Chapter 4

Structural Categories

The following chapter closely follows the organization of nine multi-verb structural categories as outlined by N. J. Enfield in *Verbs and multi-verb constructions in Lao* (2008: 113-172). These categories are used to classify various multi-verb constructions in Hmong Ntsuab. The particularities of each category are explained first, followed by a description of the grammatical features of the multi-verb constructions in that category, complete with Hmong Ntsuab examples. Some categories are further broken down into sub-categories. Table 1, below, shows a list of the structural categories and sub-categories with a sample Hmong Ntsuab MVC for each category. A summary chart showing the differences of the grammatical features across categories is provided in Appendix 2.

Table 1 Structural categories and sample constructions

Structural category	**Sample construction**
deverbal: preverbal	*tseev moog* 'accustomed' 'go'
deverbal: postverbal	*moog lawm* 'go' 'finish'
despatch: handling-despatch	*muab rau* 'take' 'give'
despatch: communication-despatch-reception	*ha rua noog* 'say' 'give' 'listen'
disposal	*coj moog nkawm* 'lead' 'go' 'study'
complex motion	*dla nqeg moog* 'run' 'descend' 'go'
resultative: same subj	*poob tuag* 'fall' 'die'
resultative: different subj	*to tuag* 'stab' 'die'
resultative: projected	*ncha pum* 'seek' 'find'
resultative: reiterative	*tua tuag* 'kill' 'die'
adverbial complement: right headed stative	*khaw nuab* 'collect' difficult'
adverbial complement: left-headed	*maaj sau* 'hurry' 'write'

Structural category	Sample construction
adverbial compound: right-marking	*nrab muab* 'grab' 'take'
adverbial compound: right-marking active	*ua sis* 'do' 'play'
adverbial compound: left-marking	*pws saib* 'recline' 'watch'
depictive: left-marking	*nyob nyeem 'sit' 'read'*
oblique: deverbal preposition	*ua rau* 'do' 'give'
causative: simple	*kua moog* 'give' 'go'
causative: simple	*ua tawg* 'do' 'break'
causative: complex	*ua rau* 'do' 'give'
causative: complex	*khaiv kuam moog* 'order' 'give' 'go'
complement, contrl, same-subj	*xaav moog* 'want' 'go'
complement, contrl, diff-subj	*xaav kua* 'want' 'give"
complement, contrl, diff-subj, flat	*kua lug* 'give' 'come'
complement, non-control	*xaav ta moog* 'think' 'say' 'go'
VP chain: parallel	*khaw khaw* 'collect' 'collect'
VP chain: purposive	*moog nkawv* 'go' 'study'
VP chain: sequential	*nruav nkaag* 'brush' 'enter'
verb compound	*ntswb pum* 'meet' 'see'

4.1 Deverbal aspect-modality marking

In Hmong Ntsuab, similar to Lao (Enfield 2008: 113), main verbs can also serve as aspect-modality markers. These verbs are termed "deverbal" markers because, although they may be functioning as aspect-modality markers, they are "transparently related to existing verbs" (2008: 114). Many aspect-modality markers are deverbal but some are not. This section does not attempt to describe the entire class of aspect-modality markers in Hmong Ntsuab, but only considers the ones that are deverbal.

Before continuing on to the discussion of the structural properties of deverbal MVCs, it is important to remember that, as previously discussed (section 3.2.1), when verbs are not functioning as main verbs they may not possess all the grammatical features of main verbs. This is especially crucial when dealing with deverbal markers, as they

are in the process of grammaticalization and have a dual grammatical function by nature. As Enfield puts it: "It is not always possible to say when a [verb] has become 'grammatical' and is no longer 'lexical'." For this reason, and in keeping with the structural categories outlined by Enfield, they are still considered in some MVCs of this study.

Because the same surface form may function as a verbal marker in one setting and a main verb in another, surface strings of, what seem to be, multiple main verbs are common. Deverbal forms often combine with other verbs in multi-verb constructions. Hmong Ntsuab makes use of both preverbal deverbals and postverbal deverbals in MVCs[6]. The grammatical features of the verbs in these two types of multi-verb constructions are discussed below.

4.1.1 Preverbal deverbal aspect-modality

Some preverbal deverbal aspect-modality markers in Hmong Ntsuab include *txug* 'arrive', *cum* 'must', and *txeev* 'accustomed'. Preverbal deverbal MVCs demonstrate unique grammatical properties. Consider the following preverbal deverbal MVC, where V1 *txeev* 'accustomed' is the preverbal deverbal aspect-modality marker[7] and V2 is *moog* 'go', as demonstrated in the simple declarative sentence below (117).

(117)

kuv	*txeev*	*moog*	*Chiang Mai*
I	accustomed	go	Chiang Mai

'I have gone (to) Chiang Mai.'

Testing shows that the verbs in these types of constructions are tightly bound, as insertion of elements creates ungrammatical constructions. For example, the multi-verb construction *txeev moog* 'accustomed' 'go' is not clause separable with the coordinator *hab* 'and' (118) or the clause linker *kuj* (119), as the creation of independent clauses results in ungrammatical sentences.

(118)

*	*kuv*	*txeev*	*hab*	*moog*	*Chiang Mai*
	I	accustomed	and	go	Chiang Mai

[6] Some verbs may appear as either the first verb in a two-verb string or as the second verb in the string, such as the verb tau 'succeed, can', which was discussed in Chapter two (section 2.4.4).

[7] Although this preverbal deverbal aspect-modality marker, *txeev,* passes many of the main verb headship tests, such as taking direct negation, and taking direct post-verbal modification, it seems to be restricted in its use as a verb.

(119)

* *kuv* *txeev* *kuj* *moog* *Chiang Mai*
I accustomed so go Chiang Mai

In addition, this multi-verb construction takes negation on the initial verb (120) but is unable to take medial negation (121).

(120)

kuv *tsi* *txeev* *moog* *Chiang Mai*
I NEG accustomed go Chiang Mai
'I have never gone (to) Chiang Mai.'

(121)

* *kuv* *txeev* *tsi* *moog* *Chiang Mai*
I accustomed NEG go Chiang Mai

As far as the yes-answer test, V1, the verb *txeev* 'accustomed', is the best single-verb response to a polar question (122). Although it is also possible to answer the question with V2 *moog* 'go' alone, and be understood, this is not a direct answer to the question (124). The preferred yes-answer is V1 alone (123), indicating that V1 is the head of the construction.

(122)

koj *pua* *txeev* *moog* *Chiang Mai*
you QST accustomed go Chiang Mai
'Have you gone (to) Chiang Mai?'

(123)

txeev
accustomed
'(I) have.'

(124)

? *moog*
go
'(I) went.'

Another indication of the tight relationship of the verbs in these types of constructions is shown in the fronting of object complements test. Preverbal deverbal MVCs allow object complements to be fronted, as shown in the example below (125).

(125)

Chiang Mai *kuv* *tsi* *txeev* *moog*
Chiang Mai I NEG accustomed go
'(To) Chiang Mai, I have never gone.'

4.1.2 Postverbal deverbal aspect-modality

Postverbal deverbal aspect-modality markers in Hmong Ntsuab are not as prevalent as their preverbal counterparts. However, they do exist. One example of a postverbal deverbal aspect-modality marker is *lawm* 'finish, already'. An example of a postverbal deverbal aspect-modality MVC is demonstrated below, where *moog* 'go' is V1 and *lawm* 'already' is the postverbal deverbal form. This multi-verb construction is shown in the simple declarative sentence below (126).

(126)
kuv moog lawm
I go finish
'I went already.'

Testing of this multi-verb construction shows that it is not clause-separable, whether independent clauses are created using the coordinating conjunction *hab* 'and' (127), the clause linker *kuj* (128), or even with the adverbial expression *dlaug ntawm lug* 'after that' (129).

(127)
* *kuv moog Chiang Mai hab lawm*
I go Chiang Mai and finish

(128)
* *kuv moog Chiang Mai kuj lawm*
I go Chiang Mai so finish

(129)
* *kuv moog Chiang Mai dlaug ntawm lug lawm*
I go Chiang Mai after that come finish

This type of V1-V2 construction takes negation on V1 (130) but is unable to take medial negation (131).

(130)
kuv tsi moog lawm
I NEG go finish
'I (am) not going anymore.'

(131)
* *kuv moog tsi lawm*
I go NEG finish

It is able to take medial negation only when an additional verb, such as *tau* 'can', is inserted in the verb string (132), which is not medial negation of *moog lawm* but of *moog tau*, a different MVC.

(132)
kuv moog tsi tau lawm
I go NEG can finish
'I cannot go anymore.'

In answering a polar question (133), V1-V2 is the preferred answer (134). V1 is also acceptable as a single verb answer (135). V2 is not acceptable (136). This indicates that V1 *moog* 'go' is the head of this construction.

(133)
puab pua moog lawm
they QST go finish
'(Did) they go already?'

(134)
moog lawm
go finish
'(They) went already.'

(135)
moog
go
'(They) went.'

(136)
* *lawm*
finish

Similar to preverbal deverbals, postverbal deverbal MVCs allow object complements to be fronted (137), indicating a tight relationship between the verbs.

(137)
tsev puab moog lawm
house they go finish
'(The) house, they went (to) already.'

4.1.3 Summary

The verbs in both preverbal and postverbal deverbal MVCs seem to be very tightly bound. There has been no clear definition in literature regarding how to determine the "tightness" or "looseness" of verbs. For the purposes of this study, a construction

that is clause separable, does not allow the fronting of object complements, and allows the insertion of other elements between verbs will be considered less tight than constructions that do not allow these things. In addition, constructions that have a clear head seem to be more tightly bound than those that do not. There is the potential to further define tightness using semantic relationships or syntactic configuration. However, a full range of tests are beyond the scope of this study.

For deverbal constructions, discussed above (section 4.1), no elements can appear between the verbs and object complements may be fronted. Medial negation is not allowed and V1 must be directly negated to negate the whole construction. Preverbal deverbal MVCs and postverbal deverbal MVCs differ in what they prefer as a yes-answer to a polar question. Although both types of constructions allow V1 as a yes-answer, postverbal deverbals prefer V1-V2. This may be an indication of the existence of a stronger V1 headship in preverbal deverbals.

4.2 Despatch expressions

Enfield describes Lao verbs of "despatch" as those "expressing some kind of transfer or placement" (2008: 123). He then explains that despatch expressions are used in three argument clauses and that there are three types of despatch expressions in Lao: "handling-despatch" constructions, "despatch-despatch" constructions, and "communications-despatch-reception" constructions (2008: 123-124). These types of despatch expressions are used in three argument clauses in Hmong Ntsuab as well, although further study must be done to provide clear examples of despatch-despatch constructions. The various types of despatch expressions are discussed below.

4.2.1 Handling-despatch

A handling verb is defined as a verb "describing the way in which something is handled" and a handling-despatch construction as one that "typically describes transfer or placement" (Enfield 2008: 123). An example of this type of construction in Hmong Ntsuab follows (138), where V1 *muab* 'take' is the handling verb, V2 *nkaag* 'enter' is the despatch verb, and where the three arguments are *kuv* 'I', *koob* 'pin', and *qhov* 'hole'.

(138)
kuv muab koob nkaag qhov
I take pin enter hole
'I put (the) pin in (the) hole.'

Another example of a handling-despatch construction follows (139) where the three arguments are *puab* 'they', *qab* 'chicken', and *miv nyuam* 'children' and where the handling verb is *muab* 'take' and the despatch verb is *rau* 'give'. This construction will be discussed in detail below.

(139)
puab muab qab rau miv nyuam
they take chicken give child(ren)
'They gave (the) chicken to (the) children.'

In this multi-verb construction *muab rau* 'take' 'give', V1 and V2, are not clause separable with *hab* 'and' or *kuj*. With a forced reading, clause separation with *hab* 'and' creates the understanding of two separate events as shown below (140). However, this is unnatural and considered an odd construction by native speakers.

(140)
% *puab muab qab hab rau miv nyuam*
they take chicken and give child(ren)
'They took chicken and gave (it to the) children.'

In terms of responding to polar questions (141) with these types of constructions, a V1-V2 answer appears to be the most complete answer. However, in casual speech, there seems to be a strong preference for the single verb answer V1 (142). Answering with V2 alone is ungrammatical (143).

(141)
puab pua muab rau miv nyuam
they QST take give child(ren)
'(Did) they take (it to the) children?'

(142)
muab
take
'(They) took (it).'

(143)
* *rau*
give

In negation, the negation marker *tsi* occurs before V1 and negates both V1 and V2 (144). Medial negation is not allowed in this type of construction (145).

(144)

puab tsi muab qab rau miv nyuam
they NEG take chicken give child(ren)
'They (did) not take (the) chicken to (the) children.'

(145)

* *puab muab qab tsi rau miv nyuam*
they take chicken NEG give child(ren)

This type of construction allows the fronting of object complements (146).

(146)

qab puab muab rau miv nyuam
chicken they take give child(ren)
'(The) chicken, they gave to (the) children.'

4.2.2 Despatch-despatch

Despatch-despatch constructions occur when both V1 and V2 are three participant verbs, one expressing despatch and the other expressing a more specific type of despatch (Enfield 2008: 123-124). These constructions prove difficult to elicit in Hmong Ntsuab, as language resource persons explained that the examples of more specific types of despatch in Lao, such as *moop* 'hand.over' in *moop haj* and *song* 'send' in *song haj* (124) were not used in the same manner in Hmong Ntsuab. Further study is needed to determine if these types of constructions exist in Hmong and if they pattern in the same way as other despatch constructions.

4.2.3 Communications-despatch

This despatch category contains constructions that make use of a verb of communication, a verb of despatch, and a verb of reception (Enfield 2008: 124). An example of this type of construction follows (147) where *has* 'say' is the verb of communication, *rua* 'give' is the verb of despatch, and *noog* 'listen' is the verb of reception.

(147)

nwg has lug nruag rua miv nyuam noog
s/he say folktale give child(ren) listen
'He told (a) folktale for (the) children (to) listen (to).'

The verbs in communications-despatch constructions follow the same grammatical patterning of other types of despatch so they will not be discussed further.

4.2.4 Summary

Despatch constructions demonstrate a tight relationship between verbs as they do not allow medial negation, are not clause separable, and allow object complement fronting. In addition, they tend to have a strong left-headed structure, with the other verbs subordinating. This is indicated in the preference for V1 answers in polar questions. Further study is needed to determine if all types of despatch, including despatch-despatch constructions, pattern in the same way.

4.3 Disposal constructions

"Disposal constructions" are similar to despatch constructions but are defined as those constructions where "the addition of a second verb does not bring an extra participant into the clause" (Enfield 2008: 125). The examples below demonstrate a single-verb sentence (148) and a disposal construction (149) in Hmong Ntsuab. Note that the addition of *V2 kawm* 'study' does not require the addition of another argument.

(148)
puab *nqaag* *ntau*
they carry book
'They carried (the) book.'

(149)
puab *nqaag* *ntau* *moog* *kawm*
they carry book go study
'They carried (the) book away (to) study.'

Some more Hmong Ntsuab disposal constructions are shown below (150) (151) (152).

(150)
puab *coj* *TV* *lug* *noog*
they take television come listen
'They brought (the) TV (to) listen (to).'

(151)
puab *coj* *dej* *moog* *hau*
they take water go drink
'They took (the) water away (to) drink.'

(152)
puab coj dej lug tshaub
they take water come boil
'They brought (the) water (to) boil.'

Note that either the directional *moog* 'go' or the directional *lug* 'come' appears between V1 and V2 in all examples and the two transitive verbs V1 and V2 share the two arguments. This is similar to Lao (2008: 126). This may be because a disposal construction without the directional results in a different reading, as shown below.

(153)
puab coj dej hau
they take water drink
'They took drinking water.'

Directionals and motion verbs will be explored more in the discussion of complex motion constructions below (section 4.4). For now, the directional that occurs between V1 and V2 will not be discussed and the focus will be on the interaction of V1 and V2 and the grammatical properties demonstrated through constituency tests.

4.3.1 Constituency tests

It is unclear whether disposal constructions are clause separable or not. The insertion of the conjunction *hab* 'and' does not appear to produce odd utterances but it does seem to affect significant meaning change in the eyes of some but not all native speakers. It is possible that this meaning change is not able to be conveyed in the English free translations. Examples of two disposal constructions (154) (156) and their clause-separated counterparts (155) (157) follow.

(154)
puab coj dej lug tshaub
they take water come boil
'They brought water (to) boil.'

(155)
puab coj dej lug hab tshaub
they take water come and boil
'They brought water and boiled (it).'

(156)
puab nqaag moog kawm
they carry go study
'They carried (the book) away (to) study.'

(157)

puab nqaag moog hab kawm
they carry go and study
'They carried (the book) away and studied (it).'

Although disposal constructions allow the insertion of elements in between the verbs, medial negation is not allowed, as it results in an ungrammatical construction (159) (160). They take negation on V1, which negates the entire construction (158).

(158)

tsi muab qab lwj moog pov tseg
NEG take chicken rot go throw keep
'(I will) not throw (the) rotten chicken away.'

(159)

* *muab qab lwj tsi moog pov tseg*
take chicken rot NEG go throw keep

(160)

* *muab qab lwj moog tsi pov tseg*
take chicken rot go NEG throw keep

Object fronting is allowed in disposal constructions (161).

(161)

qab lwj muab moog pov tseg
chicken rot take go throw keep
'(The) rotten chicken, (I) throw away.'

The preferred single-verb yes-answer for a polar question in disposal constructions is V2. This may be because V2 seems to be the least semantically bleached verb in the construction and, in answering with the single verb V2, V1 is entailed.

4.3.2 Summary

The verbs in disposal constructions pattern similar to those in despatch constructions (section 4.2). They demonstrate a tight relationship between verbs as they do not allow medial negation and allow object complement fronting. However, unlike despatch constructions, they are right-headed and not left-headed, as shown in the V2 yes-answer.

4.4 Complex motion

Motion expressions in Hmong Ntsuab may involve many facets of motion. In Hmong, verbs are used to express actions and the details of an action, which, as

Jarkey states, may include "spatial location, path, extent, and orientation... manner... duration, and... process" (Jarkey to appear: 120). Variations of these elements combine to express facets of a single action of complex motion.

Enfield distinguishes between three types of complex motion expressions: consecutive vector motion, multi-participant motion events, and manner-path-direction constructions (2008: 126-129). Since the first category describes a "multi-vector" event, or "a mover changing direction of motion a number of times," these tend to be consecutivising constructions, or constructions making use of clause-separable clause chains (2008: 127). This type is not monoclausal and will not be discussed here (section 4.9.1). The other two types of complex motion expressions, however, are discussed below.

4.4.1 Multi-participant motion events

Enfield explains that, in Lao, the 'path' and 'direction' verbs can also take complements, such as nominals or oblique phrases, which refer to "non-figure participants" (2008: 129). The term "participant" refers to any entities, actors or objects, that are a part of the event. This is similar in Hmong Ntsuab, as shown in the first example below (162), with the nominal complements *nqeg* 'stairs' and *tsev* 'house' and in the second example below (163), with the goal *ntau ntseg* 'catch fish'.

(162)

kuv	*dla*	*nqeg*	*ntaiv*	*moog*	*tsev*
I	run	descend	stairs	go	house

'I ran down (the) stairs (to the) house.'

(163)

puab	*dla*	*nqeg*	*moog*	*ntau*	*ntseg*
they	run	descend	go	catch (with a net)	fish

'She ran down (to) catch fish.'

This type of construction is not clause separable because the verbs are actually expressing a temporally unified event. When the verbs are separated with the conjunction *hab* 'and', the construction remains grammatical, however, this creates a reading of separate events and changes the relationship between the verbs. When this happens, V1 *nqeg* no longer contributes to a unified event by expressing the manner in which he went (down) but expresses an entirely different event (descending). This change in meaning can be seen in the change in the free translation of the example below, where V1 *nqeg* conveys the adverbial 'down' in the first example (164) and the main verb 'descend' in the second (165).

(164)

puab nqeg moog
they descend go
'They went down.'

(165)

puab nqeg hab moog
they descend and go
'They descended and went.'

Medial negation is not allowed in this type of constructions (166) nor is the clause linker *kuj* insertable (167) without major semantic change among the verbs.

(166)

* *nqeg tsi moog*
descend NEG go

(167)

% *puab nqeg kuj moog*
they descend so go

Note that after the clauses are separated, resulting in a reading of two events and a significant meaning change, that negation on the second verb is then allowed (168).

(168)

puab nqeg hab tsi moog
they descend and NEG go
'They descended and (did) not go.'

In answering a polar question (169), the best answer requires that all verbs from the complex motion construction be present. Answering with one verb is often inadequate or odd, as it is not a straight answer to the question, but is rather an answer that focuses on one sub-event of the larger conceptual event (170) (171) (172). In answering with only one verb, the other verbs are not necessarily entailed.

(169)

nwg pua dla nqeg moog
s/he QST run descend go
'(Did) he run down away?'

(170)

dla
run
'(He) ran.'

(171)
nqeg
descend
'(He) descended.'

(172)
moog
go
'(He) went.'

These types of constructions do allow object complement fronting (173), which is further evidence that they are conveying one conceptual event. Note that when the one single event is coerced into two separate clauses, fronting is then not allowed as it is considered odd by native speakers (174).

(173)
ntaiv kuv dla nqeg
stairs I run descend
'(The) stairs, I ran down.'

(174)
% ntaiv kuv dla hab nqeg
stairs I run and descend
'(The) stairs, I ran and descended.'

4.4.2 Manner-path-direction constructions

Enfield distinguishes between three facets of motion in a single motion vector, namely, manner, path, and direction. He describes *manner* as motion, "by what action the motion is conducted," *path* as motion "with respect to spatial coordinates intrinsic to the non-figure entities in the scene," and *direction* as motion "with respect to some relative deictic anchor" (2008: 127). Manner verbs in Hmong Ntsuab include *dla* 'run', *taug* 'walk', *caw plhaw* 'jump', *rau* 'sink', *ntaab* 'float', and *nkaag* 'crawl', among others. Path verbs include *tawm* 'exit', *nkaag* 'enter', *raw* 'follow', *sawv* 'ascend', *lug* 'circumnavigate', and *dlau* 'pass'. Direction verbs seem to be limited to three verbs, similar to what Enfield describes in Lao. They are *moog* 'go', *lug* 'come', and *rov* 'return'. An example of a manner-path-direction construction in Hmong Ntsuab follows (175).

(175)
noog yaa tawm moog
bird fly exit go
'(The) bird flew away.'

These types of constructions pattern like the multi-participant motion events discussed above (section 4.4.1) so they will not be discussed further here.

4.4.3 Summary

Both types of complex motion expressions explained above (section 4.4.1 and section 4.4.2) tend to contain verbs in a fairly tight relationship. This is evident in the fact that these types of constructions are not clause separable. Medial negation is also not allowed nor is the clause linker *kuj* insertable without major semantic change. These constructions all allow the fronting of the object complement as well. These features indicate a semantically and syntactically tight relationship between verbs.

In answering a polar question, the best answer requires that all verbs from the complex motion construction be present. Answering with one verb is often inadequate or odd. This demonstrates the relative headlessness of the construction and the fairly equal status of the verbs.

4.5 Secondary predication constructions

Enfield defines secondary predication constructions as those that are "V1-V2 constructions in which one of the verbs... makes a secondary predication in addition to that of the main verb phrase" (2008: 129). He divides secondary predication into three semantic types: resultative, adverbial, and depictive. Secondary predication constructions in Hmong Ntsuab may be divided into these semantic types, which may have sub-types as well.

4.5.1 Resultatives

In resultative secondary predication, one of the verbs "expresses something that happens or is the case because the primary predication happens or is the case" (Enfield 2008: 130). These types of constructions are also known as "Pivotal SVCs" (Jarkey to appear: 114). As Enfield explains, multi-verb resultative constructions often convey one conceptually unitary event. However, the two verbs represent separate components of the event. He explains these to be "conceptually unitary yet multi-component event descriptions" (2008: 132). Events that would be expressed in English with one verb (such as 'killing' a duck) are often expressed in Lao with two verbs (*paat* 'slice', *taaj* 'die') which detail separate event components (132). Similar to Lao, Hmong Nstuab employs multi-verb constructions to convey these types of

resultative events. A number of sub-types within the resultative category will be discussed below.

4.5.1.1 Typical same-subject resultatives

Both verbs in same-subject resultatives share a subject. In the examples below (176) (177), the shared subject is *puab* 'they'.

(176)
puab *poob* *choj* *tuag*
they fall bridge die
'They fell (from the) bridge (to their) death.'

(177)
puab *ntsau* *nyuj* *tuag*
they crash cow die
'They crashed (into the) cow and died.'

In same-subject resultatives, because the subjects of V1 and V2 are coreferential, either of the verb phrases can be omitted resulting in a grammatical sentence (178) (179). Note, however, that the removal of one of the verbs changes the sentence to one representing only one sub-component.

(178)
puab *poob* *choj*
they fall bridge
'They fell (from the) bridge.'

(179)
puab tuag
they die
'They died.'

Note also that, when removing V1 the object complement *choj* 'bridge' must be removed as well (180), as it is the direct object complement of V1 alone and not the subject of V2.

(180)
* *puab* *choj* *tuag*
they bridge die

Same-subject resultatives allow the insertion of *hab* 'and' (181), and the insertion of the clause linker *kuj* (182). They are clause separable, as forcing a reading of two separate clauses does not significantly alter the meaning.

(181)

puab *poob* *choj* *hab* *tuag*
they fall bridge and die
'They fell (from the) bridge and died.'

(182)

puab *poob* *choj* *kuj* *tuag*
they fall bridge so die
'They fell (from the) bridge so (they) died.'

It is possible that clause separability is allowed in these types of constructions because a temporal sequence is implied in the V1-V2 relationship of these resultatives. Aikenveld explains that "the order of components... is iconic... [and] the order tends to replicate the order of occurrence of subevents" (no date: 21). In this example, V1 (falling from the bridge) must occur first in order for V2 (dying) to occur.

However, the verbs do not only have a temporal relationship but also a unique semantic "relation of condition or consequence" (Enfield 2008: 133), where V1 causes a result (V2) to happen but where V1 can also occur without V2 happening. This means that, although dying occurs because of falling, falling can occur without dying. This is shown in the construction with medial negation below (183). In this construction the negation of V2 entails V1.

(183)

puab *poob* *choj* *tsi* *tuag*
they fall bridge NEG die
'They fell (from the) bridge (but did) not die.'

The fact that same-subject resultatives have a cause and effect semantic relationship, and that they allow medial negation and the subsequent entailment of V1, indicates that these resultatives have a unique semantic relationship.

The preferred yes-answer to a polar question further supports this notion of the unique semantic relationship between verbs. In these constructions, V2 is the preferred yes-answer, as demonstrated below (184) (185).

(184)

puab *poob* *choj* *pua* *tuag*
they fall bridge QST die
'(Did) they fall (from the) bridge (to their) death?'

(185)
tuag
die
'(They fell to their) death.'

It is unnecessary to answer this polar question as V1-V2. Only V2 'dying' is necessary because V1 'falling' is entailed. Note that the free translation is '(They fell to their) death' and not '(They) died'. As 'falling' is assumed to have already happened, the real question here is whether, as a result of falling (entailed), dying occurred or not. Because of this, the V2 answer is sufficient.

Generally, MVCs that are clause separable do not allow object complement fronting. It appears that same-subject resultative MVCs do not allow the fronting of object complements (186), as LRPs express that this type of object fronting construction is odd.

(186)
% choj puab poob tuag
bridge they fall die

This may be because the relationship of the fronted object complement to the verbs must be explicitly specified. When this happens, the resulting construction is grammatical (187).

(187)
ntawm tug choj puab poob tuag
that CLF bridge they fall die
'(From) that bridge, they fell (to their) death.'

4.5.1.2 Typical different-subject resultatives

Different-subject resultatives are also known as "switch-subject cause-effect serial verbs" (Aikhenvald no date: 21). In these types of constructions, V1 and V2 do not share a subject, but each have their own subject. In the example below (188), *kuv* 'I' is the subject of V1 (*to* 'stab'), and *tug neeg* 'CLF' 'person' is the subject of V2 (*tuag* 'die').

(188)
kuv to tug neeg tuag
I stab CLF person die
'I stabbed the person (to) death.'

Different-subject resultatives pattern like same-subject resultatives in that they allow the insertion of the clause linker *kuj*, are clause separable with *hab* 'and', and allow

medial negation with V1 entailment. Object complement fronting is not allowed and V2 is the preferred yes-answer to a polar question.

4.5.1.3 Projected resultatives

Projected resultative constructions are composed of a projected accomplishment V1 and a resultative V2. The projected accomplishment verb has an intended result or purpose, but the intended result is not guaranteed: "instead of entailing the successful result of [the] ensuing event, the entailment is that in undertaking the activity, the subject's *purpose* is to achieve that result" and the resultative verb is the "realization of this result" (Enfield 2008: 135-136). In the Hmong Nstuab example below (189), the purpose of V1 is the successful accomplishment of V2. The addition of the resultative V2 shows the successful accomplishment of the purpose of V1.

(189)
nwg ncha puab pum
s/he seek they find
'She found them.'

Projected resultatives tend to be same-subject resultatives. They pattern like the same-subject resultatives and different-subject resultatives detailed above (section 4.5.1.1 and section 4.5.1.2).

4.5.1.4 Reiterative resultatives

In reiterative resultatives "a single result event component... is specified twice." Once in the "internal semantic structure" of V1 and then again when it is "explicitly reiterated... in resultative V2 function" (Enfield 2007: 137). The Hmong Ntsuab examples below show a same-subject reiterative (190) and a different-subject reiterative (191). These examples demonstrate how the semantics of the V1 *tua* 'kill' encompass both an event (the killing) and a result (dying). This result (dying) is emphasized again by the addition of V2 *tuag* 'die'.

(190)
kuv tua kuv tuag
I kill I die
'I killed myself.'

(191)
kuv tua nyuj tuag
I kill cow die
'I killed (the) cow.'

Reiterative resultative constructions pattern differently than other types of resultative constructions. For example, in these constructions medial negation is allowed. However, unlike other resultative constructions (section 4.5.1.1, section 4.5.1.2, and section 4.5.1.3), in reiteratives, the negation of V2 does not entail V1. The example below (192) shows a construction that conveys that, in attempting to kill the cow, the cow did not die.

(192)
kuv *tua* *nyuj* *tsi* *tuag*
I kill cow NEG die
'I (tried to) kill (the) cow (but it did) not die.'

Another difference between these MVCs and other types of resultative constructions is shown in the preferred yes-answer to a polar question (193). Whereas other types prefer a V2-answer, reiterative resultative constructions prefer a V1-V2 answer (194).

(193)
puab *tua* *noog* *pua* *tuag*
they kill bird QST die
'(Did) they kill (the) bird dead?'

(194)
tua *tuag*
kill die
'(They) killed (it) dead.'

Single verb answers are grammatical as well (195) (196), but they are odd in that they do not provide a straight answer to the question[8].

(195)
? *tua*
kill
'(They) killed (it).'

[8] Different native Hmong Ntsuab speakers explain that, depending on context, it is possible for this question to be answered by V2 or V1. It is possible that the V2 answer *tuag* 'die' entails V1 *tua* 'kill' within a particular context, similar to what was explain in the polar question discussion on same-subject resultatives (section 4.5.1.1). If that is the case then for *tuag* [die] '(They killed the bird) dead' would be a more representative free translation than '(It) died'. However, in answering with V1 alone, it is assumed that V2 already occurred. Perhaps a bird is noticed to have died. In that case, the question *puab tua noog pua tuag* [they kill bird QST die] might be better represented with the following free translation: '(Did) they kill (the) bird?' and not '(Did) they kill (the) bird dead?' Further study is needed to clarify the subtleties of this construction.

(196)
? tuag
die
'(It) died.'

Aside from the lack of V1 entailment in medial negation and the preferred yes-answer in a polar question, reiterative resultative constructions pattern like the other types of resultative MVCs.

4.5.1.5 Summary

The verbs in resultative constructions seem to be more syntactically loose than some of the previously discussed construction types (section 4.1, section 4.2, and section 4.3), possibly due to the temporally sequential nature of the verbs. This is shown in that they allow elements to be inserted medially and do not allow object fronting, except under specific conditions.

The verbs in resultative constructions have tight and specific semantic relationships such that they are normally connected by condition and consequence but that the condition may not always result in the consequence. This semantic relationship becomes evident in the pattern of resultatives allowing *kuj* to be medially inserted, as this clause linker often means 'so' or 'then' and indicates that a condition/consequence relationship between verbs exists. It is also evident in the clear pattern of medial negation, which all resultative types display, and subsequent entailment of V1, which all but reiterative resultatives (section 4.5.1.4) display.

In contrast, other types of constructions, such as VP chains, are clause separable but do not allow medial negation (section 4.9.1). Both construction types typically display a temporal relationship between the verbs, allowing the clauses to be separated by the conjunction *hab* 'and'. However, verbs in VP chains do not have a condition/consequence relationship but are in a more distributive or parallel relationship (Enfield 2008: 170). This relationship does not allow medial negation, indicating that VP chains have a looser, less specific semantic relationship than resultatives.

4.5.2 Adverbial complementation

Adverbial complementation occurs when the "secondary verb says something about the manner of the primary predication" (Enfield 2008: 130). Enfield divides adverbial complementation constructions into two types: right-headed and left-

headed (138-147). In right-headed complementation constructions the preferred yes-answer to a polar question is V2. In left-headed constructions the preferred answer is V1. In Hmong Ntsuab there are two sub-types of adverbial complementation: right-headed and left-headed[9].

4.5.2.1 Right-headed adverbial complementation

In MVCs with right-headed adverbial complements, V2 is usually a "stative verb with semantic scope over preceding material, making a predication – some evaluation of manner or style – about the phrase headed by V1" (2008: 138). The following example (197) shows this type of MVC in Hmong Nstuab, where the V2 stative verb is *nyaav* 'heavy' which functions to further clarify the manner of V1 *ua* 'do'.

(197)
puab ua num nyuab
they do work heavy
'They work hard.'

Right-headed complement MVCs in Hmong Ntsuab pattern similar to typical resultative constructions (section 4.5.1.1 and section 4.5.1.2), which prefer V2 as a yes-answer and allow medial negation and the insertion of the clause linker *kuj*. However, unlike resultatives, right-headed complements allow object complement fronting (198) and are not clause separable with the conjunction *hab* 'and' (199) (200).

(198)
pob kw puab khaw nyuab
corn they collect heavy
'(The) corn, they collect (with) difficulty.'

(199)
* *puab khaw pob kw hab nyuab*
they collect corn and heavy

[9] Enfield describes that the Lao language also has both active and stative right-headed complementation. Right-headed active MVCs occur when V2 is an active verb which provides additional information about V1 (Enfield 2008: 146). These types of constructions were difficult to elicit in Hmong Ntsuab as the Lao examples, such as *qaan lin* 'read' 'play' (146), resulted in adverbial compounds in Hmong Ntsuab (section 4.5.3). It is possible that right headed active complements do not exist in Hmong Ntsuab or that they exist but the examples are not the same as the Lao constructions. Further study is needed to clarify this.

(200)

* *puab ua num hab nyuab*
they do work and heavy

This indicates that verbs in right-headed complements, although they do have a fairly specific semantic relationship similar to resultative constructions, are syntactically tighter than those in resultative constructions.

4.5.2.2 Left-headed adverbial complementation

Left-headed adverbial complementation is also possible in Hmong Nstuab. The example below (201) shows *tsawm* 'quick' as the V1 complement-taking predicate in a left-headed construction.

(201)

puab tsawm sau ntau
they hurry write book
'They quickly wrote (the) book.'

Although V1 has an adverbial function, it still acts as the head in this construction, as it is the preferred yes-answer (203) to a polar question (202).

(202)

puab pua tsawm sau
they QST hurry write
'(Did) they quickly write (the book)?'

(203)

tsawm
hurry
'(They) quickly (wrote).'

Unlike right-headed constructions detailed above (section 4.5.2.1), in left-headed complementation, medial negation is not allowed and neither is the insertion of the clause linker *kuj* between V1 and V2. In addition, an object cannot intervene between these verbs.

Similar to right-headed constructions, left-headed complement MVCs are not clause separable with *hab* 'and'. The insertion of *hab* creates a reading of two separate events, altering the semantic relationship of the verbs to one that does not allow an adverbial reading of *maaj* 'hurriedly' but forces an intransitive verb reading for *maaj* 'hurry' (205).

(204)

puab	*maaj*	*sau*	*ntau*
they	hurry	write	book

'They hurriedly wrote (the) book.'

(205)

puab	*maaj*	*hab*	*sau*	*ntau*
they	hurry	and	write	book

'They hurried and wrote (the) book' (NOT 'They hurried (to) write (the) book.')

Fronting of object complements is also allowed (206).

(206)

ntau	*puab*	*maaj*	*sau*
book	they	hurry	write

'(The) book, they hurriedly wrote.'

4.5.2.3 Summary

Both right-headed and left-headed complement constructions allow object complement fronting and both are not clause separable. This indicates that these types of constructions are slightly more tightly bound, syntactically, than typical resultatives, which are clause separable and do not allow the fronting of object complements (section 4.5.1).

Where right and left-headed complement constructions differ is in their patterns of negation and insertion of *kuj*. In left-headed complementation, medial negation is not allowed and neither is the insertion of the clause linker *kuj* between V1 and V2. In right-headed complementation, these are both allowed. In addition, in answering a polar question, right-headed complement constructions prefer a V2-answer and left-headed complement constructions prefer a V1-answer. This can be attributed to the fact that Hmong Ntsuab is a head-initial language (section 2.1). In fact, both right-headed and left-headed complement constructions are similar in that they prefer the adverbial complement as the yes-answer to a polar question. This indicates that the adverbial complement is the head verb in both types of adverbial complement constructions.

4.5.3 Adverbial compounds

In Hmong Ntsuab, adverbial compounds pattern similar to adverbial complement constructions (section 4.5.2) but tend to form a slightly tighter structure as neither verb can appear alone as the grammatical head. Similar to adverbial compounds in

Lao, "the V1-V2 compound as a whole" functions as the grammatical head of the construction (Enfield 2008: 148). Hmong Ntsuab has both right-marking and left-marking adverbial compounds. Right-marking adverbial compounds can be further divided into two types.

4.5.3.1 Right-marking adverbial compounds

Enfield notes that there are two types of right-marking adverbial compounds in Lao: In one type, V1 is a semantically bleached verb and V2 a semantically specific active verb. This first type of right-marking adverbial compound seems to be very productive in Hmong Ntsuab. Two examples are shown below. In the first example of this (207), V1 is *ua* 'do' and *sis* 'play' is the specific active V2. In the next example (208), V1 is *ua* 'do' and *tau* 'talented' is the specific active V2.

(207)
puab nyob ua sis
they sit do play
'They casually sit (around).'

(208)
puab noj ua tau
they eat do talented
'They eat well.'

Enfield makes note of another type of right-marking adverbial compound in Lao, which makes use of a "semantically general active verb" (V2) and a "V1 element with more specific semantics," (2008: 149). The following example demonstrates this type of compound (209), where *ncua* 'take' serves as the more semantically general V2 and *nrab* 'grab' as the V1 with specific semantics.

(209)
kuv nrab taub dej muab
I grab bottle water take
'I grabbed (the) water bottle.'

This second type (209) does not seem to be as productive in Hmong Ntsuab and patterns very similarly to left-headed adverbial complements, except that it prefers a V1-V2 answer to a polar question. Further study is needed here to determine the extent of usage of this type of construction in Hmong Ntusab.

Both of these types of right-marking adverbial compound constructions do not allow medial negation and do not allow the clause linker *kuj* in between V1 and V2. When object complements are present, these MVCs allow them to be fronted (210).

(210)
taub dej kuv nrab muab
bottle water I grab take
'(The) water bottle, I grabbed.'

These MVCs are also not clause separable with the conjunction *hab* 'and', as this creates an ungrammatical sentence (211).

(211)
* *puab nyob huv tsev ua hab sis*
they sit in house do and play

The preferred yes-answer to a polar question is V1-V2 for both types of right-marking adverbial compound constructions. In the second type, an object complement cannot appear between V1 and V2. All these features combine to indicate that V1 and V2 are both semantically and syntactically tightly bound in these types of constructions.

4.5.3.2 Left-marking adverbial compounds

Enfield explains that in left-marking adverbial compounds, the V1 is often a posture verb (2008: 148). This is true in Hmong Nstuab as well, as shown in the example below (212) where V1 is the posture verb *pws* 'recline' and V2 is *saib* 'watch'.

(212)
puab pws saib TV
they recline watch television
'They recline (to) watch TV.'
Left-marking adverbial compounds pattern similarly to right-marking adverbial compounds so they will not be discussed further here.

4.5.3.3 Summary

The verbs in both types of adverbial compound constructions cannot be medially negated, cannot be separated by the clause linker *kuj*, and are not clause separable with *hab* 'and'. In addition, their object complements, when present, may be fronted. These features indicate a tight syntactic relationship between the verbs in adverbial complement constructions.

Right and left-marking adverbial compounds pattern similarly to right and left-headed adverbial complements (section 4.5.2). However, the difference between these adverbial compounds and the adverbial complements is that, in these constructions, neither verb acts as the grammatical head. This is demonstrated in

responses to polar questions, where the preferred response for left-marking adverbial compounds is V1-V2. The tendency to prefer, in fact, *require*, a V1-V2 answer and not a single verb answer indicates a fairly equal syntactic status among the two verbs in these types of constructions.

4.5.4 Depictives

In depictive secondary predication, an adjunct or "non-core element" is employed, which provides "information about the state of one core argument of the clause during the time at which the main clause action takes place", but "that property is independent of the main predication" (Enfield 2008: 150). In Hmong Nstuab, depictive secondary predication can be accomplished in a multi-verb construction.

4.5.4.1 Left-marking depictives

Left-marking depictives are those in which the secondary depictive predication is made by V1, as shown in (213), where V1 is *nyob* 'sit' and V2 is *nyeem* 'read'.

(213)
puab nyob nyeem ntau
they sit read book
'Sitting, they read (a) book.'

This type of construction patterns like left-headed adverbial complement constructions (section 4.5.2.2). They do not allow the clause linker *kuj* in between V1 and V2, do not allow medial negation, and are not clause-separable with the conjunction *hab* 'and', as this leads to a significant change in the relationship of the two verbs. Above, in (213), *nyob* is translated as the adverbial 'sitting'. In the clause separated depictive construction below (214), however, *nyob* is translated as the main verb 'sit' in the two-clause construction. This indicates the difference between the original clause (213), where V1 and V2 are do not have equal status, and the separated clause (214), where neither V1 or V2 are subordinate.

(214)
puab nyob hab nyeem ntau
they sit and read book
'They sit and read (a) book.'

When object complements are present, they may be fronted (215).

(215)
ntau puab nyob nyeem
book they sit read
'(The) book, they read, sitting.'

Left-marking depictives appear very similar to left-marking adverbial compounds. They pattern differently in terms of the preferred answer to a polar question as compounds prefer a V1-V2 answer. However, both left-headed adverbial complements and left-marking depictives prefer a V1 answer. The only distinction between these two constructions is that, in left-headed adverbial complements, V1 is an adverbial verb, and in left-marking depictives, V1 is a depictive verb.

4.5.4.2 Summary

Depictives pattern similar to adverbial complements and adverbial compounds, indicating that they have a similar syntactic structure. Further study is required to explore all the possible types of depictive constructions in Hmong Ntsuab.

4.6 Oblique phrases / adjunction

Enfield explains that, in Lao, verb phrases may actually perform the function of prepositional phrases in other languages, which "rather than being coordinated with other verb phrases, are adjoined to the main phrase" (2008: 153). Although Enfield discusses two types of prepositions, denominal and deverbal, this section will only focus on deverbal prepositions, as they are the forms that may appear as main verbs in other contexts.

4.6.1 Deverbal preposition constructions

A deverbal preposition "provides a way of adding an argument to the core of the clause" but the "notion embodied in the preposition is not predicated as an event" (2008: 154). In the following Hmong Ntsuab construction (216), *nkaag* 'enter' serves as the deverbal preposition, by which the extra argument *tsev* 'house' is added.

(216)
kuv caij neeg nkaag tsev
I ride horse enter house
'I rode (the) horse into (the) house.'

In the next example (217), *rau* 'give' is the deverbal preposition and the extra argument is *koj* 'you'.

(217)
kuv ua mov rau koj noj
I do rice give you eat
'I made rice (for) you (to) eat.'

In this case (217), *ua* 'do' and *rau* 'give' are used together to convey a benefactive function in what could be translated as 'for' in English.

Deverbal preposition constructions are headed by V1, as V1 is the preferred yes-answer to a polar question (218) (219).

(218)
koj pua ua mov rau miv nyuam
you QST do rice give child(ren)
'(Did) you make rice for (the) children?'

(219)
ua
do
'(I) made (it).'

These types of constructions do not allow medial negation or the insertion of the clause linker *kuj*. They allow their object complements to be fronted and they are not clause separable. This is clearly evident in that, when clause separation is coerced, the clause changes from a benefactive deverbal preposition construction to a despatch construction. This is shown in the comparison of the following two examples (220) (221).

(220)
kuv ua mov rau koj noj
I do rice give you eat
'I made rice (for) you (to) eat.'

(221)
kuv ua mov hab rau koj noj
I do rice and give you eat
'I made rice and gave (it to) you (to) eat.'

It is possible for *ua* 'do' and *rau* 'give' to convey a causative function in different context. The grammatical patterning of these two verbs in a causative construction is discussed below (section 4.7).

4.6.2 Summary

Deverbal prepositions are headed by V1 and fairly tight syntactically, in that they do not allow the insertion of any elements between V1 and V2. Insertion of elements is either ungrammatical or drastically changes the meaning of the utterance.

The verbs *ua* 'do' and *rau* 'give' may combine to convey prepositional, despatch, or causative functions. It is important to note, however, that *ua* 'do' and *rau* 'give', when used in deverbal preposition constructions, pattern differently than their despatch and causative counterparts. This is proof that it is not the mere combination of verbs that is important in deciphering meaning, but also their syntactic and semantic environments.

4.7 Causative constructions

Enfield's description of causative MVCs in Lao relates to what he terms a "periphrastic strategy," one that "involves no overt marking of the relationship between the main causative verb and its complement" (2008: 157). Traditional causation is defined as an "interpersonal force relation between a causer and a causee" (Cornillie and Delbecque 2007: 5). Different verbs may be used in MVCs to form causative constructions in Hmong Nstuab.

4.7.1 Causative constructions using *kua* 'give'

In Hmong Ntsuab, causative constructions can be formed by using the verb *kua* 'give' in combination with another verb. Enfield explains that, in Lao, in causative constructions that use 'give', "the causer... says or does something... because of which the causee does something" and where the causer knew that, "as a result of his action, that the complement event would happen" (2008: 157). This is similar to causative constructions that use *kua* 'give' in Hmong Ntsuab. The example below (222) shows a construction where V1 *kua* 'give' is used in combination with V2 *moog* 'go' to convey the meaning 'to allow,' 'to let,' or 'to have'.

(222)

puab	*kua*	*miv nyuam*	*moog*	teb
they	give	child(ren)	go	field

'They had (the) children go (to the) field.'

These types of constructions allow the fronting of the object complement. In addition, they do not allow insertion of the clause linker *kuj* between verbs (223) and are not clause separable with the conjunction *hab* 'and' (224).

(223)

* *puab kua miv nyuam kuj moog* teb
they give child(ren) then go field

(224)

* *puab kua miv nyuam hab moog teb*
they give child(ren) and go field

Causative constructions that use *kua* 'give' are, interestingly enough, able to take negation on either verb (225) (226). When they are medially negated, V1 is entailed.

(225)

puab tsi kua miv nyuam moog teb
they NEG give child(ren) go field
'They (did) not have (the) children go (to the) field.'

(226)

puab kua miv nyuam tsi moog teb
they give child(ren) NEG go field
'They had (the) children not go (to the) field.'

Another interesting feature of these types of construction is that they require a V1-V2 answer (228) and not a single-verb answer (229) (230) when responding to a polar question (227).

(227)

puab pua kua miv nyuam moog teb
they QST give child(ren) go field
'(Did) they have (the) children go (to the) field?'

(228)

kua moog
give go
'(They) had (them) go.'

(229)

? *kua*
give
'(They) gave (something to them).'

(230)

? *moog*
go
'(They) went.'

This indicates that the MVC is not clearly headed by V1 or by V2 but that there involves some ambiguity of inner structure. See the section on flat different-subject

control complementation (section 4.8.1.3) for a discussion on ambiguity of the lower clause.

4.7.2 Causative constructions using *ua* 'do'

Another type of causative MVC in Hmong Nstuab employs the use of the verb *ua* 'do' in conjunction with another verb. In causative constructions with 'do' in Lao, the "main subject does something... and because of that the complement event occurs" (Enfield 2008: 158). This is similar in Hmong Ntsuab as well. The main subject (*puab* 'they') in the following example (231) has done something, because of which a complement event (*av tawg* 'window' 'break') happens.

(231)
puab ua av tawg
they do glass shatter
'They broke (the) window.'

As explained by Enfield (2008: 158), in these types of constructions, the secondary subject does not *do* something as a result of the causee, as in *kua* 'give' constructions above (section 4.7.1), but something *happens to* that subject as a result of the causee. In the example above (231), the secondary subject, the window, did not do anything.

These *ua* 'do' causative constructions pattern like *kua* 'give' constructions above (section 4.7.1) and will not be discussed further here.

4.7.3 Causative constructions using *ua kua* 'do' 'give' or *ua rau* 'do' 'give'

Causative constructions may also be formed by combining *ua* 'do' and *kua* 'give' together with a third verb (232), or by combining *ua* 'do' and *rau* 'give' together with a third verb (233).

(232)
puab ua kua av tawg
they do CAUS glass shatter
'They caused (the) glass (to) shatter.'

(233)
puab ua rau koj tu sab
they do CAUS you sad heart
'They made you sad.'

In these types of MVCs the main subject may not intentionally cause something to happen or even be aware that something is happening (Enfield 2008: 158), as opposed to the control of main subjects in causative constructions that employ 'give' alone (section 4.7.1).

These causative constructions pattern almost exactly like the *kua* 'give' constructions and the *ua* 'do' constructions above (section 4.7.1 and section 4.7.2). The only difference is that these constructions require negation on V1 alone and do not allow medial negation (234) (235).

(234)

% puab ua tsi kua av tawg
they do NEG CAUS glass shatter
'They caused (the) glass (to) not shatter.'

(235)

** puab ua tsi rau koj tu sab*
they do NEG give you sad heart

4.7.4 Other causative-like constructions

In addition to the strategies explained above, other verbs may combine to convey a causative function. In the first example below (236), the verbs *caij* 'ride' and *hlaag* 'cross' create a causation where the subject, *kuv* 'I', caused the horse to jump across the chair.

(236)

kuv caij neeg hlaag rooj
I ride horse cross.over chair
'I rode (the) horse across (the) chair.'

In the next example (237), *khaiv* 'order' and *kua* 'give' form a causative construction.

(237)

puab khaiv kua miv nyuam moog
they order give child(ren) go
'They ordered (the) children (to) go.'

These constructions, pattern similar to *ua kua* 'do' 'give' and *ua rau* 'do' 'give' constructions, as discussed above (section 4.7.3).

4.7.5 Summary

All the types of causative constructions surveyed here allow the fronting of the object complement, do not allow insertion of the clause linker *kuj* between verbs, and are not clause separable with the conjunction *hab* 'and'. Each of the causative constructions also require V1-V2 as a yes-answer to a polar question, indicating that there is not a strong verb head in these types of constructions. Although medial negation is allowed in the simple causative constructions (section 4.7.1 and section 4.7.2), medial negation does not appear to be allowed with complex types of causative constructions (section 4.7.3 and section 4.7.4). Further research is needed to confirm this conclusion.

4.8 Complementation

Although some types of complementation have been addressed above (section 4.5.2), complementation will be more specifically explored in this section. Complementation in Hmong Ntsuab may be divided into control complementation and non-control complementation. Control is determined based on "the extent to which the temporal or argument structure properties of the complement-taking predicate will determine those of the lower predicate" (Enfield 2008: 160). This section begins with a look at control complementation.

4.8.1 Control complementation

Control complementation occurs when "there is control by the main verb of argument coreference as well as temporal relation across the two predicates" (2008: 160). Both same-subject and different-subject control complementation are possible in Hmong Ntsuab.

4.8.1.1 Same-subject

In same-subject control complementation, "the matrix verb specifies a verb phrase as its complement" (2008: 160), which can be a simple single verb or a complex verb phrase. In the following two examples (238) (239), this matrix verb is an auxiliary-verb *xaav,* meaning 'want'.

(238)

puab	*xaav*	*moog*	*teb*
they	want	go	field

'They want (to) go (to the) field.'

(239)
puab *xaav* *noog* *nkauj*
they want listen music
'They want (to) listen (to) music.'

Same-subject control complementation constructions are not clause separable and their object complements can be fronted. They do not allow insertion of the clause linker *kuj* between verbs and they cannot take medial negation. They are headed by V1, as the following polar question (240) and V1 answer (241) demonstrate.

(240)
puab *pua* *xaav* *moog* *teb*
they QST think go field
'(Do) they want (to) go (to the) field?'

(241)
xaav
want
'(They) want (to).'

4.8.1.2 S-COMP different-subject

Another type of control complementation is different-subject complementation. Enfield distinguishes between "S-COMP" and "flat" different-subject control complementation (2008: 163-164). The former occurs when "the upper verb clearly takes the lower clause as a whole complement," as indicated by the possible ellipsis of subject (2008: 162-163). Hmong Ntsuab has these types of control complement constructions. In the following S-COMP example (242), the upper verb is *xaav* 'want' and the lower clause complement is *kua koj noog nkauj* 'you (to) listen (to) music'.

(242)
puab *xaav* *kua* *(koj)* *noog* *nkauj*
they want APPL you listen music
'They want you (to) listen (to) music.'

These pattern similarly to same-subject control complement constructions (section 4.8.1.1) in that they are not clause separable and their object complements can be fronted. They do not allow insertion of the clause linker *kuj* between verbs and they are headed by V1, indicating that "the lower clause is strongly dependent on the main verb" (162-163). In the example above (242), the preferred yes-answer to a polar question is V1 *xaav* 'want'.

4.8.1.3 Flat different-subject

Enfield distinguishes between *S-COMP* different-subject and *flat* different-subject control complementation, defining the latter as occurring when "the main verb phrase [is] flat with respect to the relatedness of the upper verb and the lower verb phrase" (2008: 164). Hmong Ntsuab has constructions like this (243) which are causatives.

(243)
kuv kua puab lug
I APPL they come
'I have them come.'

These constructions pattern similarly to S-COMP constructions except that they prefer a V1-V2 answer when answering a polar question (244) (245) (246).

(244)
koj pua kua puab lug
you QST APPL they come
'(Did) you have them come?'

(245)
kua lug
APPL come
'(I) had (them) come.'

(246)
% *kua*
APPL
'(I) had (them).'

Enfield mentions that this V1-V2 answer is an indication of the "ambiguity of the lower noun phrase," which occurs in these types of constructions because the object in the upper clause is often the subject of the lower clause (2008: 164). This is evident in the above example (243) where *puab* 'they' can be interpreted as the object complement of the upper clause or the subject of the lower clause.

4.8.2 Non-control complementation

Non-control complement constructions, as defined by Enfield, often make use of "verbs of speech and cognition" and are "usually marked with an overt complementiser" (2008: 165). In Hmong Ntsuab, this complementiser in these types of constructions is *ta* 'say' (247).

(247)
kuv xaav ta puab moog
I think say they go
'I think that they went.'

Non-control complement constructions are not clause separable and the insertion of the clause particle *kuj* is not possible between verbs without meaning change[10]. However, similar to different subject control complements (section 4.8.1.2 and section 4.8.1.3), these constructions allow medial negation.

Non-control complement constructions are different than other types of complement constructions (section 4.8.1) in relation to headship. The yes-answer test indicates that V1-V2-V3 is the best yes-answer to a polar question for these constructions (248) (249) (250) (251) (252).

(248)
koj pua xaav ta puab moog
you QST think say they go
'(Do) you think that they went?'

(249)
xaav ta moog
think say go
'(I) think that (they) went.'

(250)
xaav ta
think say
'(I) think so'

(251)
% xaav
think
'(I) think'

(252)
? moog
go
'(They) went.'

[10] The insertion of *kuj* is allowed in the lower clause with meaning change, possibly because of the independence of the subordinating clause. As Enfield explains it, the subordinating clause in these types of constructions, "retains many of the properties of an independent sentence" (2008: 165). Further study must be done to further specify the independent qualities of these types of constructions in Hmong Ntsuab.

4.8.3 Summary

The four types of complementation constructions discussed above (section 4.8.1 and section 4.8.2) are similar in that they are not clause separable and their object complements can be fronted. They also do not allow insertion of the clause linker *kuj* between verbs. An area for further study is in patterns of negation and headship, as there appears to be significant differences among complementation construction types in this area.

4.9 Coordinating constructions

Although coordinating constructions may not be considered multi-verb constructions by some, they will be discussed here to provide a comparison against the different types of MVCs that have already been reviewed. Two types of coordinating constructions and their grammatical distinctions are discussed below: verb chains and verb compounds.

4.9.1 Verb chaining

Enfield defines a "verb (phrase) chain" as "a string of verb phrases with no overt linking morphology, usually with a single understood subject, which may or may not be overtly expressed" (2008: 170). Kroeger explains that each clause in the verb chain may refer to distinct events and different arguments may be taken by the different verbs in a clause chain (2007: 7). Sometimes, verb chains demonstrate a purposive relationship between the verbs and sometimes they display a parallel or distributive relationship. Still other times they display a sequential relationship (Enfield 2008: 170-171).

4.9.1.1 Purposive verb chains

Purposive verb chains in Hmong Ntsuab usually consist of V1-V2, where V2 is the purpose of V1. The MVC *moog kawm* 'go study' is considered a purposive (253).

(253)

nwg	*txau sab*	*moog*	*Chiang Mai*	*kawm*	*ntau*
s/he	interested	go	Chiang Mai	study	book

'She (is) interested (in) going (to) Chiang Mai (to) study.'

These verb chains do not allow medial negation but each verb must be negated independently. They are considered clause-separable and not subordinating, as the

insertion of *hab* 'and', does not cause a significant change to the semantic content on the whole or to the V1-V2 semantic relationship (254).

(254)

nwg	*txau sab*	*moog*	*Chiang Mai*	*hab*	*kawm*	*ntau*
s/he	interested	go	Chiang Mai	and	study	book

'She (is) interested (in) going (to) Chiang Mai and studying.'

In purposive verb chains, the preferred yes-answer to a polar question is V1-V2. These verb chains allow the insertion of the clause linker *kuj,* indicating that the verbs have a specific semantic relationship.

4.9.1.2 Parallel verb chains

In parallel relationship verb chains, the various verbs and verb phrases have no dependence on each other in terms of "temporal, consequential, conditional, causative, or purposive relation" (2008: 170). In the example below (255), the verb phrases *khaw hov xob* 'collect chillies' and *khaw tawm* 'collect peanuts' are in a parallel relationship as a verb chain.

(255)

puab	*khaw*	*hov txob*	*khaw*	*tawm*	*hab*	*lug*	*noj*
they	collect	chilli pepper	collect	peanut	and	come	eat

'They collected chillies, collected peanuts, and brought (them to) eat.'

There is no inherent temporal relationship between the collecting of the chillies and the collecting of the peanuts and one does not depend on the other in terms of cause and result or purpose. Parallel verb chains do not allow medial negation or the insertion of the clause linker *kuj,* both of which have been shown to only occur in between verbs with a more specific and dependent semantic relationship, like causatives (section 4.7) and resultatives (section 4.5.1). They must be negated individually as they represent individual, semantically independent, events. This is further supported by the fact that they are very clearly clause separable: when the clause is restated as two clauses, the result is the same meaning.

4.9.1.3 Sequential verb chains

In other cases, the verbs in a verb chain may be fairly independent but still be in a sequential relationship, where "the events listed in the chain are understood to happen one after the other" (2008: 171). As Enfield explains, these events are often actions that are "habitually linked in the daily flow of events" (*ibid*). The following Hmong Nstuab examples (256) (257) show sequential verb chains.

(256)

rov	*lug*	*ntsuav*	*teg*	*ua*	*mov*	*zaub*	*noj*
return	come	wash	hand	do	rice	vegetable	eat

'(I) come back, wash (my) hands, (and) make food (to) eat.'

(257)

ntsuav	*nav*	*nkaag*	*txhaw*	*pws*
wash	teeth	enter	room	sleep

'(I) brush (my) teeth (and) enter (the) room (to) sleep.'

In the second example above (257), the verb phrases *nruav nav* 'brush (my) teeth' and *nkaag txhaw* 'enter (the) room' are in a sequential relationship, where the subject does one before the other, most likely habitually. The final verb *pws* 'sleep' is in a purposive relationship with the verb phrase *nkaag txhaw* 'enter (the) room'.

Sequential verb chains pattern identically to purposive verb chains (section 4.9.1.1) and almost identically to parallel verb chains (section 4.9.1.2). The only difference is that sequential verb chains allow the insertion of the clause linker *kuj* (258).

(258)

ntsuav	*nav*	*kuj*	*nkaag*	*txhaw*	*pws*
wash	teeth	then	enter	room	sleep

'(I) brushed (my) teeth so (I) entered (the) room (to) sleep.'

This indicates a tighter, more specific, (temporal) semantic relationship between the verbs in a sequential verb chain than those in a parallel verb chain.

4.9.1.4 Summary

Verb chains can be identified and distinguished from the many other types of multi-verb constructions through the examination of their grammatical patterning. As demonstrated, the verbs in verb chains are very loosely connected, both syntactically and semantically.

4.9.2 Verb compounds

Verb compounds are the result of a combination of "two or more verbs... resulting in what is effectively a single verb, with a single subject and a single object" (Enfield 2008: 172). Hmong Ntsuab makes use of verb compounds (259).

(259)

kuv	*ntswb*	*pum*	*puab*
I	meet	see	they

'I met them.'

These constructions have no clear head because they "usually involve a pair of near synonyms" (2008: 172) and, as a result, V1 or V2 is usually acceptable as a yes-answer to a polar question (260) (261) (262).

(260)
koj pua ntswb pum puab
you QST meet see they
'(Did) you encounter them?'

(261)
ntswb
meet
'(I) met (them).'

(262)
pum
see
'(I) saw (them).'

Because they contain synonymous verbs, these constructions do not take medial negation, as that would be semantically odd. They allow the fronting of object complements (263) and they are clause separable (264), but they do not allow the insertion of the clause linker *kuj*, as this insertion causes significant meaning change among the verbs (265).

(263)
puab kuv ntswb pum
they I meet see
'Them, I encountered.'

(264)
kuv ntswb hab pum puab
I meet and see they
'I met and saw them.'

(265)
% kuv ntswb kuj pum puab
I meet so see they
'I met them so I saw them.'

4.9.3 Summary

Semantically, the verbs in verb compounds work together to convey on conceptual event. Syntactically, they pattern differently from all the other constructions

surveyed in this study, in that they allow both fronting of object complements and are clause separable. Similar to verb chains (section 4.9.1), they have no clear head, not because both V1 and V2 must be present in a yes-answer but because either may be present.