object fronting and Q words switching tests (not to mention that in CPs the nominal element was shown to jointly predicate).

There are also differences between the nominal components. Nominal hosts in CPs tend to resist NP modification. Nominals in OVs have no such limitation.

7.8 Semantic patterns of Lhasa Tibetan verbalizers
Where then do all the lesser verbalizers fit? The lesser verbalizers fill semantic needs that the big three verbalizers cannot fill. Verbalizers such as zhu ‘say(H)’ and shod ‘say’ fill the need for verbalizers which cover verbal actions specifically in the domain of speech. The verb zhu ‘say(H)’ also fulfills the need for honorific verbalization. Other very common honorific verbalizers (skyon ‘do’ and gnang ‘do’) have not been directly covered in this study but also fill a similar need. Other verbalizers such as thebs ‘be.done’ and shor ‘happen’ fulfill semantic needs to communicate the verbal action was involuntary. (This can also be done with the big three in other grammatical constructions but thebs ‘be.done’ and shor ‘happen’ give another communicative option). Without going into further detail then, it can reasonably be argued that the lesser verbalizers have more semantic content and fulfill semantic communicative needs the speakers have.

7.9 Scalar explanation
There is a spectrum with constructions headed by full lexical verbs on one end and those headed by the three major verbalizers on the other end. Most constructions headed by ‘minor verbalizers’ fall on the same side as the more prototypical main three verbalizers. The NP constraint tests tended to be effective but certain sub-tests
were more easily broken. The conclusiveness of the NP constraint tests (how strongly various kinds of NP modification were resisted) is summarized in this scalar representation below:

![Scalar Representation of Types of NP Modification](image)

**Figure 13 A scalar representation of types of NP modification**

On the far left of the scale are modifiers which are more referential and specific. Case and topicalization are the most referential. Hosts can never be modified with those. This is because the host is not an argument level constituent but is subsumed as part of the CP, predicating the other arguments.

Demonstratives (and to a lesser extent numbers) are less specific but it is also rare for prototypical CPs to be modified with them. The hosts which were able to be modified by demonstratives and numbers were generally DECPs. More prototypical CPs resisted this.

While adjectives can sometimes be explained as adverbial modifiers these are the least specific of the modifiers. Many CPs can be internally modified with *yag.po* ‘good’ or *mang.po* ‘many’. There are some CPs which resist even these modifiers. Adjective modification can also be explained as compounding. The adjectives don’t necessarily make the host more referential but can change the kind of host being verbalized while still allowing the CP to be a generalized verbal action. Also, while certain ‘CP’s were able to take adjective modification it did not naturally occur in the corpus of data very often. It certainly didn’t occur as much as with other nominal constituents.

**7.10 Ideas for future research**

While Kopp (1998) did study the semantics of LT verbalizers, there is still room for future research. Syntactically verbalizers are no different to single stem verbs so
further semantic research is where fruitful differences will be found, especially with the minor verbalizers which Kopp did not examine.

Another area for future research suggested by Bartee (2007) is on the phonology of the CP as a whole. This would involve analyzing the intonation contours (and possibly other phonological properties such as tone) of CPs and comparing them with OVs. Tests would use Praat or some other software to analyze the CP phonologically and see if it is different to an OV construction. Bartee says “prosodically, verbalized constructions fall under one intonation contour and speakers do not pause after the nominal component” (2007:144). This test was beyond the scope of this thesis but could be fruitful in future research.

A related sub-test would concern stress placement. The host is usually two syllables but often also just one. It is less commonly three or more syllables. There is one possible host example of 6 syllables. There are 15 examples of 5 syllables. In these cases the CP starts to resemble an idiom. Examining stress placement using metrical phonology may prove definitive.

A final area is comparison with other linguistic varieties. Candidate CPs in related Tibetic languages could be examined.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


APPENDIX A

EXPLANATION OF GLOSSING AND TRANSLITERATION STRATEGY

Lhasa Tibetan is diglossic. The spoken and written varieties vary considerably. Tibetan has a robust literary tradition. Tournadre and Dorje explain that written Tibetan has “three broad categories: Old Tibetan (7th to 11th century), Classical Literary Tibetan (12th to 19th century) and Modern Literary Tibetan (20th century)” (2005:27). They go on to say that even latter category “is still very conservative.” Modern Literary Tibetan is quite different from colloquial Lhasa Tibetan.

There are two common approaches to glossing in academic writing on Tibetan. The first is to transcribe colloquial speech in IPA (or some similar phonetic rendering). This is especially useful in a less standard language variety of Tibetan. Huber, Bartee etc. choose this strategy (at least some of the time) (Huber, 2002), (Bartee, 2007). One weakness of this method is that it is harder to see the connections to written Tibetan. Another is that untrained native speakers have difficulty reading it.

The second approach is more useful in a standard language variety of Tibetan like Lhasa Tibetan. It is the closest to what Tournadre calls Standard Spoken Tibetan (SST) which is used widely in the Tibetan diaspora communities (2005). This approach is also useful when dealing with written Tibetan (in any of its various registers). The approach is to use the Tibetan orthography and accepted spelling conventions and then also use a romanized system (called Wylie) to transliterate the Tibetan letters. Garrett (2001), Tournadre (2005:45), Goldstein (1991), Kopp (some of the time) (1998), and others use this approach. This is the approach which is used in this thesis. It is easy to switch between the written Tibetan and Wylie. The Tibetan makes this more accessible to native speakers and the Wylie (although hard to pronounce to uninitiated) at least makes it readable to those who can’t read the Tibetan orthography. Sometimes just Wylie Transliteration is used and the Tibetan orthography is dropped altogether. Generally I have tried to include both. Tournadre says “while transliteration enables the reader to recognize the Tibetan spelling of a word and, to a certain extent, its archaic pronunciation, it gives no straightforward indication of how it is pronounced in Modern Central Tibetan” (2005:44).
As for the variation between written Tibetan and colloquial Tibetan, Bailey & Walker’s lead has been followed. Most of the data studied is from their Lhasa Verbs data and their conventions have been followed. They generally went with the literary spelling of Tibetan orthography (especially where the differences were not great. However, they explain “when the divergence between the written pronunciation and the spoken pronunciation is wide enough, we have sometimes spelled words in conformity with actual speech” (Bailey & Walker 2004:xxxv). They “aspired to strike a balance, however imperfect, between orthodox spellings and colloquial transcriptions” and were “guided by [their] Tibetan mentors, who themselves acknowledge the considerable disagreement over the proper transcription of Lhasa dialect” (2004).

Bailey and Walker included a pronunciation section under each verbal entry and if some spoken words are pronounced differently to the way they are written they noted this. In this section they chose to write the words in Tibetan orthography but reflecting the common pronunciation. They offer a weakness of this method saying it “will appear jarring to a Tibetan who is not accustomed to seeing words deliberately spelled in a non-orthodox way” (Bailey & Walker 2004:xxxii). They then go on to explain two advantages, saying this strategy helps students “learn to appreciate that the Tibetan system of spelling affects the pronunciation of different syllables in a very predictable way” and they “can show this modified spelling of a verb to Tibetans and confirm that the verb does undergo such a pronunciation shift in Lhasa dialect.”

Bailey and Walker also give a table showing the normative pronunciation changes and the spelling they have used to reflect that. This can be found on xxxvi.

**Methodology of analysis and glossing**
The majority of data used has already been put into Tibetan orthography. Analysis was then done using Fieldworks Language Explorer (FLEx). FLEx works best with word spaces (and can also be used at a morpheme level) but Tibetan writing does not employ word spacing (ignoring Modern Drenjongke (Sikkimese) and Ladakhi language varieties) but rather a full stop like dot called a *tshig* between every syllable. I put word spaces in myself for the purposes of analysis and glossing. Sometimes this task was difficult because as Goldstein says “virtually all Tibetan syllables have independent meanings” (1991:329). Where a word has more than one syllable I put (as is conventional) a period between each syllable (where the Tibetan *tshig* is). Because written Tibetan preserves complex clusters (that are no longer pronounced) it would be very confusing to not include these periods.
Case can be a separate syllable or added into the previous syllable depending on phonological rules. In the former case I have separated the case with a space and analyzed it as another ‘word.’ In the latter case I have glossed it in the previous word itself. Garret uses dashes within the words to show morpheme breaks. I have left morpheme breaks in the glossing but no used such dashes. Perhaps when the case is a separate syllable it should still be glossed as the same word. However, this was the analysis that I found most helpful. Tournadre also seems to employ this approach as he explains how “particles” help new readers find where words end saying “the task may he made easier by picking out grammatical particles such as plurals, conjunctions and case markers, which always follow the words with which they are associated, and therefore indicate where they end” (2005:66). An example of case incorporated into the word is ngar ‘to me’ (comprised of the morphemes nga ‘I’ and → ‘LOC’). The same word is sometimes said in two syllables (or as I have chosen to present it in FLEX, as two words) in nga la ‘to me’ (comprised of two words nga ‘I’ and la ‘LOC’). This is not to argue the merits of one word or two word analyses but to explain how I have glossed the data.

### Table 21 Table illustrating glossing of case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>One word</th>
<th>Two words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>ངའི།</td>
<td>ང་གི།</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nga'i</td>
<td>nga gi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1SG.GEN</td>
<td>1SG GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative/Dative/Benefactive</td>
<td>ངར།</td>
<td>ང་ལ།</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ngar</td>
<td>nga la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1SG.LOC</td>
<td>1SG LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>ངས།</td>
<td>ང་གིས།</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ngas</td>
<td>nga gis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1SG.ERG</td>
<td>1SG ERG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all of these examples occur regularly in the data but they are used here to illustrate glossing and word splitting.

In glossing the verbalizers I have chosen to use the general word ‘do’ unless making a point about the semantics. If the same word is used as a single stem verb though it
is usually glossed in a different way, related to its contextual meaning. In borderline cases (CP candidates) the SSV gloss is usually used.

The formalism used in this thesis to identify CPs is underlining the host and putting the verbalizer in bold.
**APPENDIX B**

**HOSTS WITH MULTIPLE VERBALIZERS**

Below a list of hosts (or in the case of compound verbs, initial components) which can take multiple verbalizers. They are all from the LV corpus of data. Some of these are free variation and do not change the meaning. Some of these verbalizers do change the meaning. This shows the semantic motivation for a large class of minor verbalizers. It also shows that while verbalizers (light verbs) are semantically ‘light’, they do contribute to the semantics of the CP, together with the host.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Verb 1</th>
<th>Verb 2</th>
<th>Verb 3</th>
<th>Verb 4</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>dka'.las</td>
<td>khag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>toil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>dka'.las</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to work hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>dka'.las</td>
<td>bzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to create difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>skul.lcag</td>
<td>thebs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be spoiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>skul.lcag</td>
<td>byed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to inspire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>skul.lcag</td>
<td>gtong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to inspire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>skul.lcag</td>
<td>gtong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be inspired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>skul.lcag</td>
<td>byed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be inspired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be thirsty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be addicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to spread out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The meanings are given in the language of the corpus.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Pinyin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>མོང་མོ།</td>
<td>gong.mthor</td>
<td>progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gad.mo</td>
<td>laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>མོང་མོ།</td>
<td>gong.mthor</td>
<td>progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gad.mo</td>
<td>laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>མོང་མོ།</td>
<td>gong.mthor</td>
<td>progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>མོང་མོ།</td>
<td>gong.mthor</td>
<td>progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ལྟོག་བཤལ།</td>
<td>gong.'phel g tong</td>
<td>value rise do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gad.khog rgyags</td>
<td>stomach satisfy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>ལྟོག་བཤལ།</td>
<td>gong.khog lto gs</td>
<td>stomach hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gad.khog bshal</td>
<td>stomach purge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ལྟོག་བཤལ།</td>
<td>gong.khog bt d</td>
<td>have lightening strike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ལྟོག་བཤལ།</td>
<td>gong.'khyud</td>
<td>to get an electric shock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>ལྟོག་བཤལ།</td>
<td>gong.'phel</td>
<td>value increase go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gong.mthor</td>
<td>progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gad.khog</td>
<td>stomach hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gad.khog</td>
<td>stomach hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gad.khog</td>
<td>stomach hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gad.khog</td>
<td>stomach hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gad.khog</td>
<td>stomach hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gad.khog</td>
<td>stomach hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>བོད་མོ།</td>
<td>gad.khog</td>
<td>stomach hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>ཐོག་ཚུགས</td>
<td>'go.tshugs</td>
<td>to be started.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>ཐོག་འཛུགས</td>
<td>'go.'dzugs</td>
<td>begin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>སྣོ་རྒྱག</td>
<td>sgo.rgyag</td>
<td>close door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>སྣོ་ཕྱེ</td>
<td>sgo.phye</td>
<td>to open a door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>སྣོ་འདོགས་</td>
<td>sgro.'dogs</td>
<td>wrong views cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>སྣོ་འདོགས་</td>
<td>sgro.'dogs</td>
<td>wrong views do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>སྣོ་འདོགས་</td>
<td>sgro.'dogs</td>
<td>to exaggerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>སྣོ་འདོགས་</td>
<td>sgro.'dogs</td>
<td>to know, to recognise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>སྣོ་འདོགས་</td>
<td>sgro.'dogs</td>
<td>to recognize</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
81 ཆོག་མཆན་ to ask for permission
permission ask(H)
to ask for permission
83 མཇལ་ཁ་ to grant an audience
audience do
to grant an audience
84 མཇལ་ཁ་ to request an audience
audience request(H)
to request an audience
86 རྱེས་ཤུལ་ to track
leftover follow
to track
87 རྱེས་ཤུལ་ to inherit
leftover grasp
to inherit
89 བརྱེ་པོ་ to exchange something
switch do
to exchange something
90 བརྱེ་པོ་ to exchange something
switch send.back
to exchange something
92 སྦྱེག་ to punish, to fine
crime do
to punish, to fine
93 སྦྱེག་ to get hit
crime get.hit
to get hit
94 སྦྱེག་ to gain
crime accumulate
to accumulate
96 བཏོལ་ཏོལ་ to honk a horn
honking do
to honk a horn
97 བཏོལ་ཏོལ་ to honk a horn
honking do
to honk a horn
98 རྒྱག་ to whip
hitting do
to whip
99 རྒྱག་ to whip
hitting do
to whip
100 རྒྱག་ to whip
hitting do
to whip
102 རགས་མཚན་ to manifest a sign
sign show
to manifest a sign
103 རགས་མཚན་ to have sign manifest itself
sign reveal
to have sign manifest itself
105 འྲི་བོ་ to try or test
lta.shod byed
to try or test
106 འྲི་བོ་ to try or test
lta.shod lta
to try or test
108 རླ་བ་ to applaud
thal.mo rdab
hand.joining strike
to applaud
109 རླ་བ་ to hold hands in prayer
thal.mo sbyar
doubt eat
to hold hands in prayer
111 རྡེ་ཤུག་ to be unsure, indecisive
the.tshom za
doubt eat
to be unsure, indecisive
112 དེ་ཚོམ་ the.tshom
the doubt to be unsure, indecisive

113 དེ་ཚོམ་ the.tshom
byed doubt do to hesitate

to hesitate to be unsure, indecisive
to be content, satisfied
to cause suffering
to suffer hardship
to show one's feelings

122 མཆོག་ལུང་ log countenance return to change one's feelings to be offended

124 ལུང་ལུང་ གདིརིན་ snang.ba gtong attention do spread malicious rumours

125 ལུང་ལུང་ བྱེད། snang.ba byed rumour do to change one's feelings to be offended

126 ལུང་ལུང་ ཁེངས snang.ba bzhag attention put spread malicious rumours

127 ལུང་ལུང་ དྲེས། snang.ba shod fill to notice

128 ལུང་ལུང་ ལོག་ sret.lad log return to notice

129 ལུང་ལུང་ མདོརིན་ snang.po 'khrab fill to develop, advance

130 ལུང་ལུང་ ལེགས། snang.po 'gro fill to develop, progress

131 ལུང་ལུང་ ལེགས། snang.po 'gro fill to develop, progress

132 ལུང་ལུང་ རོ་ phog.thug shor offense happen to be offended

134 ལུང་ལུང་ ལོས། phra.ma 'jug rumour participate to change one's feelings to be offended

135 ལུང་ལུང་ རོ་ phra.ma byed rumour do to change one's feelings to be offended

136 ལུང་ལུང་ དྲེས། snang.ba bzhag attention put spread malicious rumours

137 ལུང་ལུང་ རོ་ phra.ma byed rumour do to change one's feelings to be offended

138 ལུང་ལུང་ རོ་ phra.ma byed rumour do to change one's feelings to be offended
### to fly a kite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>བ་འཕིར་</td>
<td>bya.'phir</td>
<td>to fly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>གོད</td>
<td>glod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to trust in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>བོས་</td>
<td>blobs</td>
<td>to trust in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བཀལ</td>
<td>bkal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to relinquish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>བོས་</td>
<td>blobs</td>
<td>to relinquish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>དེ་</td>
<td>bzod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to be willing to risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དབང་</td>
<td>dbangs</td>
<td>to be willing to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བསྐུར</td>
<td>bsкур</td>
<td>risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to give authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དབང་</td>
<td>dbang</td>
<td>to give authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བཞིབས་</td>
<td>thob</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to obtain authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དབང་</td>
<td>dbang</td>
<td>to obtain authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བཞིབས་</td>
<td>thob</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to empower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དབུགས་</td>
<td>dbugs</td>
<td>to empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>སོད</td>
<td>sprod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to pant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དབུགས་</td>
<td>dbugs</td>
<td>to pant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བཞིབས་</td>
<td>thob</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to suffocate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དབུགས་</td>
<td>dbugs</td>
<td>to suffocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>སོད</td>
<td>sprod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to get

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དཔོན་ལམ་</td>
<td>smon.lam</td>
<td>to get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>རྒྱག་</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to be suffocated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དཔོན་ལམ་</td>
<td>smon.lam</td>
<td>to be suffocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>རྒྱག་</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to humiliates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དམའ་འབྱེབས་</td>
<td>dma.'bebs</td>
<td>to humiliate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>དེ་</td>
<td>bzod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to inhale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དབག་</td>
<td>dbug</td>
<td>to inhale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>བཞིབས་</td>
<td>thob</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to pray

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དཔོན་ལམ་</td>
<td>smon.lam</td>
<td>to pray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>རྒྱག་</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to split

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དཔོན་ལམ་</td>
<td>smon.lam</td>
<td>to split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>རྒྱག་</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to be split

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དཔོན་ལམ་</td>
<td>smon.lam</td>
<td>to be split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>རྒྱག་</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### to be deflated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Wylie</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>དཔོན་ལམ་</td>
<td>smon.lam</td>
<td>to be deflated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>རྒྱག་</td>
<td>rgyag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to apply paint

175 རི་ དོར

rtsi gtor

paint spray
to spray paint

177 དོར་རགས་ རྒྱས་

dzor.rtags glod

shame loose
to act in a shameful way

178 དོར་རགས་ རྒྱས་

dzor.rtags gshom

shame prepare
to act in a shameful way

180 རྫུན་རྐུབ་ རྡོར་

rdzun.rkub rdol

charlatan burst
to be exposed as a fake

181 རྫུན་རྐུབ་ རྡོར་

rdzun.rkub lug

charlatan fall
to be exposed as a fake

183 འབྲུག་ རྡོར་

yar.rgyas 'gro

improvement go
to progress
bsam.'char 'don
opinion put.forth
to give an opinion

bsam.'char 'dri
opinion ask
to ask an opinion

a.log rgyag
overturning do
to turn over

a.log thebs
overturning be.done
to be turned over

og.btsir gtong
strangulation do
to strangle

og.btsir glod
strangulation loose
to strangle