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ABSTRACT
In addition to denoting disposal, ka in Taiwan Southern Min has other functions such as introducing goal, source, benefactive, and adversative. Like the disposal ka-construction, the ka NP in goal/source ka constructions is semantically related to the postverbal object. Compared with the disposal ka-construction, goal/source ka-constructions sometimes require one more postverbal argument. As for benefactive/adversative ka-constructions, they differ from the other ka-constructions in that the benefactive/adversative argument is often optional. This paper discusses the non-disposal ka constructions, and it argues that Lin’s (2010) account of the disposal ka-construction can be applied to account for goal/source ka-constructions. The benefactive ka-construction and the adversative ka-construction are semantically related, and they also have the same structure. To sum up, among the four types of non-disposal ka construction, two of them (goal and source) are argued to have the same structure as that for a disposal ka-construction, and the benefactive/adversative ka-constructions have their own distinctive structure.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Similar to *ba* in Mandarin Chinese, *ka* in Taiwan Southern Min (TSM)\(^1\) can introduce the patient theta role as in (1). The other theta roles *ka* can introduce are classified into three types by Teng (1982): goal as in (2), source as in (3), and benefactive as in (4). In Tsao (2003), benefactive is taken to include adversative as well as in (5).

(1) a. *伊 *ka 我拍一下。 *i  ka gua phah  cit  e.\(^2\) (patient)
   he KA  I  hit one CL.
   He hit me once.'

   b. *伊拍一下。 *i phah  cit  e.
   he hit one CL.

(2) a. *伊 ka 我問一個問題。 *i  ka gua mng cit  e bunte. (goal)
   he KA  I  ask one CL question.
   ‘He asked me a question.’

   b. ?伊問一個問題。 ?i mng cit e  bunte.
   he ask one CL question.

---

\(^1\) Taiwan Southern Min (TSM) discussed in this paper refers to the Southern Min spoken by more than 80% of the people in Taiwan (Cheng 1985).

\(^2\) The romanization used in this paper for Taiwan Southern Min examples is according to the TLPA (Taiwan Language Phonetic Alphabet), which was promulgated by the Ministry of Education in Taiwan in 1998.

\(^3\) Abbreviations used in this paper are listed below:

The ka NP is peculiar in at least two aspects: optionality and (superficial) displacement. First, among the five types of ka-construction, Tsao (2003) takes patient, goal, and source to be an obligatory argument as shown in (1-3), while benefactive/adversative is optional as in (4-5).

Second, the preverbal ka NP which carries the theta role of patient, goal, or source can often take the postverbal position as well, as shown in (6-8).

(6) 伊拍我一下。
i phah gua cι e. (patient) (cf. (1))
he hit I one CL
He hit me once.’

(7) 伊问我一个问题。
i mng gua cι e bunte. (goal) (cf. (2))
he ask I one CL question.
‘He asked me a question.’
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(8) 伊欲罰你錢哦？
i beh huat li cinn o?  (source) (cf. (3))
he want fine you money PRT
‘He would like to fine you?’

The displacement of the benefactive or adversative $ka$ NP in the postverbal position, however, is not acceptable as in (9) and (10).

(9) *伊咧洗弟弟身軀。
*i tih ce titi sinkhu.  (benefactive)  (cf. (4))
he at wash brother body
‘He is washing the brother’s body.’

(10) *伊摃破我杯仔。
*i kong-phua gua pue-a.  (adversative)  (cf. (5))
he hit-break I cup
‘He broke my cup.’

Regarding the discussion on $ka$, the disposal $ka$-construction, that is, the $ka$-construction introducing the patient theta role as in (1), has drawn much attention, and various proposals are available, including Tsao’s (2003) raising approach, Yang’s (2006) NOP (null operator) approach, and Lin’s (2010) control approach. This paper aims to adopt Lin’s control approach on the disposal $ka$-construction to explain the

---

4 In both (9) and (10), if the associative marker $e$ is inserted between the benefactive/adversative and the patient as in (i) and (ii), the sentences are then grammatical. However, it should be noted that in (i) and (ii) only one NP follows the verb, *titi e sinkhu* ‘brother’s body’ in (i) and *gua e pue-a* ‘my cup’ in (ii).

(i) 伊咧洗弟弟 e 身軀。
i tih ce titi e sinkhu.  (benefactive)(cf. (9))
he at wash brother ASSOC body
‘He is washing the brother’s body.’

(ii) 伊摃破我 e 杯仔。
i kong-phua gua e pue-a.  (adversative) (cf. (10))
he hit-break I ASSOC cup
‘He broke my cup.’
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derivation and properties of the non-disposal ka-constructions introducing goal and source, and Lin’s (2012) proposal on adversatives is applied to benefactives. This paper is structured as follows. Section 1 introduces the properties of ka-construction. Section 2 reviews literature on ka-construction, and Section 3 presents the proposed analyses on non-disposal ka-constructions. Section 4 concludes this paper.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Regarding the semantic relation between the ka NP and the postverbal object, Hung (1995) and Tsao (2003) argue that the ka NP is base-generated as the object of the main verb and it is raised to the preverbal position and assigned Case by the preposition ka. As pointed out in Yang (2006), one of the problems with this raising approach is that the raising of the ka NP is not motivated as it already receives Case from the main verb.

In Yang’s (2006) null operator approach, (11) is proposed to be the structure of ka-construction. In (11) the ka NP, Abing, is base-generated in the preverbal position. As for the object of the verb phah ‘hit’, it is occupied by a null operator, which moves up to adjoin to VP3 and is coindexed with the ka NP, Abing.
Yang’s NOP analysis nicely captures the semantic relation between the *ka* NP and the object of the lower verb through null operator movement and coindexation. However, as pointed out in Lin (2010), this NOP analysis is still not without problems. First of all, the subject of the lower VP, i.e., Pro,\(^5\) is presented to be coindexed with the main subject, that is, *gua ‘I’* in this case; however, this coindexation is not supported by any argument. Furthermore, control of Pro by the more distant NP *gua* is not consistent with the Generalized Control Rule, which states that an empty pronominal is controlled in its control domain (Huang 1989).\(^6\)

---

5 The idea of Pro is due to Huang (1989).
6 The author would like to thank one of the reviewers for pointing this out.
Another problem with this NOP analysis is its accountability with ciong constructions such as (13) and (14). Ciong is another disposal marker in TSM, and the difference between ciong and ka is that those sentences containing ciong tend to occur in written discourse (Chappell 2000). Ciong may occur alone as in (13) or co-occur with ka as in (14). In a ciong...ka construction, a third person pronoun i may occur after ka as in (15). To put it another way, i is optional when it occurs after ka as in (14). In the structure under the NOP analysis, i.e., (11), the only possible position for i is the Pro position. Placing the third person pronoun i in the Pro position will result in the illogical meaning that he affected the shoes in the event in which they wore themselves threadbare.

(12) 伊 ka 鞋子穿破去矣。
   i  ka  e-a ching-phuakhi a.
   he KA shoes wear-threadbare PRT
   'He wore his shoes threadbare.'

(13) 伊将鞋仔穿破去矣。
   i ciong e-a ching-phuakhi a. (cf. (12))
   he CIONG shoes wear-threadbare PRT
   'He wore his shoes threadbare.'

(14)伊將鞋仔 ka 穿破去矣。
   i ciong e-a ka ching-phuakhi a.
   he CIONG shoes KA wear-threadbare PRT
   'He wore his shoes threadbare.'

---

7 One reviewer points out that (13) and (14) may differ in meaning. The minute meaning difference may be that when two disposal markers are used as in (14), the disposal meaning is stronger. That is, (13) simply describes the event, while (14) puts emphasis on what happens to the shoes.

8 The third person i can also be omitted when it occurs after the passive marker hoo as in (i).

(i) 我予（伊）拍著。
   gua hoo (i) phah-tioh.
   I PASS he hit-arrive
   'I was hit by him.'
Lin (2010) proposes (16) to be the structure of the disposal ka-construction in (12), and (16) is based on the structure proposed by Huang (1999) for short passives such as (17). The structure for a short passive such as (18) denotes the meaning that a person/object is affected in a certain event. The disposal construction, on the other hand, denotes the meaning that someone affects a person/object in the way that person/object is affected in a certain event. The short passive and the disposal construction differ in the presence of the agent; therefore, (18) is modified into (16) to accommodate the presence of the agent in a disposal construction. In (16), V1 and V2 are respectively occupied by the two verbs of the disposal construction, ka and ching-phuakhi ‘wear-threadbare’; ka as a light verb denotes the meaning of ‘affect’ (Li 2006; Lin 2001; Yang 2006) and subcategorizes for an NP object, NP2 in (16), and a VP which describes what the affected object undergoes, that is VP2 in (16). Ka has to move up from V1 to v to assign Case to e-a ‘shoes’ in NP2. VP2 in (16) involves a passivized verb, which does not assign Case to its object, NP4. As VP2 in (16) involves a passivized verb, thus only a transitive verb is allowed. As demonstrated in (19) an intransitive verb such as thiau ‘jump’ is not tolerated.

9 Resultative compounds such as ching-phuakhi ‘wear-threadbare’ are argued to be derived from a structure that can be simplified as \{\_V \_NP \_V \_NP \_V \_V \} through V-to-V incorporation in syntax by Lin (2007). Lin (2010), however, does not show the detailed internal structure for the resultative compound ching-phuakhi as in (16). As the internal structure of the compound is not the focus of the discussion here and it does not affect the analysis, the detailed structure of the compound is not illustrated in this paper to simplify discussion. It should be noted that both a compound verb such as ching-phuakhi and a simple verb such as phah ‘hit’ as in (i) fits into (16) well.

(i) 伊 ka 我拍。  
i ka gua phah.  
he KAI hit  
‘He hit me.’
(16) vP
   NP1
     i
     ‘he’
   v
   VP1
     NP2
       e-a,
       ‘shoes’
     V1
     VP2
     NP3
     Pro,
     ‘wear-threadbare’
   V2
   NP4
der

(17) 老王被打 了。
Laowang bei da le.
Laowang PASS hit ASP
‘Laowang was hit.’
der

(18) IP...
   NP
     Laowang,
     bei
dr
   V
   VP
     NP
     PRO,
     da-le
t
   V
   NP
(19) *我 ka 伊跳。
   *gua ka i thiau.
   I KA he jump
   intended meaning: ‘I affected him in the event in which I jumped.’

That VP2 in (16) involves a passivized verb is further proved by (20) which involves the active usage of the verb taking the object in the postverbal position.

(20) 伊穿破鞋仔矣。
   i ching-phua e-a a.
   he wear-threadbare shoes PRT
   ‘He wore his shoes threadbare.’

In (16) Pro has to undergo A-movement from the object of ching-phuakhi ‘wear-threadbare’ to the VP-internal subject position since it is in a case-less position;\(^\text{10}\) Pro is then controlled by the closest NP c-commanding it, that is e-a ‘shoes’ (Principle of Minimal Distance (Chomsky 1980; Rosenbaum 1970)), and gets interpreted at this position. (16) thus expresses the meaning that he affected the shoes in the event in which the shoes were worn threadbare.

Lin’s (2010) control approach can also explain the disposal construction involving the use of ciong. If V1 in (16) is occupied by ciong, not ka, after ciong is moved up to v to assign Case to e-a, (13) is derived.\(^\text{11}\) Instead of moving up ka, if ciong is inserted in v and ka stays in-situ in V1, (14) is then derived as shown in (21).

\(^{10}\) Ching-phuakhi in VP2 in (16) is a passivized verb, and it cannot assign Case to its object. The object of ching-phuakhi is thus in a case-less position.

\(^{11}\) (13) has the same structure as (16), except ka is replaced by ciong.
When ka remains in-situ and is available to assign Case to the Pro inside VP2, this Pro can be optionally filled with a pronoun that is coreferential with the NP object, as in (15), where i refers to e-a ‘shoes.’ This offers more evidence proving that Pro moves up from the postverbal position to the preverbal position. Without the raising, the derivation of (15) cannot be accounted for. On the other hand, in cases where ka does not stay in-situ and Pro thus cannot get Case from it, i is not allowed as in (22-23), which have (24) as their structure. Lin (2010) has discussed disposal ka-construction in detail; however, the non-disposal ka-constructions as in (2-5) are not under discussion in Lin (2010).

(22) *伊 ka 鞋仔伊穿破去矣。
    *i ka e-a i ching-phuakhi a. (cf. (12))
    he KA shoes he wear-threadbare PRT
    ‘He wore his shoes threadbare.’
Benefactive and adversative arguments are often taken as optional. Tsao (2003) thus suggests that different from patient, goal, and source, benefactive and adversative arguments are base-generated in the preverbal position. Yang (2006) proposes only one structure as in (11) for ka-construction no matter what theta role the ka NP takes. The theta role that the ka NP takes is determined by the secondary predicate. However, the benefactive/adversative argument is optional and it cannot take the postverbal position as shown in (9-10); therefore, the intended position for the object in OP in VP3 in (11) is not needed, and (11) cannot account for benefactive/adversative ka-construction.

Lin (2012) discusses adversative ka-construction such as (25) and proposes (26) to be its structure. Following Huang et al. (2009), Lin (2012) divides the complements taken by ka into two types: VP and IP. In a disposal ka-construction ka takes a VP as in (16), while in an
adversative, *ka* is followed by an IP as in (26). In a disposal *ka*-construction, the *ka* NP is related to an argument within the VP subcategorized for by *ka*. To illustrate, in (16), the *ka* NP *e*-a ‘shoes’ is related to Pro inside VP2. That is, what is threadbare is the shoes in (16). The *ka* NP in an adversative *ka*-construction, however, is not related to any position inside the following phrase/sentence, which is complete in meaning. Moreover, the *ka* NP is affected by the event denoted by a sentence, not a verb phrase. To illustrate, in (26) the *ka* NP *gua* ‘I’ is affected by the event that he ran away. Huang et al. (2009) thus proposes that the adversative *ka* takes an IP complement. In a proposal that adopts a VP-internal subject hypothesis, one may equally argue that the adversative *ka* takes a VP which contains an internal subject as its complement. However, to clearly manifest the difference between the two types of complements taken by *ka*, this paper adopts the VP/IP distinction.

(25) 伊竟然 *ka* 我走去。
    i kingjian  ka gua cau-khi.
    he unexpectedly KA  I run-away
    ‘He unexpectedly ran away on me.’
Tsai (2007) argues that in Mandarin adveratives such as (27), the main subject is moved up from the position of the embedded subject. Adversatives in TSM have the same semantic relation as those in Mandarin. Lin (2012) thus adopts Tsai’s analysis to account for adverasive ka-construction in TSM. That is, cau-khi ‘run-away’ in (26) is predicated of the embedded subject i, which is then moved up to the sentence-initial topic position.\(^\text{13, 14}\)

(27) 他居然給我跑了。

\begin{verbatim}
  ta juran gei wo pao-le.
  he unexpectedly GEI I run-ASP

  ‘He unexpectedly ran away on me.’
\end{verbatim}

\(^{13}\) The embedded subject has to move up because all clauses have subjects, following the Extended Projection Principle (Chomsky 1981).

\(^{14}\) Tsai (2007) has argued that the external argument occupies a topic position rather than a subject position. That is, the subject is further moved to the topic position.
Lin’s (2012) proposal can capture the characteristics of adversatives; however, it does not further explain benefactives. This paper, therefore, aims to examine whether Lin’s (2012) proposal for adversatives can be applied to explain benefactives.

3. THE PROPOSAL

The data collected for this study mainly come from story books. The data analyzed are sentences containing ka which introduces patient as in (28), goal as in (29), source as in (30), benefactive as in (31), and adversative as in (32).

(28) 你吞去？ (蘆竹鄉閩南語故事集)  
hoo tsua long-kun ka li thun-khi? (patient) (Hu 1990)  
PASS snake man KA you swallow  
‘You were swallowed by the snake man?’

(29) 這位考生回答 (鳳山市閩南語故事集(一))  
cite khosing ka i huetap (goal) (Hu and Wang 1999)  
this CL examinee KA he answer  
‘This examinee answered him.’

(30) 海關的人民沒收去 (趣味臺語選集)  
haikuan e lang ka i butsiu-khi (source) (Hsieh 1993)  
customs CL people KA he confiscate  
‘People at the customs confiscated his stuff.’

(31) 他的母親洗衣服 (大安鄉閩南語故事集(一))  
in lao-bu tioh ka lang se sann-khoo (benefactive)  
his mother then KA people wash clothes-pants (Hu and Wang 1998)  
‘His mother washed clothes for other people.’
Lin (2010) proposes (16) to be the structure of patient ka-construction. As discussed in the Literature Review, this proposal is more plausible than Tsao (2003) and Yang (2006). Therefore, this paper adopts Lin’s (2010) control proposal to explain goal and source ka-constructions. As for benefactive and adversative ka-constructions, these two constructions only differ in the effect caused by the event, which is either positive or negative. Therefore, it is possible that these two constructions share the same structure. On the basis of Lin’s (2012) account of adversative ka-construction, this study examines these two constructions.

3.1 Patient, Goal, and Source Ka-constructions

In the disposal ka-construction (16), the light verb ka denotes ‘affect’ and is subcategorized for an NP and a VP. (16) thus expresses the meaning that he affected the shoes in the event in which the shoes were worn threadbare. With ka denoting ‘affect’ and subcategorizing for an NP and a VP, this proposal can also be applied to goal and source ka-constructions. For instance, (29) has (33) as its structure, which expresses the meaning that this examinee affected him in the event in which he was answered.
Goal/source introducing ka-constructions and patient introducing ka-construction bear the same structure. The theta-role the ka NP receives is determined by the main verb; for instance, thun-khi ‘swallow’ in (28) assigns the theta-role patient, while huetap ‘answer’ in (29) assigns goal.

However, goal/source ka-constructions and patient ka-construction differ in that the former may involve three-argument verbs such as kong ‘tell’ in (34a), while the latter often involves two-argument verbs such as thun-khi ‘swallow’ in (28). Yang (2011) takes goal and source

15 More examples involving three-argument goal/source ka-construction and two-argument patient ka-construction are provided below. As shown in (34a), (i), (ii), and (iii), verbs such as kong ‘tell’, kau-tai ‘tell’, thong-po ‘inform’, and tho ‘ask’ are three argument verbs. In addition to a theme argument, they assign one more argument, goal or source, which is introduced by ka. As for two-argument verbs as in (iv-v), they assign one argument, patient, which is introduced by ka.

(i) 阿兄 ka 交代這件代誌
   a-hiann ka kau-tai cit kiaann tai-ci. (goal)
   brother KA tell this CL matter
   ‘Brother told (him) this matter.’
ka-constructions such as (34) to be dative construction. He believes that dative goal/source ka-constructions like (34) differ from other goal and source ka-constructions such as (2-3) in that the ka NP can be omitted in the dative construction as in (34b) and the ka NP cannot take the postverbal position as in (34c).

(34) a. 伊 ka 我講一個故事。
i ka gua kong cit e koosu. (goal)
he KA I tell one CL story
‘He told me a story.’

b. 伊講一個故事。
i kong cit e koosu.
he tell one CL story
‘He told a story.’

(ii) 伊揹會 ka 通報消息
i long e ka thong-po siao-sit (goal)
he all will KA inform news
‘He will inform (him) of the news.’

(iii) 伊猶原 ka 讨錢
i iu-guan ka tho cinn (source)
he still KA ask money
‘He still asked money (from him).’

(iv) ka 冊買轉來
ka cheh be tng-lai (patient)
KA book buy back
‘buy books’

(v) ka 摣落
ka kong-lue (patient)
KA hit
‘hit (him)’
Non-disposal *Ka

c.  *伊講我一个故事。
    *i kong gua cit e koosu.
    he tell I one CL story
    ‘He told me a story.’

Under the current proposal, example (34a), the so-called dative construction by Yang (2011), is argued to have (35) as its structure, which differs from (33) in the VP2-internal structure and which expresses the meaning that he affected me in the event in which I was told a story. Larsonian VP-shell analysis is adopted here for three-argument verbs (Larson 1988), and inside the VP subcategorized for by *ka, i.e. VP2, two VP-shells are adopted, one headed by V2 and the other by V3.16

---

16 Because inside VP2 the movement of Pro from NP4 to NP3 applies vacuously, it is not evident that V2 exists. However, if Larsonian VP-shell analysis is strictly followed, for a three-argument verb such as *kong ‘tell’ two VP-shells should exist in VP2 headed by *kong.
Whether to take an extra argument in goal/source *ka*-construction is determined by the verb, a two-argument verb or a three-argument verb. That is, this is a lexical matter. Therefore, there is no need to posit a totally different structure for three-argument goal/source *ka*-construction. The difference is well captured in the VP2-internal structure, where the verb may need one or two internal arguments.

Yang (2011) has mentioned that the *ka* NP in some goal and source *ka*-constructions can be omitted as in (34b). This omission can still be accounted for in this current proposal by not projecting the phrase headed by *ka* in (35) as shown in (36).
As a sentence without a *ka* NP, it is more than natural not to project the phrase headed by *ka*. Moreover, even though *ka* is subcategorized for a passivized VP in (35), now in (36) without *ka*, the VP in structure (36) is a regular active one. The omission of a *ka* NP certainly leads to meaning difference in that the goal argument is not specified in (34b), while in (34a) the goal argument is clearly specified to be the NP introduced by *ka*. It should be noted that even though the goal is not specified in (34b), it is still implied. That is, in (34b) there exists an unspecified goal, which takes the NP2 position in (36).

As mentioned in section 1, patient, goal, and source are often taken as obligatory arguments as shown in (1-3) (Tsao 2003). That is, the goal/source argument is obligatory for the verb in (2-3). Even though for some verbs, the goal/source argument may appear to be optional as shown in (34b), the goal/source is still implied. That is, the goal/source is still perceived to exist, though not specified. Also mentioned in section 1 is that the preverbal *ka* NP which carries the theta role of patient, goal, or source can often take the postverbal position as shown in (6-8). This property demonstrates that the preverbal *ka* NP in patient/goal/source *ka*-constructions is related to a position after the verb. Thus, it provides evidence that the patient, goal, and source argument is related to a position inside the verb phrase, i.e. *Pro* in VP2 in (16). However, this

---

17 That *ka* is subcategorized for a passivized VP is argued for in Section 2 where the structure for the disposal *ka*-construction, i.e. (16), is discussed.
paper does not argue that the two sentences, the one with *ka* such as (2a) and the one without *ka* such as (7), are structurally related. A raising account that proposes that the *ka* NP is base-generated as the object of the main verb and then raised to the preverbal position and assigned Case by *ka* (Hung 1995; Tsao 2003) is already proven to be problematic in section 2. The reason why the two sentences are semantically similar is that they involve the same three-argument verb, *mng* ‘ask’.

As for whether a verb can take two postverbal objects or not, it is a verb specific matter: that is, it is a matter of whether the verb allows double object construction. For instance, *mng* ‘ask’ in (7) can take two postverbal objects, while *kong* ‘tell’ in (34c) cannot. With (36) as the structure for both (7) and (34c), NP2 can be filled when the verb is *mng*, but not when the verb is *kong*. This matter is not related to the formation of *ka*-construction.18 Not only that, whether a transitive verb can take a postverbal object is often not related to the formation of *ka*-construction. For instance, even though the *ka* NP in (37) is semantically related to the postverbal object, it cannot take the postverbal position as in (38) because in Chinese three syllable verbs often cannot take a postverbal object.

18 This is not due to the meaning of the verb, either. To illustrate, even though *kong* ‘tell’ cannot take two postverbal objects, its English counterpart can as in *He told me a story*.

3.2 Benefactive/adversative *Ka*-constructions

Benefactive and adversative *ka*-constructions only differ in the effect (positive or negative) denoted by the event. That is, the two
ka-constructions are basically the same, and the effect caused by the event may be perceived as positive or negative depending on the meaning of the event. Therefore, it is likely that the two constructions have the same structure. Applying the structure for adversatives as in (26) to explain a benefactive ka-construction such as (31) seems to work. As shown in (39), ka denotes ‘affect’ and is subcategorized for an NP, the one affected, and an IP. In the IP se sann-khoo ‘wash clothes’ is predicated of the embedded subject in lao-bu ‘his mother’; in lao-bu then moves up to the topic position, and the correct word order is derived.

(39) vP
  \——\v'
  \——/ v
  \——/ NP
  \——/ lang
‘people’
  \——/ V
  \——/ IP
   \——/ ka
    \——/ NP
     \——/ in lao-bu
‘his mother’
  \——/ V'
   \——/ se
‘wash’
  \——/ sann-khoo
‘clothes-pants’

One of the features that distinguish patient/goal/source ka-constructions from benefactive/adversative ka-constructions is that the patient/goal/source argument is not optional as in (1-3), while the benefactive/adversative argument is optional as shown in (4-5). Take (40) as an example. When the benefactive ka NP is omitted, (40b) certainly has a meaning different from that of (40a); that is, the benefactee is not specified in (40b). However, unlike the omission of a goal/source as in (34b) where the unspecified goal is still implied, (40b) does not imply
the existence of a benefactee. That is, (40b) is simply describing a clothes-washing activity. In comparison with the structure for (40a), i.e. (39), which can be applied to (40a) as well, the structure for (40b), as specified in (41), only involves the lower IP without the *ka* projection. That is why (40b) expresses the activity only.

(40) a. 伊咧 *ka* 我洗衫。
   i tih ka gua se sann.
   he at KA  I  wash clothes
   ‘He is washing clothes for me.’

   b. 伊咧洗衫。
   i tih se sann.
   he at wash clothes
   ‘He is washing clothes.’

(41)

Another feature that distinguishes patient/goal/source *ka*-constructions from benefactive/adversative *ka*-constructions is that the patient/goal/source argument can often take the postverbal position as well as in (6-8), while the benefactive/adversative argument cannot as in (9-10). Again this feature proves that the benefactive/adversative argument is not related to any position in the following phrase/sentence. As demonstrated in (39), there is no empty pronominal inside IP that is related to the benefactive *ka* NP
4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Among the five ka-constructions, this paper has argued that they all involve ka as a light verb denoting ‘affect’, and the specific theta-role carried by the affected ka NP is determined by the main verb. Patient, goal, and source introducing ka-constructions have similar structures. The extra argument of a three-argument verb in goal/source ka-constructions is projected in the VP-internal structure. As for benefactive and adversative ka-constructions, they only differ in the effect denoted by the event, positive or negative, and they are argued to have the same structure. The displacement of the ka NP, that is, the semantic relation between the ka NP and a postverbal position, is explained by the control relation between the ka NP and the Pro in VP-internal structure. In sum, this paper has proposed two different structures for the five ka-constructions in TSM. The five ka-constructions all involve the light verb ka which denotes ‘affect’, and the ka is subcategorized for an NP and a VP/IP.19

---

19 That a verb may have two different c-selections is not peculiar to ka. As shown in the following examples, the verb know is subcategorized for an NP or an IP.

(i) I know the answer.

(ii) I know that you know the answer.
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Non-disposal Ka
台灣閩南語中非表處置意的 Ka

林惠玲
國立中正大學

台灣閩南語的 ka 字除了引導受事者外，尚可引導標的、來源、受惠者、受害者的論旨。受事者、標的、來源 ka 字句的 ka 名詞組與動後受詞語意相關。另外，與受事者 ka 字句相較之下，標的、來源 ka 字句通常除主詞外，動詞尚需二論元。而受惠者/受害者 ka 字句與其他 ka 字句不同處在於，受惠者/受害者論元常為非必要論元。本文討論的對象為非表處置意的 ka 字句。本文採用 Lin (2010)就處置意 ka 字句所提出的分析法來解釋標的、來源 ka 字句的結構。另外，受惠與受害 ka 字句語意相關，並且有相同的結構。這四類非表處置意的 ka 字句中，兩類（標的、來源）跟表處置意 ka 字句有相同的結構，而受惠者/受害者 ka 字句則有其獨有的結構。

關鍵字：台灣閩南語、ka 字句、受事者、標的、來源、受惠者、受害者