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Abstract

This paper investigates the properties of Hakka psych predicates with a focus on the interaction of lexical semantics and syntax. Based on syntactic realization, psych predicates in Hakka are divided into two types: experiencer-subject (such as the verb *fear*), including *xiag* ‘to like,’ *seu* ‘to worry,’ *nau* ‘to dislike,’ *giang* ‘to fear,’ and *kien* ‘to get angry,’ and stimulus-subject (such as the verb *frighten*), including *hag* ‘to frighten.’ All data in this paper are corpus-based and reflect real-world usage of Hakka psych predicates.

Psych predicates of the experiencer-subject type have similar syntactic distributions such as allowing degree modification and occurring in result/extent constructions. Psych predicates of the stimulus-subject type express causation in terms of lexical (e.g. *hag* ‘to frighten’), morphological (e.g. *V-xi*).
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compounds), or analytic (i.e. periphrastic, syntactic) means (e.g. \([bun]+NP+V\)
and \([ded_4+ngin_5+V]\), though the latter is fossilized, or lexicalized). The
morphological and analytic causatives have the function of converting psych
predicates of the experiencer-subject type into those of the stimulus-subject type.
Thus they may be viewed as a kind of mechanism to counteract the asymmetry
that lexical psych predicates of the stimulus-subject type are outnumbered by
those of the experiencer-subject type in Hakka.

We adopt the theory of Construction Grammar (Goldberg 1995) which
argues that the basic building blocks in grammar are constructions (form-
meaning pairings). It has the advantage of explaining the interaction of the psych
predicates and the seven sentential constructions (three of the experiencer-subject
type and four of the stimulus-subject type) discussed in this paper, without
having to resort to additional, ad hoc senses of the psych predicates.

**Keywords:** Construction Grammar, psych predicates, causation, experiencer-
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### 1. Introduction

Psych predicates have been a hotly debated topic in the linguistics literature.
It is unique in that, unlike typical transitive verbs which have clear-cut distinction
between the more agent-like argument (realized as the grammatical subject) and
the more patient-like argument (realized as the grammatical object), there is a kind
of “flip-flop” phenomenon found in the psych predicates of the world’s many
languages. This phenomenon is due to the peculiarity of the arguments in psych
predicates: their argument roles Experiencer and Stimulus are close in the Proto-

This paper follows the framework of Construction Grammar (Goldberg 1995)
and discusses the interaction of lexical semantics and syntax of Hakka psych
predicates. Based on distributional properties, psych predicates can have either an experiencer-subject like the verb *fear* or a stimulus-subject like the verb *frighten*. The following Hakka psych predicates will be discussed in this paper: 惕 *xiag4* “to like,” 憔 *seu5* “to worry,” 懊 *nau1* “to dislike,” 驚 *giang1* “to fear,” 護 *kien2* “to get angry,” and 惧 *hag4* “to frighten.”

The issue of causation also plays a role in the discussion of psych predicates. We distinguish between three types of causation: lexical, morphological, and analytic (or periphrastic, or syntactic). Besides lexical causatives like *hag4* “to frighten,” the morphological causative *[V-xi2]* and the analytic causatives *[bun1+NP+V]* and *[ded1+ngin5+V]* will be discussed. They are superficially parallel, but they have different syntactic behaviors.

This paper is organized as follows: Besides this introduction, Section 2 presents a literature review of psych predicates and causation; Section 3 describes the theoretical framework of Construction Grammar; Section 4 discusses psych

---

1 The term “predicate” used here covers what is traditionally called verbs and adjectives. Since the distinction between verbs and adjectives in Hakka as well as in other Sinitic languages cannot be made based on morphological (i.e. derivational and inflectional) properties alone, and relies also on syntactic distributions, it is controversial to claim a clear-cut distinction between a verb and an adjective. To avoid this uncertainty, the term “predicate” is used throughout this paper, though the formulaic symbol V is still used in expressing constructions such as *[bun1+NP+V]*.

2 The romanization of Hakka here follows the Sixian (四縣) dialect version of the Romanization Proposal for Taiwan Hakka (臺灣客家語拼音方案) adopted by the Ministry of Education (MOE). To improve visual layout and avoid confusion with footnotes, subscripted numbers are used to mark tones (this applies to data from Mandarin Chinese and Taiwan Southern Min as well). The numbers represent the following tones in Sixian Hakka: 1 for rising; 2 for falling; 3 for high level; 4 for low entering; 5 for low level; 8 for high entering. The romanized spelling is preceded by the corresponding character based on Recommended Characters for Written Taiwan Hakka (臺灣客家語書寫推薦用字) announced by MOE. Note that the list of psych predicates here is not meant to be exhaustive. Psych predicates are part of the lexicon, and their open-class nature makes it difficult to enumerate all of them. Those listed here are chosen because of their high frequency of occurrence and monosyllabicity. Thus excluded are disyllabic psych predicates used nominally as well as predicatively like 歡喜 *fon3hi6* “delighted,” 快樂 *kuai3log8* “happy,” and 顯著 *gon1ku6* “sad.”
predicates of the experiencer-subject type; Section 5 discusses issues of causation and psych predicates of the stimulus-subject type; Section 6 concludes this paper.

2. Literature Review

This section reviews some significant works related to our discussion of Hakka psych predicates here. The first part gives a review of psych predicates in some languages, and the second part presents formal and semantic properties of causation.

2.1. Works on Psych Predicates

Psych predicates exhibit diverse mapping from lexical semantics to syntax. Belletti and Rizzi (1988) suggest that two θ-roles exist for psych verbs: Theme and Experiencer. The mapping from θ-grids to syntax is determined by case-grids. Grimshaw (1990) explains the syntactic realization of psych verbs by resorting to the interaction of Thematic Tier and Aspectual Tier. Based on the four event types: activity, accomplishment, achievement, and state, Van Voorst (1992) claims that all psych verbs belong to the event type of achievement, which cannot express measurable or delimitable events. Levin (1993) distinguishes between four groups of psych predicates, *amuse/admire/marvel/appeal* based on transitivity and argument positions.

Most, if not all, psych predicates have two arguments. The first is less controversially called *Experiencer*, while the second is argued to be either *Stimulus*, or *Cause*, or *Theme*. Based on distributional properties, Jackendoff (2007: 217) distinguishes between two types of psych predicates: (1a) has an experiencer-subject and a stimulus-object, while (1b) has a stimulus-subject and an experiencer-object.

(1) a. John fears sincerity.

b. Sincerity frightens John.

Jackendoff (2007: 218) lists the following basic sentence patterns of psych predicates. Since the subject is always present while the object is not, those in (2a)-(2c) are called Experiencer-Subject (henceforth ES) type, and those in (2d)-(2f) are
called Stimulus-Subject (henceforth SS) type.

(2) a. I’m bored. (Experiencer-Adjective)
b. I’m bored with this. (Experiencer-Adjective-Stimulus)
c. I detest this. (Experiencer-Verb-Stimulus)
d. This bores me. (Stimulus-Verb-Experiencer)
e. This is [boring / detestable] to me. (Stimulus-Adjective-Experiencer)
f. This is [boring / detestable]. (Stimulus-Adjective)

The notion of ES-type and SS-type psych predicates also applies to Mandarin Chinese, but the lexical properties and syntactic behavior are different from those in English. Here we briefly review Wu (1993) and Chang et al. (2000), since the issues there concern us the most.  

Based on transitivity and causation, Wu (1993) distinguishes between psychological causatives like 振奮 zhen4fen4 “to excite,” psychological statives like 擔心 dan1xin1 “to worry,” and psychological intransitives like 震驚 zhen4jing1 “to be shocked,” which correspond to Jackendoff’s (2007) SS-type transitive, ES-type transitive, and ES-type intransitive, respectively. However, there is a gap here: the SS-type intransitive, which is absent in Wu (1993), can be exemplified by 有趣 you3qu4 “interesting.”

Chang et al. (2000) discuss near-synonyms of “verbs of emotion” in Mandarin Chinese. On top of distributional criteria, two types of verbs (grouped into seven semantic categories of happiness, depression, sadness, regret, anger, fear, and worry) of emotion are distinguished. Type A verbs (like 高興 gao1xing4 “happy”) are predominantly used as predicates while Type B verbs (like 快樂 kuai4le4 “happy”) are much more often used in their nominalized forms (arguments or nominal modifiers). Generally speaking, Type A verbs tend to express transition while Type B verbs are often used to indicate homogeneity. The morphological structures of these verbs are also resorted to: All Type A verbs are non-VV

---

3 Other works on psych predicates in Mandarin Chinese include Yang (2000), Liu (2001), and W. Lai (2004), to mention only a few.
compounds, while most Type B verbs are (Chang et al. 2000: 76-77).

To the knowledge of the author, works on psych predicates in Taiwan Southern Min and Hakka are rare, if not non-existent. Based on the rationale that Taiwan Southern Min and Hakka are also Sinitic languages, we believe that the discussions above can be extended to the study of psych predicates in Taiwan Southern Min and Hakka as well.

### 2.2. On Causation

Causation is a complex concept with heavy philosophical overtones. Linguistically, it can be tackled in terms of formal markings and semantic parameters. For example, Shibatani (1976) distinguishes between *lexical causative* and *productive causative* based on formal markings, and between *manipulative causative* and *directive causative* based on semantic parameters. This subsection presents previous works on formal and semantic properties of causation, with emphasis on three related Sinitic languages: Mandarin Chinese, Taiwan Southern Min, and Hakka.

#### 2.2.1. Formal Properties of Causation

From a typological perspective, Comrie (1989) gives a three-way distinction among *analytic causative*, *morphological causative*, and *lexical causative*. Analytic causatives express causation in syntactic structures like complex sentences, containing causative verbs like *cause* or *have* as in English. Morphological causatives express causation using affixation. For example, the Turkish verb *öldör* “to kill” is formed by suffixing the non-causative verb *öl* “to die” with the causative suffix *-dir* (along with vowel harmony). Lexical causatives are verbs that are causative themselves. One sense of the English verb *sink* is “to cause to sink,” making this verb a lexical causative. Finer distinction on causation can be found in Dixon (2000).

The three-way distinction of Comrie (1989) extends to causatives in Mandarin Chinese. Causative verbs like 使 *shi3*, 令 *ling4*, 敎 *jiao4*, 叫 *jiao4*, and 譲 *rang4* discussed in Chang (2005) are analytic causatives which, together with the simplex
verbs, form complex syntactic structures traditionally termed *pivotal constructions*. Morphological causatives are for the most part V-V compounds (specifically verb-complement compounds, or resultative-verb compounds) as shown in Huang (1988), Li (1990, 1995), and Cheng and Huang (1994), to mention only a few. Monosyllabic lexical causatives are rare, if not impossible, in Mandarin Chinese. Tang (2002) observes that the monosyllabic verb 開 *kai* “to open,” like other compound verbs, participates in the causative-inchoative alternation.

Inspired by R. Cheng (1974, 1985), Lien (1999) offers a detailed discussion of causatives in Taiwan Southern Min. Analytic (i.e. syntactic, periphrastic) causatives in Taiwan Southern Min include verbs like 與 *hoo7* “to give,” 拍 *phah4* “to hit,” and 創 *chhong3* “to make.” 4 Synthetic (or morphological) causatives in Taiwan Southern Min can be classified based on the difference between simplex and causative verbs. Tonal alternation is exemplified by 斷 *tng3* “to break” and 斷 *tng2* “to cause to break,” while initial alternation is exemplified by 上 *chiunn7* “to ascend” and 上 *chhiunn7* “to cause to ascend.” Lexical causatives in Taiwan Southern Min are either labile causatives, where the simplex verb and the causative verb share the same form, e.g. 起 *khiz2* “to rise” and 起 *khiz2* “to raise,” or suppletive causatives, where no morphological relationship is found between the simplex verb and the causative verb, e.g. 食 *chiahs* “to eat” and 飼 *chhi7* “to feed.”

The word 分 *bun1* is originally a verb meaning “to give; to separate” in Hakka. Lai (2001) shows that *bun1* exhibits multiple grammatical functions and discusses its two-cline grammaticalization. One function that concerns us here is the causative (or, more precisely, permissive) marker. 5 Thus *bun1* is an analytic causative in the sense of Comrie (1989). Verb-complement constructions in Hakka sometimes express causatives when the complement is a result (Chiang 2007); they are morphological causatives.

---

4 The verb *hoo7* can also be used in dative and passive constructions, in addition to causatives. See Cheng et al. (1999).

5 Chiang (2006) also considers *bun1* a causative marker in the Dongshi dialect of Hakka.
2.2.2. Semantic Properties of Causation

Talmy’s (2000) model of Force Dynamics provides a significant perspective on how entities interact under the cover term *causation*. The two entities are called the *Agonist* (the focal force entity) and the *Antagonist* (the force element that opposes it). Each entity has intrinsic force tendency of being toward action or being toward rest. The resultant of the force interaction is either *action* or *rest*, based on which entity is stronger. The Agonist interacts with Antagonist according to parametric variations. This model explains causation subtypes such as helping, letting, preventing, and overcoming.

In Mandarin Chinese, S. Huang (1974: 360) distinguishes between *event causatives* (3a) and *factive causatives* (3b). While an event causative contains a causal link between an event and a state, the cause in a factive causative must be interpretable as a fact or fact-like entity, e.g. idea, notion, thought, motion, or proposal, etc.

(3) a. 張三把他踢死了  

\[ \text{zhang} \text{san}_1 \text{ ba}_3 \text{ ta}_1 \text{ ti}_1 \text{-si}_3 \text{ le} \]

Zhangsan BA 3SG kick-dead ASP

“Zhangsan kicked him/her dead.”

b. 照片把我嚇了一跳

\[ \text{zhao} \text{pian}_4 \text{ ba}_3 \text{ wo}_3 \text{ xia}_4 \text{ le} \text{ yi}_2 \text{tiao}_4 \]

picture BA 1SG scare ASP one:jump

“The picture scared me so I jumped up.”

The term *indirect imperative* is first used in Teng (1989: 229) to categorize the semantics involved in pivotal constructions where the main verbs are 催 *cui*_1 “to urge,” 勸 *quan*_4 “to persuade,” or 請 *qing*_3 “to ask,” and the like. In her diachronic

---

6 Abbreviations used in the glosses of Mandarin Chinese data: ASP for aspect marker; NEG for negation marker; PRT for particle; SG for singular; 1/2/3 for first/second/third person, respectively. Function words that retain their forms in the glosses are BA (for 把 *ba*_3, a disposal marker), JIANG (for 將 *jiang*_1, a disposal marker), and RANG (for 讓 *rang*_4, a causative/passive marker).
study of causativization of verbs such as 使 shih3, 令 ling4, 教 jiao4, 叫 jiao4, and 讓 rang4, Chang (2005) argues for three major tendencies involved in the history of these verbs: from shih3-yi4 (使役), or indirect imperatives, to causatives, from deliberate causatives to non-deliberate causatives, and from general causatives to descriptive causatives. For brevity I will not explain all the terms above, but instead resort to a brief demonstration of the distinction between shih3-yi4, as in (4a), and descriptive causatives, as in (4b):

(4) a. 我攔住河沿，不讓他回去，務要將他擒了
   wo3 lan2 zhu4 he4yan4, bu2 rang4 ta1 hui2qu4, wu4
   1SG intercept ASP riverbank NEG RANG 3SG return definitely
   yao4 jiang1 ta1 qin2 le
   want JIANG 3SG catch PRT
   “I will intercept him at the riverbank, and not allow him to return. He must be caught.”

b. 他這種情形真讓我擔心
   ta1 zhe4 zhong3 qing4xing2 zhen1 rang4 wo3 dan1xin1
   3SG this kind situation really RANG 1SG worry
   “The situation he is in really worries me.”

The distinction of shih3-yi4 (i.e. indirect imperative) and descriptive causative shows that “causation” is a cover term for a bunch of related but different concepts. It is descriptive causative that is relevant to our study of psych predicates here.

3. Theoretical Framework

The term Construction Grammar is a cover term for a family of theories which view grammatical constructions as the basic building blocks in language, as opposed

---
7 From Chang (2005: 128) with my translation, originally from Chapter 22 of Journey to the West (西遊記), one of the Four Great Classical Novels of Chinese literature.
8 From Chang (2005: 137) with my translation.
to the traditional view that syntactic rules and the lexicon alone shape the language. Early pioneering works of Construction Grammar include, among others, Fillmore et al. (1988), Michaelis and Lambrecht (1996), Jackendoff (1997), and Kay and Fillmore (1999). Goldberg’s (1995, 2006) idea of a constructional argument (in contrast to a verbal argument) is employed in her books to account for argument mismatches in many argument structure constructions.

A construction is a pairing of form (syntax and phonology) and meaning (semantics, pragmatics, etc.). Goldberg (1995: 4) gives the following definition of a construction: “C is a construction iff $C$ is a form-meaning pair $<F_i, S_i>$ such that some aspect of $F_i$ or some aspect of $S_i$ is not strictly predictable from $C$’s component parts or from other previously established constructions.”

Thus a construction is nonredundant. It can be of various scales: as short as words or phrases, e.g. *let alone* in Fillmore et al. (1988), or as long as sentences, e.g. ditransitive and resultative constructions in Goldberg (1995). Constructions may contain constants and variables alike. The elements in the *let alone* construction are solely constants (*substantive*); those in ditransitives and resultatives are solely variables (*schematic*). Some constructions are mixtures of both, e.g. the *V-ing NP away* construction (Jackendoff 1997) and the *What's X doing Y?* construction (Kay and Fillmore 1999). A cline of constructions is summarized in Goldberg (2003: 220).

In this sense, constructions are basic building blocks of grammar. There is no need to distinguish grammar from lexicon, as everything is a construction in the widest sense. One of the advantages of Construction Grammar is that implausible verb senses are avoided. The examples below are from Goldberg (1995: 9). The verbs below appear in sentence patterns that they are normally incompatible with: in (5a), *sneeze* appears in a sentence where *take* normally appears; in (5b), *bake* appears in a sentence where *send* normally appears; in (5c), *talk* appears in a sentence where *make* normally appears.

(5) a. He sneezed the napkin off the table.
   b. She baked him a cake.
c. Dan talked himself blue in the face.

One can easily propose that there are two argument structures out there for each of the verb above, but the cost is the proliferation of word senses. The verbs above do not alter their meanings; they simply retain their original senses. It makes no sense to add ad hoc argument structures simply to explain the sentences in (5).

Construction Grammar can avoid this proliferation by attributing the senses to the sentential constructions per se. Sentences are constructions which provide meanings, as well as contribute to argument structures. (5a) is a caused-motion construction; (5b) is a ditransitive construction; (5c) is a resultative construction. Different constructions have different constructional arguments. The integration of semantically compatible verbal and constructional arguments determines the meaning of the whole sentence.

In this paper, Construction Grammar is adopted to explain the syntactic distributions of psych predicates in Hakka. But before that, we have to present data for psych predicates in Hakka.

Based on argument realization, psych predicates can be either of the ES-type or the SS-type. An ES-type psych predicate has an experiencer-subject and an optional stimulus-object. Contrarily, an SS-type psych predicate has an stimulus-subject and an experiencer-object. In the following two sections, Section 4 discusses ES-type psych predicates, while Section 5 discusses SS-type psych predicates and the typology of causation.

4. ES-Type Psych Predicates in Hakka

This section presents ES-type psych predicates in Hakka. Their syntactic behaviors are discussed in each of the following subsections. They can engage in transitive alternation, allow modification, or be followed by extent/result phrases.

4.1. Psych Predicates in Transitive Alternation

The psych predicates xiag4 “to like,” seu5 “to worry,” nau1 “to dislike,” gian4
“to fear,” and kiern “to get angry” have experiencers as their subjects, and stimuli as their objects, as shown in (6).

(6) a. 我家娘母唔惜佢

\[ nga5\ ga1ngiong5\ m5\ xiag4\ nga15 \]
1SG.G mother-in-law NEG like 1SG

“My mother-in-law does not like me.”

b. 佢愁愛樣似過去

\[ gi5\ seu5\ oi3\ ngiong2ban1\ go3\ hi3 \]
3SG worry want how cross go

“He was worried about how he could go across.”

c. 頭擺有一個心臼惱家娘

\[ teusbai2\ iu1\ id4\ ge3\ xi1\ ku11\ nau1\ ga1ngiong5 \]
past have one CL daughter-in-law dislike mother-in-law

“One upon a time, there was a woman who disliked her mother-in-law.”

d. 你驚麼個

\[ ng5\ giang1\ ma2ge3 \]
2SG fear what

“What are you afraid of?”

e. 頭擺吾姆當肥，有一擺因爲譎吾爸常常飲酒賭微，就絕食抗議，幾下日結果就瘦下來

9 Part of the examples used in this paper are from the NCCU Corpus of Spoken Hakka (國立政治大學客語口語語料庫) at http://140.119.172.200/ and Hakka data collected and transcribed by teachers and research assistants at related departments/institutes of various universities in Taiwan, whose efforts and kindness in sharing the data are heartily appreciated. Abbreviations used in the glosses are: ASP for aspect marker; CL for classifier; G for genitive case; NEG for negation marker; PRT for particle; SFX for suffix; SG for singular; 1/2/3 for first/second/third person, respectively. Nominative and accusative cases are not distinguished and thus unmarked. Function words that retain their forms in the glosses are BUN (for 分 bun1, a multi-functional marker; see Lai 2001), DO (for 到 do2, a result/extent marker, distinct from 著 do2, an aspect marker; see S. Li and Lai 2011), and GE (for 个 ge3, a possessive/adjective marker or a nominalizer, distinct from demonstrative该 ge3 and classifier 個 ge3).

10 The underlined characters 幾下 gi3ha2 expresses the combined and reduced form gia1.
teusbai2 nga5 me1 dong1pi5, iu1 id4bai2 in1vi3
past 1SG.G mom very chubby have once because
kien2 nga5 ba1 cong5cong5 im2 ziu2 du2gieu2, qiu3
angry 1SG.G dad often drink wine gamble then
qiedssiids kong3ang1is, gia1 ngid4, gied4go2 qiu3 ceu3 ha1loi5
hunger:strike protest several day so then slender come:down
“My mom was very chubby. Once she went on hunger strike to protest against
my dad’s alcohol abuse and gambling. She became slender within several
days.”

If the stimulus is understood contextually, the object can be omitted in syntax,
though semantically the stimulus is still present, as shown in (7).

(7) a. 吾爸頭攏已惜匪唷，啊這下就毋借了
   nga5 ba1 teusbai2 is3 xia4 nga5 io2, a3 ia2ha3 qiu3
   1SG.G dad past very like 1SG PRT PRT now then
   m5 xia4 le2
   NEG like PRT
   “My dad used to like me, but not any more.”

b. 你毋使愁，佢有辦法做，你去睡
   ng5 ma3ii2 seu5, nga5 iu1 pan3fab4 zo3, ng5 hi3 soi3
   2SG need:not worry 1SG have method do 2SG go sleep
   “Don’t worry. I can do it. Go sleep!”

c. 「十人九痣」，講到痔仔，痔痔都驚，痔痔都懶
   “siibs ngin5 giu2 ci3,” gong2 do3 ci3-e2, sa5sa5 du3
ten person nine pile talk DO pile-SFX everyone all
   gian1, sa5sa5 du3 nau1
   afraid everyone all worried
   “Nine out of ten people have piles.’ When it comes to piles, everyone is afraid
   and worried.”

d. 喊佢做個佢亦毋會講
When asked to do something, he doesn’t get angry.”

Besides the basic pattern, ES-type psych predicates can be modified by degree adverbs or result/extent phrases. The discussions are in the next subsection.

4.2. Modification by Degree Adverbs or Result/Extent Phrases

Psych predicates are mostly gradable, and therefore modification by degree adverbs is possible, as shown in (8). Degree modification has nothing to do with transitivity: (8a) and (8c) are transitive, while the others are intransitive.

(8) a. 夫人哀盡惜滿女
   congmin5oi qin3 xia4 man1 ng2
   mother-in-law very like youngest daughter
   “The mother-in-law likes the youngest daughter very much.”

b. 毋過厥姆看著俊仔一日一日瘦了去，心中盡愁
   m3gogiai me1 kon3 do2 lai3-e2 id4 ngid4 id4 ngid4
   but 3SG.G mom look ASP son-SFX one day one day
   ceu3 le2 hi3 xim1 zung1 qin3 seu5
   slender ASP go heart inside very worried
   “But his mom saw him getting thinner and thinner day by day, which worried her a lot.”

c. 大家一定都當懶寒天伯公
   tai5ga1 id4ti3 du3 dong1 nau1 hon5ti1 bag4gung1
   everyone definitely all very annoyed winter granduncle
   “Everyone is definitely very annoyed with Winter Granduncle.” (In storytelling)

d. 佢著怎樣，已傷心又當驚
   gi5 kon3 do2 an2giong5 i3 song1xim1 iu3 dong1 giang1
   3SG look ASP so very sad and very scared
   “When he saw such things, he became very sad and scared.”

e. 佢輩佢姆當譏
gia5 ba1 gia5 me1 dong1 kien2
3SG.G dad his mom very angry

“His parents were very angry.”

In addition to being modified directly by degree adverbs, psych predicates can also appear in result/extent phrases introduced by 到 do3 (which is also a verb meaning “to arrive” originally).

(9) a. 佢對佢佬好佢好，佢佢佬到佬仔
ngai5 dui3 gi5 an2 ho2 an2 ho2, xiag4 gi5 xiag4 do3 an2-e2
1SG treat 3SG so well so well like he like DO so
“I treat him so well, and like him so much.”

b. 佢斯愁到毋知愛様結煞
ngai5 si5 seu5 do3 m5 di1 oi3 ngiong5gad4sad4
1SG then worried DO NEG know want what:to:do
“Then I am so worried that I don’t know what to do.”

c. 阿珍仔分賊仔手項三摸四摸，驚到會死
ai3ni1-e2 bun1 ceds-e2 su2 hong3 sam1 mia1 xi3 mia1,
name-SFX BUN robber-SFX hand above three touch four touch
jiang1 do3 voi3 xi2
scared DO will die
“Several times, the robber touched Aziin by the hand, and she was scared to death.”

d. 害該主人就譴到無命了
hoi3 ge3 zuang5 qi3 kien2 do3 mo5 miang3 le2.
harm that host then angry DO NEG life PRT
“[This] made the host so angry that he died.”

If the stimulus-object must be present as in (9a), then verb-copying is used to create another syntactic position for the stimulus-object.

Note that since result/extent is a kind of modification, there is no way for this sentence pattern to be modified again by degree adverbs. Likewise, if a degree adverb is present before an ES-type psych predicate, it is impossible for the sentence
to be followed by a result/extent phrase introduced by \textit{do}_3.

### 4.3. A Summary of the ES-Type Psych Predicates

The distributional properties of ES-type psych predicates found in Sections 4.1-4.2 are summarized below. The codenames \textit{C1}, \textit{C2}, and \textit{C3} stand for the three constructions.\footnote{Abbreviated forms are used here: \textit{Exp}=experiencer; \textit{Pred}=predicate; \textit{Sti}=stimulus; \textit{Deg}=degree adverb; \textit{Result}/\textit{Extent}= result/extent phrase.}

(10) a. \textit{C1}: [\textit{Exp Pred (Sti)}]
   b. \textit{C2}: [\textit{Exp (Deg) Pred (Sti)}]
   c. \textit{C3}: [\textit{Exp Pred (Sti Pred) do}_3 \textit{Result/Extent}]

\textit{C1}, \textit{C2}, and \textit{C3} share the property of having an experiencer-subject and an optional stimulus-object, with possible modification by a preverbal degree adverb or a result/extent phrase introduced by \textit{do}_3. Note that the parenthesized elements in \textit{C3} stand for the optional verb-copying. We will compare the constructions with those found in SS-Type psych predicates later.

### 5. Causation and SS-Type Psych Predicates in Hakka

This section discusses the ways causation of psych predicates can be expressed in Hakka. We follow Comrie’s (1989) distinction among lexical causatives, morphological causatives, and analytic causatives. Causative psych predicates in Hakka are all SS-type, whatever their internal structures might be (some may contain ES-type lexical items).

#### 5.1. Lexical Causatives

This subsection presents data concerned with \textit{hag}_4 “to frighten.” This verb is intrinsically causative, but it exhibits dual properties of SS-type and ES-type psych predicates. The verb \textit{hag}_4 “to frighten” selects a stimulus subject (which may
be omitted if contextually understood) and an experiencer object, as in (11a) and (11b). When it occurs in a passive sentence introduced by *bun1*, as in (11c), the subject becomes the experiencer. Here the verb *hag4* behaves like an SS-type psych predicate.

(11) a. 變鬼來嚇佢  
   *bien3 gui2 loi5 hag4 ngai5*  
   become ghost come frighten 1SG  
   “[Someone] became a ghost in order to frighten me.”

b. 阿叔嚇細人  
   *a1sug4 hag4 se3ngin5*  
   uncle frighten child  
   “Uncle frightened the child.”

c. 這下佢正經分佢嚇著了  
   *ia2ha3 ngai5 ziin3gin1 bun1 gi5 hag4 do2 le2*  
   now 1SG really BUN 3SG frighten ASP PRT  
   “Now I’m really frightened by him.”

Interestingly, *hag4* also behaves like an ES-type psych predicate. When *hag4* is used intransitively (*idsha3* being a postverbal aspectual complement), we have an experiencer-subject here, as in (12).

(12) 轉到家門口，佢嚇一下  
   *zon2 do3 ga1 mun5 heu2, gi5 hag4 id4ha3*  
   return DO home door mouth 3SG frighten one:below  
   “Arriving at the door of his house, he was frightened.”

Although *hag4* does not seem to allow degree modification, it can occur in result/extent construction as in (13). The verb *hag4* here can be replaced by the ES-type psych predicate *giang1* “to fear” without changing its meaning.

(13) a. 白頭公仔嚇到衝上衝下  
   *pagsteu5gung1-e2 hag4 do3 cung hun3 hag4 cung1 ha3*  
   Chinese:bulbul-SFX frighten DO rush above rush below  
   “The Chinese bulbul was so frightened that it rushed up and down.”
b. 姓謝个嚇到會死
   xiang3 qia3 ge3 hag4 do3 vo1 xi2
surname Qia GE frighten DO will die
“The guy named Qia was very much frightened.”

We see that hag4 shows properties of both SS-type and ES-type psych predicates. As an SS-type psych predicate, it can express causation and occurs in passive sentences. As an ES-type psych predicate, it does not allow degree modification but can appear in result/extent constructions. This duality must be explained either lexically (assuming two senses of hag4) or constructionally (assuming one sense of hag4 which can be overridden when a particular construction requires), the latter approach being preferred. We turn to the rationale behind this choice later.

5.2. Morphological Causatives

As a Sinitic language, Hakka is productive in resultative-verb compounds. The examples below show resultative-verb compounds with a psych predicate and a result 死 xi2 “dead”:

(14) a. 會嚇死人
   voi3 hag4-xi2 ngin5
   will frighten-dead person
   “[It] will frighten people to death.”

b. 看著實在驚死佢
   kon3 do2 siidscai3 giang1-xi2 ngai5
   look ASP really afraid-dead 1SG
   “When I saw it, it really frightened me to death.”

c. 算命先生會講死佢
   son3miang3 xin1sang1 voi3 kien2-xi2 ngai5
   fortune telling sir will angry-dead 1SG
   “The fortune teller really made me furious.”

Although the experiencers above are not literally dead, the metaphorical nature
of these examples does not prevent us from arguing that there is causation involved. Since only (14a) contains a lexical causative *hag*₄ “to frighten,” while psych predicates like *giang*₁ “to fear” and *kien*₂ “to get angry” are non-causative, the V-*xi*₂ compound can be regarded as a kind of morphological causative like the Turkish example *öl-dür* “to kill.” For the causative V-*xi*₂ compound, it does not matter whether V is causative or not.

### 5.3. Analytic Causatives

This subsection discusses analytic causatives acting as psych predicates in Hakka. The verb 分 *bun*₁ “to give; to separate” is productive in the formation of causative psych predicates, while the verb 得 *ded*₄ “to get; to acquire” is less productive. Both verbs mean roughly “to cause” in their respective causative constructions, i.e. [*bun*₁+NP+V] and [*ded*₄+ngin₃+V].

#### 5.3.1. The [*bun*₁+NP+V] Construction

In Subsection 2.2.2, the notions of *shi*₂-*yi*₄ (indirect imperative) and descriptive causative are distinguished (Chang 2005). Both can be expressed by the verb *rang*₄ in Mandarin Chinese as in (4a) and (4b). Lai (2001) suggests that *bun*₁ is a causative marker in Hakka. When co-occurring with psych predicates, *bun*₁ expresses descriptive causative, as exemplified below.

(15) a. 你無一件做來分阿爸阿姆滿意个

```
ng5  mos5  id4  kien3  zo3  lois  bun1  a1ba1  a1me1  mani3  ge3
2SG  NEG  one  CL  do  come  BUN  dad  mom  satisfied  GE
```

“You haven’t done anything that satisfied your dad and mom.”

b. 該隻分阿姆當愁個調皮個細妹仔

```
ge3  zag4  bun1  a1me1  dong1  seu5  ge3  tiausi5  ge3  se3moi3-e2
that  CL  BUN  mom  very  worried  GE  naughty  GE  girl-SFX
```

“that naughty girl who worried her mom very much”

c. 恍樣嫁過門去正毋會分人惱哦

```
an3ngiong5  ga3  go3  mun5  hi3  zang3  m5  vo3  bun1
this:way  marry  cross  door  go  then  NEG  will  BUN
```
ngin5 nau1 o2
person annoyed PRT

“In this way, you won’t annoy the in-laws after you get married.”

d. 在屋下肚項，時時愛分阿姆順心
du3 vug5 ha1 du3 zhong3, si5 si5 o13 bun1 a1m1 sun3 xim1
at home inside all:the:time want BUN mom happy

“At home, you have to keep your mom happy all the time.”

We see that bun1 is a productive verb in the formation of analytic causatives in
Hakka. Psych predicates as different as 滿意 man1 ti3 “satisfied,” 憂 seu5 “worried,”
惱 nau1 “annoyed,” and 順心 sun3 xim1 “happy” are allowed in this construction.

5.3.2. The [ded4+ngin5+V] Construction

The [ded4+ngin5+V] construction is apparently parallel to the [bun1+NP+V]
construction; they have similar surface structure and look like analytic (syntactic)
causatives, after all. There are, however, some observations that suggest that this
is not the case: (i) while the experiencer NP in [bun1+NP+V] is unrestricted, the
experiencer ngin5 “people” in [ded4+ngin5+V] is lexically determined; (ii) while the
V in [bun1+NP+V] can be virtually any verb or adjective, the V in [ded4+ngin5+V]
was limited to only a few psych predicates; (iii) while degree modification is allowed
in the position immediately preceding the V in [bun1+NP+V], it is allowed only
before the whole [ded4+ngin5+V] construction.

Searching the Hakka Corpus for [ded4+ngin5+V] construction yields 51
instances (30 instances for 得人惜 ded4 ngin5 xiag4, 16 instances for 得人驚
ded4 ngin5 gian1, 3 instances for 得人懶 ded4 ngin5 nau1, and 2 instances for 得人畏
ded4 ngin5 vi2). The following examples show their syntactic distribution.

(16) a. 供一個係仔又當得人惜哦
   giung3 id4 ge3 lai3 e2 iu3 dong1 ded4 ngin5 xiag4 o2
   raise one CL son-SFX again very endearing PRT
   “They have a son, who is very endearing.”

b. 你看該大老虎恁得人驚
ng5 kon3 ge3 tais lo5fu2 an2 ded4ngin5giang1
2SG look that big tiger so frightening
“Look! The big tiger is so frightening.”
c. 細老妹盡得人惱
   se3 lo2moi3 cin3 ded4ngin5nau1
   little sister very annoying
   “My little sister is very annoying.”
d. 寒天伯公个歌聲，實在得人畏
   hon5tien1 bag4gung1 ge3 go1 sang1, siid5scai3 ded4ngin5vi3
   winter granduncle GE song voice really frightening
   “The singing voice of Winter Granduncle is really frightening.” (In storytelling)

In (16), the [ded4ngin5+V] construction is modified by a variety of degree modifiers: dong1 “very,” an2 “so,” cin3 “very,” and siid5scai3 “really.” The English translation suggests that they are like single lexical items, or, to be specific, adjectives ending in -ing. The syntactic structure inside does not matter anymore.

If this is the case, then we expect to find them listed in the dictionaries. We looked up Hakka dictionaries published over a wide time span in order to understand the diachronic use of [ded4+ngin5+V]. The following Hakka dictionaries were consulted, and the results are shown below.

b. Rey (1926). Dictionnaire Chinois-Francais Dialecte Hac-ka
d. X. Huang (1998). Meixian Fangyan Cidian
e. He and Liu (2006). Keyu Ciku
f. Xu (2009). Hakka Dictionary of Taiwan
Table 1  Examples of \([ded_4+ngin_5+V]\) in Hakka Dictionaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionary</th>
<th>Examples of ([ded_4+ngin_5+V])^{12}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacIver (1905)</td>
<td>惜 (xiag_4), 懐 (nau_1), 畏 (vi_3), 恐 (pa_2), 愛 (oi_3), 惟 (seu_5), 服 (fug_4), 敬重 (gin_cung_3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rey (1926)</td>
<td>惜 (nau_1), 畏 (vi_3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhongyuan Zhoukanshe (1992)</td>
<td>惜 (xiag_4), 懐 (nau_1), 畏 (vi_3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Huang (1998)</td>
<td>惜 (xiag_4), 懐 (nau_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He and Liu (2006)</td>
<td>惜 (xiag_4), 懐 (nau_1), 驚 (gian_1), 畏 (vi_3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xu (2009)</td>
<td>惜 (xiag_4), 懐 (nau_1), 驚 (gian_1), 畏 (vi_3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most productive form, \([ded_4+ngin_5+V]\), can be found in MacIver (1905), which lists eight items.^{13} Two contemporary dictionaries, He and Liu (2006) and Xu (2009), agree with our corpus-based findings. The rest of the dictionaries contain subsets of the four psych predicates. This may be due to lack of comprehensiveness.

It is interesting to note that psych predicates allowed in the modern form of \([ded_4+ngin_5+V]\) are all monosyllabic (unlike that found in MacIver 1905). We believe there are phonological reasons behind this. Lexicalized or idiomatic expressions tend to be neat and concise. Trisyllabic words are much preferred to tetrasyllabic ones during the process of lexicalization. Thus monosyllabic verbs are preferred in the use of the \([ded_4+ngin_5+V]\) construction nowadays.

5.4. A Summary of the SS-Type Psych Predicates and the Types of Causation

Based on the discussions in Sections 5.1-5.3, the distributional properties concerned with SS-type psych predicates are summarized below. The codenames

---

12 Omitting aforementioned \(xiag_4\), \(seu_5\), \(nau_1\), and \(gian_1\), we list the meanings of other items below: 畏 \(vi_3\) “to be afraid,” 伯 \(pa_2\) “to be afraid,” 愛 \(oi_3\) “to love,” 服 \(fug_4\) “to succumb,” 敬重 \(gin\_cung_3\) “to respect.”

13 Note, however, that 得人驚 \(ded\_ngin\_gian_1\) is not listed in MacIver (1905). A plausible explanation is that semantically similar expressions 得人懼 \(ded\_ngin\_nau_1\) and 得人懼 \(ded\_ngin\_vi_3\) are already in use, triggering lexical blocking.
C4, C5, C6, and C7 stand for the four constructions.

(18) a. C4: [Sti Pred Exp]
   b. C5: [Sti Pred-xi2 Exp]
   c. C6: [Sti bun1 Exp Pred]
   d. C7: [Sti ded4 ngin5 Pred]

The causative verb *hag4* “to frighten” (lexical causative) can occur in the “Pred” slot of C4. The compound Pred-xi2 (morphological causative) allows both ES-type and SS-type in the “Pred” slot of C5. The [*bun1*+NP+*V*] and [*ded4*+*ngin5*+*V*] (both analytic causatives) are reformatted as C6 and C7 to conform to other constructions. C4, C5, C6, and C7 all express causation in different means. The following table shows the verbs compatible with each construction and the type of causation involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codename</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Type (Instance) of Pred</th>
<th>Type of Causation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Sti Pred Exp]</td>
<td>SS-type (<em>hag4</em> only)</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[Sti Pred-xi2 Exp]</td>
<td>Both ES-type and SS-type</td>
<td>Morphological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>[Sti bun1 Exp Pred]</td>
<td>ES-type</td>
<td>Analytic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>[Sti ded4 ngin5 Pred]</td>
<td>ES-type (<em>xi4</em> , <em>nau1</em> , <em>giang1</em>, and <em>vi3</em> only)</td>
<td>Analytic (lexicalized)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Conclusion

Based on our observation in the previous sections, two lines of discussion are presented in this final section. First, the advantages of Construction Grammar in dealing with the change of causativity in Hakka psych predicates will be presented. Second, the role of the two analytic causatives: [*bun1*+NP+*V*] and [*ded4*+*ngin5*+*V*] as a balancing mechanism will be discussed. Last, the concluding remarks are presented.
6.1. A Constructional Account of Change in Causativity

In this section, the advantages of Construction Grammar in explaining change in causativity will be presented. First we review the non-causative use of the causative verb *hag*\textsubscript{4} “to frighten.” Then we investigate the rise of the causativity of the V-\textit{x}\textsubscript{2} compound where V is usually non-causative.

In (13) of Section 5.1, two examples of *hag*\textsubscript{4} “to frighten” are presented. They belong to the result/extent construction C3 marked by \textit{do}. The two examples are non-causative like those with ES-type psych predicates in (9). A question naturally arises: how can the causativity of a lexical verb be eliminated in the result/extent construction?

A basic tenet of Construction Grammar is that lexical, phrasal, or sentential elements can be constructions, and these constructions contribute to meaning, in addition to the meanings of the lexical items and their arrangement (i.e. syntax).

The causative verb *hag*\textsubscript{4} “to frighten” appears in C4 (which is causative) as well as in C3 (which is non-causative). This behavior can be attributed to either the duality of the verb itself, or the properties of the constructions this verb appears in. Below, we argue that the second approach is preferred.

If we adopt a lexical approach, then we have to add a non-causative sense to the verb *hag*\textsubscript{4} “to frighten,” which is an example of proliferation in word senses and thus not preferred. It is not plausible, since no other psych predicates in Hakka have this dual property. Also, although *hag*\textsubscript{4} “to frighten” can appear in C3, it cannot appear, like typical ES-type psych predicates, in C1 and C2.\textsuperscript{14} This casts doubt on the status of *hag*\textsubscript{4} “to frighten” as simply an ES-type (non-causative) psych predicate. We believe there is something peculiar in *hag*\textsubscript{4} “to frighten” when it appears in C3.

In the constructional approach, the conflict between causative *hag*\textsubscript{4} and non-causative result/extent construction C3 can be resolved this way: We maintain the

\textsuperscript{14} One may argue that *hag*\textsubscript{4} “to frighten” cannot appear in C1 because C1 and C4 are structurally similar and there is a motive to avoid ambiguity and misunderstanding. However, this argument fails to explain why *hag*\textsubscript{4} cannot appear in C2 (unique in its structure) either.
causativity of \textit{hag}4, while loosening the constraint that the psych predicate in C3 must be non-causative. We propose that the “Pred” slot of C3 can be either ES-type or SS-type. The properties of the “Pred” slot can be overridden, or coerced, by that of C3. This approach has the following advantages: (i) the semantics of \textit{hag}4 as a causative verb is preserved; (ii) proliferation in word senses can be avoided, as has been shown in the discussion of English examples (5) in Section 3; (iii) the problem that \textit{hag}4 can appear in C3, but not C2, is solved.

In Section 5.2 on morphological causatives, although a causative verb \textit{hag}4 “to frighten” can appear in the V slot of the V-\textit{xi2} compound as in (14a), the majority of the verbs in this slot are non-causative, as shown by \textit{giang}1 “to fear” and \textit{kien}2 “to get angry” in (14b) and (14c). The question that naturally arises is: how can a compound be causative when both its components (\textit{V} and \textit{xi2}) are non-causative?

One account is that the compound verbs are inherently causative. However, it is not clear how the causative sense arises when the predicate is a compound verb instead of a simple one. Since V-\textit{xi2} compounds are productive and not listable, there must be a lexical rule for V-\textit{xi2} compounds that generates causativity during compounding. However, when these V-\textit{xi2} compounds appear in intransitive sentences, no sense of causativity is observed. Compare (19) with (14b) in terms of causativity:

(19) 佮驚死了
\[ ngais\ giang1-\textit{xi2} \ le2 \]
1SG afraid-dead ASP
“I was frightened to death.”

Therefore, the last resort is the constructional approach. We argue that the causative sense results from the whole transitive sentence pattern [NP1 V-\textit{xi2} NP2]. Except for \textit{hag}4 “frighten,” there are “flip-flops” in the realization of the arguments: the stimulus becomes the subject and the experiencer becomes the object. It is not important whether the verb in the V slot is non-causative (ES-type) or causative (SS-type). The whole construction suggests the causative sense, disregarding the causativity of the psych predicate in the V slot.
6.2. The Balancing Mechanism of Analytic Causatives

Although \([bun_1+NP+V]\) and \([ded_4+ngin_5+V]\) are superficially parallel, both allowing ES-type psych predicates in the V slots and can be viewed as SS-type psych predicates as a whole, they have the following differences: (i) they differ in that the former is more productive, compatible with a variety of NPs and a wide range of ES-type psych predicates, whereas the latter is less productive, allowing only \(ngin_5\) “people” as experiencers and four ES-type psych predicates, i.e. \(xiang_4, nau_1, giang_1\), and \(vi_5\); (ii) modification by degree adverbs is allowed in the position immediately preceding the psych predicate in \([bun_1+NP+V]\) construction, while it is allowed in the position immediately preceding the whole \([ded_4+ngin_5+V]\) construction.

Based on the evidence of the lexical restrictions of \(ngin_5\) and V, and the constraint of modification by degree adverbs, we claim that the \([ded_4+ngin_5+V]\) construction has undergone reanalysis. Although structurally a serial verb construction, the whole \([ded_4+ngin_5+V]\) exhibits the properties of an SS-type psych predicate. In other words, \([ded_4+ngin_5+V]\) has been lexicalized and must be listed in the lexicon.

There must be a motive behind the productivity of analytic causatives in Hakka. We suggest that the two constructions \([bun_1+NP+V]\) and \([ded_4+ngin_5+V]\) exist to compensate for the present situation that, in Hakka as well as other Sinitic languages, lexical SS-type psych predicates are outnumbered by lexical ES-type psych predicates. In Hakka, lexical causative psych predicates are rare. In English, on the contrary, lexical causative psych predicates such as \(interest\), \(surprise\), and \(frighten\) are common. Therefore, analytic causatives are usually used in translating English lexical causatives into Hakka, Taiwan Southern Min, and Mandarin Chinese.

6.3. Concluding Remarks

The seven constructions discussed in this paper are summarized below. The distinction between ES-type and SS-type psych predicates applies in both the predicate level and the construction level.
### Table 3  Sentence Patterns of Psych Predicates in Hakka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codename</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Type of Predicate</th>
<th>Type of Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>[Exp Pred (Sti)]</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Exp (Deg) Pred (Sti)]</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Exp Pred (Sti Pred) do_3 Result/Extent]</td>
<td>ES, SS</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Sti Pred Exp]</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[Sti Pred-xi_2 Exp]</td>
<td>ES, SS</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>[Sti bun_1 Exp Pred]</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>[Sti ded_4 nging_5 Pred]</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the lexical level, the ES-type psych predicates outnumber SS-type ones in Hakka: ṭag₄ “to frighten” is the only one that exists to the best knowledge of the author. Therefore, to compensate for this asymmetry, morphological and analytic causatives are employed.

To build on the findings of this paper, further study could include (i) a more thorough investigation into psych predicates in Hakka, particularly disyllabic ones; (ii) a contrastive analysis with Mandarin Chinese, Taiwan Southern Min, or English.

Based on data from the Hakka Corpus, this paper contributes to the description and understanding of psych predicates in Hakka. It also supports a constructional view of grammar. The study of Hakka analytic causatives reveals the division of labor between lexicon and syntax. The lack of SS-type psych predicates in the lexicon is counterbalanced by the use of SS-type syntactic constructions [bun\_1+NP+V] and [ded\_4+ngin\_5+V]. Although languages differ drastically in terms of lexicon and syntax, the balancing mechanisms found may be universal and shed light on the evolutionary tendencies of languages.
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從構式語法看客語心理謂語與致使

黃漢君*

摘要

本文探討客語心理謂語的性質，特別著重於詞彙語意與句法的互動關係。根據句法表現，心理謂語可分為兩類：感事者主語（如英語動詞 fear）以及起事者主語（如英語動詞 frighten）。客語的「惜」(xiag4)、「愁」(seu5)、「惱」(nau1)、「驚」(iang1)、「讃」(kien2) 為前者，而「嚇」(hag4) 為後者。本文所有的語料皆取自客語語料庫，力求反映客語心理謂語的真實用法。

感事者主語類心理謂語具有類似的句法分布，例如接受程度修飾，以及可以出現在結果或程度構式中。起事者主語類心理謂語以各種方式表達致使：詞彙手段如「嚇」，構詞手段如「V- 死」複合詞，句法手段如「分+NP+V」以及「得 + 人 + V」（但後者已形成詞彙化之固定用法）。構詞性致使與句法性致使具有將感事者主語類心理謂語轉換成起事者主語類心理謂語之功能。因此兩者皆可視為一種對客語中起事者主語類心理謂語遠少於感事者主語類心理謂語的不平衡現象加以調整之機制。

我們採納 Goldberg (1995) 所主張的「構式語法」(Construction Grammar) 理論。該理論認為語法的基本組成單位為構式（形式與意義的配對）。其優點為合理解釋客語心理謂語與本文中所討論的七種句式（其中三種為感事者主語類，四種為起事者主語類）的互動關係，而不需要去設立額外且特殊個案式的心理謂語意義。

關鍵詞：構式語法、心理謂語、致使、感事者主語、起事者主語、客語
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