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THE ANALYTIC CAUSATIVES OF EARLY MODERN SOUTHERN MIN
IN DIACHRONIC PERSPECTIVE*

Hilary Chappell and Alain Peyraube
Centre de Recherches Linguistiques sur l’Asie Orientale
EHESS and CNRS, Paris, France

1. INTRODUCTION

The main objective of this study is to analyze the function of analytic causative constructions in Early Modern Southern Min [Sinitic] in order to elucidate the possible stages of grammaticalization and the diachronic relationships between different periods of Chinese, in particular, between Archaic and Medieval Chinese and the development of Southern Min.

The term analytic causative refers to constructions which use syntactic means such as complex predicates to code causation as opposed to morphological means such as a special affix on the verb (Shibatani and Pardeshi 2002). In Sinitic languages, analytic causatives generally develop historically from pivot constructions where the direct object of the first causative verb is the subject of the second verb. The three main causative verbs in Early

---

* Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the Tenth Annual Conference of the International Association of Chinese Linguistics/Thirteenth North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics, held at UC Irvine in June, 2001 and at Centre de Recherches Linguistiques sur l’Asie Orientale, Paris in May 2002. We are indebted to Prof. Chinfa Lien for his many enlightenments on Southern Min grammar and Dr. Imogen Yu-chin Chen for her assistance in the interpretation of the Doctrina Christiana, as well as Professors Walter Bisang, Cao Guangshun, Redouane Djamouri, Bernd Heine, Mei Tsu-lin, Laurent Sagart, Kenichi Takashima and Anne Yue for their comments and personal communications. We would also like to thank Mr Tony McCumstie, Catholic Theological College, Melbourne, Mr Charles Sherlock, United Theological College, the University of Melbourne and Father Liam Mackle, Catholic chaplain at La Trobe University, Melbourne, for their clarifications regarding theological aspects of the Doctrina Christiana and its contents.

This project is funded by an Australian Research Council Large Grant #A00106262 ‘Medieval Chinese and the diachronic syntax of Southern Min: 16th – 20th centuries’ (2001–2003).

---

1 We consider that there are three main types of analytic causative constructions:

1) event causatives where no agentive causer is implicated (e.g. *Heavy rains caused a landslide in California.*)

2) experiencer causatives which engender a state of affairs in the causee (e.g. *The film made him very sad.*)

3) agentive causatives where the causer is a volitional agent (e.g. *She got him to eat the food he disliked most.*)

The agentive causative type can be further subdivided into various grades of directive causatives which frequently involve some kind of speech act on the part of the causer, and the implication that the causee has to do what the causer wishes (e.g. *I had the plumber come over and fix up the roof*); and permissive causatives...
Modern Southern Min of 16th and 17th centuries are thus derived from lexical verbs grammaticalized into causative function as $V_1$ in complex predicates (serial verb constructions):

$$NP_{\text{Causer}} + V_1[\text{causative}] + NP_{\text{causee}} + V_2 + (NP\ldots)$$

These are:

(i) $khit^4$乞 ‘to give’ which forms a permissive ‘let’ type of causative,
(ii) $su^2$使 ‘to cause, send’ which forms both a directive causative and an unintentional experiencer causative and
(iii) $su^3$賜 ‘to bestow, grant’ which also forms a directive causative.

The verbs $su^2$使 ‘cause’ < ‘send’ and $khit^4$乞 ‘let’ < ‘give’ are commonly found in earlier stages of Chinese in causative usage. One of the issues in this paper is thus to explain the apparent singleton status of $su^3$賜 ‘to bestow, grant’ as a causative verb.

Before proceeding with the main analysis in §4, we provide a brief description of the corpus in §2 and an outline of causative constructions in the Archaic and Medieval Chinese periods in §3.

Linguistic causation is generally regarded as a relation holding between two events or states of affairs and, strictly speaking, cannot be represented as the property of a person or any other entity. As a consequence of this, two entities such as the causative agent (or causer) and the causee – the person who is motivated to carry out an action or to experience a situation – occur in causative constructions only in so far as they take part in some event or state of affairs. Syntactically, they may thus be considered as the referents of nominals which elliptically represents a causing or caused event.

Another essential feature of causative constructions is the entailment of a resulting event or state of affairs, often referred to as the counterfactual inference (see McCawley 1976): if the causing event had not taken place then the caused event would not have either. This change-of-state entailment is inherent in all causative constructions.

The nature of the embedded predicate containing $V_2$ constitutes a third important parameter to consider, as will be shown below for the three main causative verbs found in the Early Southern Min material: the situation involving the causee may be coded by a verb of intentional action; a non-control event verb; or a state of affairs. The predicate of the complex causative clause can thus determine the semantic type of causative (see Talmy 1976, Shibatani 1976).

2. SOUTHERN MIN LANGUAGES: BACKGROUND AND CORPUS

2.1 Background to this study

A well-known phenomenon in Southern Min languages is the vivid contrast between literary and colloquial pronunciations. For example, the character for ‘name’, 名, has the literary reading bêng versus the colloquial miàn. This divergence reflects the presence of several strata in the Min lexicon: the earliest and colloquial stratum can be traced back to the Han dynasties (206 BCE - 220 CE) while the second, also colloquial, is from the

where one event enables another event to happen (e.g. In the end, I said ‘yes’ and let the kids go to see a movie). See Talmy (1976), Shibatani (1976) and Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002) for detailed semantic studies.
Nanbeichao period (420-589). The third stratum of reading pronunciations, used to recite texts in Min, reflects the late Tang koine, based on the prestige dialect of the capital, Chang’an (see Mei & Yang 1995; Lien 2000). The literary-colloquial distinction - 文白異讀- is observable in some of the texts treated in §4 of this analysis.

Also relevant for this analysis are the early migrations of Southern Min people to the Southeast Asian region, beginning in the Ming dynasty, to the Philippines, Siam (Thailand) and the East Indies (Malaysia and Indonesia) by various sea routes. The Spanish conquest of the Philippines in the 16th century and the subsequent establishment of Catholic missions in this archipelago saw the compilation of religious documents in both Tagalog and the Southern Min koine spoken by the majority of the Chinese population in Manila (cf. van der Loon 1966 on the history of the first printed books in the Philippines).

2.2 Corpus of Early Southern Min documents

We refer to five documents which reflect the language of late 16th and early 17th century Southern Min. Four of these early texts were compiled by Catholic priests (Dominicans and Jesuits) and their Chinese collaborators in the Philippines for the Sangley or Chinese trading community who had settled there by the late 16th century (see Chappell 2000 and Chappell and Peyraube forthcoming for more details).

(i) *Doctrina Christiana en letra y lengua china*, (blockprinted, 1607, Manila), held at the Vatican Library. The translation of the Spanish version of the *Doctrina Christiana* into a Min dialect in character form is attributed by van der Loon (1967) to Dominican missionaries in the Philippines, including Fathers Juan Cobo and Miguel Benavides, with the aid of unknown Chinese collaborators. We make use of the reproduction by van der Loon (1967) which collates the character text with two romanized versions. The page numbers for all examples from this document refer to this edition.

(ii) *Li Jing Ji* [Romance of the Litchi Mirror] (1566, 1581), Tenri University version. This is a Ming dynasty play written in a mixture of Quanzhou and Chaozhou dialects (both Southern Min).

(iii) *Arte de la lengua Chiõ Chiu* [Grammar of the Chiõ Chiu language] (handwritten, 1620, Manila), held at the University of Barcelona Library, where it was discovered in the 1980s by us. On the last page of the manuscript is found the mention of one Father Melchior de Mançano, followed by the words ‘for the use of Father Rajmundo Feijoo’. From this it can probably be inferred that de Mançano was the author of the grammar. The Barcelona copy is longer and more complete than another one held at the British Library, allowing scholars to date the manuscript precisely as having been written in the year 1620. The clue is found on page 31a: ‘48th year of the reign of Emperor Wan Li’.²

(iv) *Bocabulario de la lengua sangleya* [Lexicon of the Sangley language] (handwritten, ca. 1617, Manila), held at the British Library. This is a Southern Min-Spanish lexicon providing definitions and some grammatical information. The *Arte* explicitly

² Mei Tsu-Lin (personal communication) has observed that the Wan Li era lasted only 47 years, ending in 1619. He concludes that the Sangleys in remote Manila were most likely unaware of the end of his reign. For more information of this manuscript, see Chappell and Peyraube, forthcoming.
mentions the lexicon in its preface, so it is certain that they represent the same dialect of Southern Min. Van der Loon (1967: 98) who viewed a different copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris suggests however that it can be dated with certainty at 1595.

(v) Diccionarium Sino-Hispanicum [Chinese-Spanish Dictionary] (handwritten, 1604, Cebu), held at the Angelica Library in Rome; attributed to the Jesuit, Father Pedro Chirino. This manuscript similarly gives examples of a Southern Min dialect with Spanish glosses, however, without providing any definitions.3

3. AN OUTLINE OF CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN CLASSICAL AND MEDIEVAL CHINESE

We first briefly describe the development of causative constructions in Archaic and Medieval Chinese.

3.1 Morphological devices

According to reconstructions for Old Chinese, a morphological causative could be formed with the prefix *s- on verbs (Mei 1989). The following two examples from Sagart (1999: 70) show this relationship between a non-causative verb (on the left-hand side) and its causativized counterpart with the prefix *s-.

(1) shí 食 *b-m-lïk > zyik ‘to eat’ : sì 飼 *b-s-lïk-s > ziH ‘to feed’ (transitive)

dēng 登 *a-tïŋ > tọŋ ‘to ascend, rise, go up : zēng 增 *a-s-tïŋ > tsoŋ ‘to increase, add to’

3.2 Non-analytic causatives

In written texts from the Archaic Chinese period (5th - 2nd century BC, Classical Chinese par excellence), nouns could be used as verbs, without requiring any morphological markers of verbhood. This kind of zero derivation can be seen in the case of chén 臣 ‘subject’ in example (2) which takes on the causative meaning of ‘to make someone a subject’ in its verbal use:

(2) Archaic Chinese (5th - 2nd century BC)

Xué yān ér hòu chén zhī

learn from:3SG and later subject 3SG

‘Learn from him before making him (his) subject.’ (Mèngzǐ 孟子)

Not only nouns, but also intransitive verbs, including the class of stative verbs or adjectives, could be used as causative verbs without any overt marking. As such, they belong to a

3 We are grateful to Federico Masini for having drawn our attention to this dictionary and for generously providing us with a copy of it. See Masini (2000)
special class of labile or ambitransitive verbs for this period of Chinese. Such verbs are described as ‘covert causatives’ by Lien (2003) due to their zero derivation. For example:

(3) 故遠人不服，則修文德以來之
   Gù yuǎn rén bù fú zé xiū wén dé yǐ lái zhī
   therefore far people NEG submit then cultivate civil virtue so:that come 3SG
   ‘Therefore, if people from far away do not submit, then cultivate the civil virtues in order to make them come.’ (Lúnyǔ 论语)

(4) 常慾死之
   Cháng yù sǐ zhī
   often want die 3SG
   ‘(He) often wanted to kill him. (i.e. make him dead) (Hàn Shū 漢書: 朱買臣專)

3.3 Analytic causatives

During the Archaic period, there were also some causative verbs which were used to form analytic constructions: the most common were 使 ‘to send, to cause’, 令 ‘to command’ and to a lesser extent, 遺 ‘to give, to offer as a gift’. Examples with 使 ‘to cause’ are presented below:

(5) 使周游于四方
   Shǐ zhōu yóu yú sì fāng
   CAUS around travel at four directions
   ‘making (them) travel around in all directions’ (Guó Yǔ 国語)

(6) 乃夜去不使人知
   nǎi yè qù, bù shǐ rén zhī
   then 1PL go NEG CAUS people know
   ‘Then we left at night, (and) did not let anyone know.’ (Shǐ Ji史記游俠列傳)

Indeed, examples of 使 and 令 in causative usage are found in one of the earliest classics from this period: the Shī Jīng 詩經 or Book of Odes, a heterogeneous anthology of poems covering a period of five centuries (10th – 5th BCE). These three causative verbs continued to be used in the Pre-Medieval period (2nd c.BCE – 2nd c. CE) throughout the Medieval (2nd – 13th c.CE), Pre-Modern (13th – 14th c.CE) and the Modern periods (15th – 18th c.CE), up until the 18th century, but in the register of Classical Chinese.

The first meaning of 乞 in Late Archaic or Classical Chinese was ‘to ask for’ or ‘to beg’ after which it acquired the meaning of ‘to give’ in the early Han period. The following examples are taken from different periods in the history of the Chinese language:
The verb 乞 ‘to give’ begins to be used as a causative verb in Early Modern Mandarin. For example:

(10) 乞 我 惶了推門推不開
    qǐ wǒ huáng le, tuī mén tuī bù kāi
    CAUS 1SG frighten PFV push door push NEG open
    ‘(It) made me so frightened (that I) could not open the door.’ (Jīn Píng Méi Cǐhuà 金瓶梅詞話)

The causative verb 教, with its source in a lexical verb meaning ‘to instruct’, is attested as a new causative verb from the end of Pre-Medieval: some examples can be found in Lún Héng (輪衡) by Wang Chong 王充 (2nd century AD). It was followed by 交 ‘to exchange’, beginning around the 6th century, and later by 叫 in the Modern period whose original meaning was ‘to call’ (see Ohta 1991, Chang 2005). Examples are:

(11) 又 教 弟 坐
    yòu jiào dì zuò
    in:adition CAUS brother sit
    ‘(And) furthermore, (he) let his brother sit.’ (Zǔ Tǎng Jí 祖堂集)

---

4 Chang Li-li (2005) hypothesizes three general tendencies for the causativization of the verbs shǐ 使, jiào 教 (叫) and ràng 讓: from indirect imperatives to causatives, from intentional causatives to non-intentional causatives, and from general causatives to descriptive causatives. These tendencies are motivated by only one mechanism: generalization (of the verb meaning, of the subject type; of the reference of the object).
(12) 莫教人笑汝　　（Hán Shān Shī 寒山詩 803.2.18）
mò jiào rén xiào rǔ
NEG CAUS people laugh 2SG
‘Don’t let people mock you!’

(13) 叫妹妹出來拜辭哥哥　　（Yǒnglè Dà Diàn 永樂大典西文：張協狀元）
jiào mèimèi chū lái bài cí gēgē
CAUS Miss exit come say farewell Mister
‘Tell Mademoiselle to go out and say farewell to the gentleman;’

(14) 教你別娶妻　　（poem from Wáng Fàn Zhi 王梵志詩）
jiào nǐ bié qū qī
CAUS 2SG NEG marry wife
‘(I ) exhort you not to get married.’

Other causative verbs are found in Late Medieval and Modern Chinese (7th – 18th centuries), whose sources include: yǔ 與 ‘to give’, yào 要 ‘to want’, fàng 放 ‘to place’ and zháo/zhuó 著(着) ‘to place, to use’ (Sun 2005). In an early textbook of Mandarin, written for Koreans and known as the Lǎo Qī Dà 老乞大 (14th century), 51% of the verbal zhuó are causatives with the meaning of ‘to ask’, ‘to tell somebody to do something’, as in the following example:

(15) 我著孩子們 做與你吃
wǒ zuó háizǐmen zuò yǔ nǐ chī
1SG CAUS children do give 2SG eat
‘I’ll get my children to make you something to eat.’ (Lǎo Qī Dà Yánjiě 老乞大諺解)

Finally, ràng 讓 ‘to yield’ and gěi 给 ‘to give’ came into use as a causative verb in the period of Early Modern Mandarin.

(16) 众人讓人 他 坐 吃茶
ezhòng rén ràng tā zuò chī chá
people CAUS 3SG sit consume tea
‘People let him sit to drink tea.’ (Jīn Píng Méi Cǐhuà 金瓶梅词话)

Most of these causative verbs may be or have been used as passive markers as well: yǔ 與 is probably the first causative verb to have been used as a passive marker (Feng 2000 : 638), qǐ 乞, jiào 叫/教/交 (attested as a passive as early as the Tang, according to Jiang Lansheng 2000: 226), gěi 给 (18th century), ràng 讓 (20th century), and even zhuó 著 (着). Some of them were also of course grammaticalized into dative markers, specifically

---

5 On fàng 放 and zháo/zhuó 著(着), see also Zhang Meilan (n.d.).
6 For the grammaticalization of jiào 教, ràng 讓 and gěi 给 into passives, see the detailed analysis of Chang Li-li (2005) who advocates the following pathway: causative> permissive > unwilling permissive > passive;
those with the meaning ‘to give’ 與, gěi 给 and qǐ 乞 ‘to give’.

3.4 An account of grammaticalization

There are several ways we could choose to account for the links between dative, causative and passive where the source is a verb of giving: these involve combining the concepts of both polygrammaticalization (Craig 1991) and grammaticalization chains (Heine et al 1991: ch.8) to best explain this phenomenon. Let us begin with the simplest hypotheses and then refine these:

(i) Polygrammaticalization where the different pathways emanating from a single source morpheme involve just a one-step process:

V [+give] > dative marker (yū, qī, gěi)
V [+give] > V [+causative] (yū, qī, gěi, jiào, …)
V [+give] > passive marker (yū, qī, gěi, jiào, …)

If this first solution were adopted, it would not account for the close semantic relationship between the causative and passive uses, discussed below, by virtue of giving them separate developmental pathways. An alternative hypothesis might be the following:

(ii) Grammaticalization chains evincing repeated occurrences of grammaticalization

The different meanings (dative, causative, passive) are linked and derived, one from the other, by a process of repeated grammaticalization (Heine and Kuteva 2005), providing two possible solutions:

(i) V [+give] > dative marker > causative verb > passive marker
(ii) V [+give] > dative marker > passive marker > causative verb

However, the second solution does not provide us with a desirable hypothesis either for the following reasons: First, the development from dative marker to causative verb suggested in chain (i) or of dative marker to passive marker suggested in chain (ii) is not supported by data from surrounding language families (see Lord et al 2002); second, it would violate the grammaticalization principle of unidirectionality (Hopper and Traugott 1993, Peyraube 1999) in that a dative marker (most likely a preposition) is grammaticalized into a causative verb in chain (i). This would in fact represent the reverse process of de-grammaticalization or lexicalization. The same applies to the second stage in chain (ii) involving the derivation from a passive marker to a causative verb, since the passive marker functions like a preposition, and is thus more grammaticalized than the causative verb.

---

See also Jiang (2003), Hong & Zhao (forthcoming) and Feng (2000/610) who thinks that the passive zhuó 著 (著) also arises from the causative use. However, it could also have its origin in a verb zhào/zhuó meaning ‘to be affected’, ‘to suffer’, given that there exist dialects with a zhào/zhuó passive but without the causative usage. See below, §3.4.
Our hypothesis

We thus propose that there are at least two different pathways of grammaticalization for give verbs, and that we have a case of polygrammaticalization comprising several steps for each pathway (that is, grammaticalization chains, as per Craig 1991):

V [+give] > dative marker
V [+give] > causative > passive marker

This hypothesis appears to conform to the data at hand which show that the causative use appeared before the passive one (Jiang 2002). Furthermore, the syntactic configuration for the datives is different from that for the passive and causative constructions: the dative markers always follow the main verb whereas the causative and passive exponents precede it (see details in §4). This is reinforced by a third fact that causative verbs from sources other than verbs of giving, similarly develop into passive markers (but not into dative prepositions). This applies, for example, to jiào 吠 ‘to call’ (or jiào 教 ‘to teach’) and ràng 讓 ‘to yield’) used as passive markers in contemporary Mandarin.7

This is not crosslinguistically unusual since strong links are attested between verbs of giving, the source of dative markers and causative verbs in many languages.8 What is interesting to observe about most of the causative verbs used in different periods of Chinese that we have mentioned above is that they also developed into passive markers: this includes verbs from a variety of sources such as yǔ 與, qǐ 乞 (chǐ 吃) ‘to give’, jiào 吠 ‘to call’, ‘to tell’ (or jiào 教 ‘to teach’, ‘to instruct’), ràng 讓 ‘to yield’, and even zhuó 著 (著), according to Wu (1996). Only shǐ 使 ‘to send’, ‘to use’ and líng 令 ‘to command’, attested as causatives as early as Archaic Chinese (Wei 2000), did not develop a passive use, though they continue to function as causative verbs in contemporary Mandarin, and other dialect groups, not to mention in Early Southern Min (see Chappell 2000, Lien 1999, 2003).9 Wu hypothesizes that the passive use of zhuó 著 (著) comes from one of its fully lexical verb meanings of ‘to suffer’. However, we prefer the hypothesis of Feng (2000) deriving the passive use from the causative and agree with the Sun’s conjecture (2005) stating that the causative use of zhuó 著 (著) comes from its verbal use of ‘to send’, ‘to use’; this arose in its turn from a metaphorical extension from an earlier meaning ‘to place’.

In many contemporary Sinitic languages, verbs of giving are the main source for not only datives and causatives but also for passives (Yue-Hashimoto 1993: 131) and for object markers (Chappell 2006), as is the case for Southern Min, for example, the Shanghai and Suzhou dialects of Wu, Southwestern Mandarin dialects, standard Hong Kong Cantonese, Meixian Hakka and Taiwanese Southern Min. In contrast to this, Standard Chinese, or Mandarin, generally makes use of a different set of sources from other Sinitic languages, namely, the causative verbs ràng 讓 ‘to yield’ and jiào 吠 ‘to call’, ‘to tell’

---

7 Verbs of giving also develop into benefactive markers, as in standard Mandarin, and purposive conjunctions with the meaning of ‘so that’, among other functions (Newman 1996).
9 Note in this connection that líng 令 ‘to command’ is literary in contemporary usage.
which have developed into passive exponents. The verb  
ě to give' is mainly used as a
marker of the dative, benefactive and purposive. This led Hashimoto (1976) to make his
famous proposal that the difference in source morphemes could serve as one of the features
dividing Northern and Southern Sinitic languages.

From a typological point of view, what is atypical then is the development of verbs of
giving into passive markers. It is not attested crosslinguistically, for example, in Heine and
Nonehtheless, shared passive and causative morphology is certainly not uncommon in the
surrounding language areas, including Altaic and Japanese, but the source of the exponents
is not a verb of giving (see the relevant articles in Comrie and Polinsky 1993).

In an earlier version of this paper (Chappell and Peyraube 2001), we hypothesized
that the development of verbs of giving into passive markers could constitute what is
possibly a unique pathway for Sinitic, reinforced by evidence from earlier stages of
Chinese, showing that qi ́zi (khit' in Southern Min) ‘to give’ is not only used in Early
Mandarin as a passive marker but also in Early Southern Min by the time of the 16th
century. We were of the view that verbs of giving develop into causative verbs in many
Southeast Asian languages but do not appear to progress past this stage, as in Thai, Khmer
and Yao (Hmong-Mien). Verbs belonging to other semantic fields often turn out to be the
source of passive exponents in these languages, such as the verb ‘to suffer’ in Vietnamese
(Clark 1974).

However, in the light of recent indicative research by Zhang Min (2000), we have
revised this view and instead conjecture that verbs of giving which develop into passive
markers might not be unique characteristic of Sinitic languages after all, as earlier
claimed (Chappell and Peyraube 2006), but rather a characteristic shared with certain
languages in East and Southeast Asia from different language families or even from related
groups, for example, possibly Austro-Asiatic and Tibeto-Burman languages, but not
Austronesian.

Thus, after further in-depth research has been carried out, this may prove to be a clear
example of a grammatical feature defining a linguistic area, in combination with other
grammatical features, similar to the one proposed by Comrie (1989) for the Balkans zone
where genetically different languages like Rumanian, Albanian, Bulgarian and Modern
Greek form a Sprachbund or ‘confederation of languages’, or similar to the example of the
Içana-Vaupés basin in North-East Amazonia, where genetically different languages
including Arawak, Tucano-East and Maku also share syntactic features unknown
elsewhere in the families they belong to (Aikhenvald 1999).

What is most important to notice is that all the passive markers that have their source
in verbs of giving in the investigated languages are not directly derived from these verbs of
giving, but come from causative verbs, derived themselves from verbs of giving (see also
Jiang Shaoyu 2002, 2003; Hong and Zhao forthcoming):

\[ V \; [\text{+ give}] \; > \; V \; [\text{+ causative}] \; > \; \text{passive marker} \]

As it is completely atypical to find this development from a verb of giving directly into a
passive marker, but quite common to find the passives directly grammaticalized from
causatives, we could have here an implicational universal:
If a language has a passive marker whose origin is a verb of giving, then it necessarily has a causative verb realised by the same form and having its source in a verb of giving.

\[ \text{[GIVE > PASSIVE MARKER]} \Rightarrow \text{[GIVE > CAUSATIVE]} \]

Let us now turn to an examination of the data on causative constructions in Southern Min.

4. **CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN EARLY SOUTHERN MIN**

In this main section, presenting the syntactic and semantic analysis of causative verbs in Early Southern Min, three verbs are examined: These are:

(i) \( \textit{khit}^4 \) ‘to give’, ‘to beg’ whose counterpart is \( \textit{qi} \) in standard Mandarin and whose historical development was briefly described in §3.3 above. \( \textit{Qi} \) has lost both causative and passive functions in contemporary Mandarin but retains them in many Min dialects (Chappell 2000).

(ii) \( \textit{su}^2 \) ‘to cause’, ‘to send’ whose counterpart in standard Mandarin is \( \textit{sh}i \) and whose historical development was also outlined in §3.3 above. \( \textit{Shi} \) is still used particularly in written registers of Mandarin as a causative verb but not in Taiwanese Southern Min (Lien 1999).

(iii) \( \textit{su}^3 \) ‘to bestow’, ‘to grant’ whose counterpart in standard Mandarin is \( \textit{ci} \). The use of \( \textit{ci} \) has a very classical flavour. Moreover, it only exists as a bound morpheme in contemporary Mandarin, for example, in \( \textit{cigēi} \) 賜給 ‘to bestow (a gift) upon someone’. It is not the common causative verb in either contemporary Taiwanese Southern Min or the Xiamen dialect where \( \textit{hōu} \) 與 is used, nor in other Min dialects where \( \textit{qi} \) 乞 and its cognates prevail.

In the analysis below, we rely mainly – but not exclusively – on two documents: the *Doctrina Christiana* and the *Li Jing Ji* [Romance of the Lychee Mirror], simply because these contain the largest quantity of extended texts, either prose or dialogue in form, from which to draw examples.

4.1 \( \textit{khit}^4 \) ‘to give’, ‘to beg’

4.1.1. The verb \( \textit{khit}^4 \) ‘to give’, ‘to beg’

In the *Doctrina Christiana* (DC), there are 22 examples of the morpheme \( \textit{khit}^4 \) \( \textit{kir} \) in various functions, in addition to 9 examples where it is the V₂ of a complex verb (the latter are discussed separately in §4.3). In the *Li Jing Ji* [Romance of the Litchi Mirror] (1566, 1581), there are more than 223 instances of this verb. We make use, however, of a sample of 80, part of a database established and analysed by Lien (2002).\(^{11}\)

In the *Doctrina Christiana*, passive, causative and two kinds of dative constructions are all formed with this exponent \( \textit{khit}^4 \) \( \textit{ge} \) (kir). As a verb, it has been reconstructed with

---

\(^{10}\) The two authors of this article and Zhang Min are undertaking further new research on the possibility of an implicational universal.

\(^{11}\) We thank Prof. Chinfa Lien for making these data available to us from the *Li Jing Ji* [Romance of the Litchi Mirror].
two pronunciations and two meanings in Archaic Chinese ‘ask, beg’ and ‘give’, with the meaning of ‘ask’ being the earlier one (see Mei 1980 regarding different tonal categories). The structures are described in more detail below. In the Arte, which uses the romanization kit or kir, only the passive and dative uses are discussed, whereas van der Loon mentions both the verbal meanings of ‘to give’ and ‘to ask’ and the causative meanings of ‘to enable’ and ‘to let (somebody do something)’ in Appendix I (1967: 140). The use of khit⁴ ᴿ (kir) as a give verb is indeed so described in the Bocabulario (ca 1617: 215, British Library manuscript), while its use in general can be traced back to the Han and Wei dynasties (Zhang 1989). The following table summarizes the constructions formed by this verb.

Table 1: Constructions formed by khit⁴ ᴿ (kir)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural formula</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>LJJ</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lexical verb ‘to beg’ or ‘to give’</td>
<td>Verb – Direct Object</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(ii): Dative construction, with ‘to/for’ separated from V₁ by the I.O.</td>
<td>Verb – D.O. – khit⁴ – I.O.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(i): Causative verb ‘to let’: V₁ in a pivotal construction</td>
<td>khit⁴ – NP_CAUSEE – VP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(ii): Purposive conjunction ‘so that’</td>
<td>Clause₁ – khit⁴_SO THAT – Clause₂</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Passive exponent</td>
<td>NP_PATIENT – khit⁴ NP_AGENT – VP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from Table 1 that the largest proportion of examples show the causative usage khit⁴ ᴿ (kir) with 46/102. The dative function has the second highest frequency with 29/102, then passives rank third with 17/102. In contrast to these three grammaticalized functions, there are only ten tokens of khit⁴ ᴿ (kir) as a lexical verb in the two documents (10/102). This indicates that khit⁴ ᴿ (kir) had already reached an advanced stage in its grammaticalization pathways by the 16th century. Interestingly, the three examples of lexical verbs found in the Doctrina Christiana all precede the same verb sia 賴 ‘to forgive’ and have the meaning of ‘ask for’ (see also Yue-Hashimoto 1999), as shown in the next example:¹²

¹² Note also that the romanization for this verb in the Doctrina Christiana is kiet and not kir (or kit), perhaps a reflection of its lexical use. For the two other examples, one lacks the romanization while the other uses the more typical romanization of kir.
Verb\textsubscript{1} + Verb\textsubscript{2}

(17) 乞 赦 人 罪
\textit{kiei sia} – –
beg forgive people sin [DC 19a, p. 170]
‘(Jesus then prayed to God, the Father) and begged forgiveness for people sins.’\textsuperscript{13}

This lexical specialization to the earlier meaning of \textit{khit\textsuperscript{4} 乞 (kir)} is reinforced by the fact that the two main lexical verbs of giving found in the Arte, the Bocabulario and the Doctrina Christiana, all from the same period, are \textit{tho\textsuperscript{3} 度} and \textit{u\textsuperscript{5} 與}, and not \textit{khit\textsuperscript{4} khit}.

(18) 汝 有 錢 一 個 度 我
\textit{lù ù chin cheg guè tôu guà}
2SG have money one CLF give me
‘If you have money, give me a dollar (coin).’ \textit{(Si tienes dinero un toston me da.)} [Arte 1620: 12]

4.1.2. The use of \textit{khit\textsuperscript{4} 乞} in dative constructions

The Arte explains (1620: 3a) that only the genitive, dative and ablative cases use particles to mark these functions in the dialect of Southern Min described, while other cases such as the nominative, accusative and vocative are not declined but rely purely on position. Specifically, the genitive uses the postpositioned particle \textit{gûe (個)}, while the dative uses \textit{kît (乞, khit\textsuperscript{4})} preposed before the noun it governs, and the ablative, one of the three particles \textit{cang, cab, or tâng (共, 甲, 同)}\textsuperscript{14}. However, only examples with pronouns and \textit{lâng}人 ‘person’ are presented in the chapter on case in the Arte.

In the Doctrina Christiana, as mentioned above, there are 11 examples of dative constructions formed with \textit{khit\textsuperscript{4} 乞 (kir)} where it functions like a dative marker introducing the indirect object, regardless of construction type. In 5 of these, it immediately follows the verb, typically \textit{su\textsuperscript{3} 賜}, leading to classification as construction type 2(i): Verb – \textit{khit\textsuperscript{4} – I.O. – D.O.}\textsuperscript{15}. The remaining six examples belong to construction type (2ii): Verb – D.O. – \textit{khit\textsuperscript{4} – I.O} where the direct object precedes \textit{khit\textsuperscript{4}} which in turn serves as a preposition.

\textsuperscript{13} All our numbered examples from the Doctrina Christiana refer to the reproduction given in Appendix II of van der Loon’s 1967 article on this topic. The characters and romanization follow the first two lines in the text provided by van der Loon, while we have added in the interlinear glossing and translation into English. Note that even though the Dominicans devised a fully phonemic and tonal transliteration for Southern Min, in the two romanized versions of the Doctrina Christiana found in the British Library manuscript; aspiration, tone marks and nasalization have in the main been omitted. For some characters, the romanization is missing altogether, indicated by ‘--’.

\textsuperscript{14} The Chinese characters given in the parentheses refer to those used in the Arte and do not necessarily reflect the true etymological source.

\textsuperscript{15} Note that for four of the dative constructions of type 2(i) where \textit{khit\textsuperscript{4} 乞 (kir)} immediately follows the verb, it combines in this V\textsubscript{2} position with \textit{su\textsuperscript{3} 賜} as V\textsubscript{1} to form a complex verb \textit{su\textsuperscript{3} – khit\textsuperscript{4} 賜 乞 (su kir)}, not to mention one further example with \textit{pang- khit\textsuperscript{4} 賜 乞 (pang-kir)}. We discuss complex verbs in further detail in §4.3.1 on \textit{su\textsuperscript{3} 賜} ‘to bestow’, ‘to grant’ in conjunction with a further five complex causative verbs, similarly based on \textit{su\textsuperscript{3} – khit\textsuperscript{4} 賜 乞}. 
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introducing the indirect object. One example of each of the two subtypes of the dative constructions with $khit^4$ is given below.

\[
\text{NOUN}_{\text{subject}} - \text{VERB} - kir - \text{NOUN}_{\text{indirect object}} - \text{NOUN}_{\text{object}}
\]

(19) 總名沙膠覽民廚。賜乞人呀膊舍。
chong mia Sacalamento su kir lang Galacia.
full name sacraments bestow give people grace
‘The full name is the Sacraments which bestow grace upon us.’

(20) 做一件事好事乞伊
cho cheg kia ho su kir y
do one CLF good deed give$_{\text{DAT}}$ 3SG
‘do a good deed for them’ [DC p.162]

This represents just one pathway in the grammaticalization of $khit^4$ 乞, where $khit^4$ 乞 is in the $V_2$ position of an original serial verb construction. Eighteen examples of these two kinds of dative constructions are also found in the Li Jing Ji 荔鏡記 [Romance of the Litchi Mirror], for which we present one such example below.

(21) 你挙落荔枝乞阮為記
li`2 tan`3 loh`8 nai`7-chi1        khit44 gun`2  ui`5 ki`3
2SG throw down litchi:branch give$_{\text{DAT}}$ 1PL for sign
‘Throw down the litchi branch to me as a token of your love.’ (LJJ Act 26, line 235)

Hence, it appears that the dative use of $khit^4$ 乞 is well-established by the 16th century for Southern Min. Its lexical use as a verb ‘to ask’ or ‘to beg’ is clearly infrequent while the

\[16\] A comparison can be made here with an earlier stage of Chinese, namely Medieval Chinese: From Late Medieval Chinese ($7^{th} - 13^{th}$ c.) up until the end of the Modern Chinese period ($18^{th}$ c.), the following word orders were available for datives, according to Peyraube (1986, 1988, 1996):

(i) Verb + Indirect Object + Direct Object
(ii) Verb + [Prep $y\tilde{u}$ 與 + Indirect Object] + Direct Object
(iii) Verb + Direct Object + [Prep $y\tilde{u}$ 與 + Indirect Object]
(iv) [Prep $y\tilde{u}$ 與 + Indirect Object] + Verb + Direct Object

The source of the structures in (ii) and (iii) – where the indirect object (or recipient) is marked by $y\tilde{u}$ 與 – is a serial verb construction $V_1 + V_2 + IO + DO$ which emerged during the Han period, around the first century AD. Its special semantic features were: $V_1 =$ verb of giving specifying manner and $V_2 =$ one of three general verbs of giving including $y\tilde{u}$ 與, $y\tilde{u}$ 予 and $w\tilde{e}i$ 遺. The $V_2 + IO$ in this construction became postposed after the DO to create the structure in (iii) by analogy with other existing serial verb constructions during this same period while the $V_2$, lexically restricted to $y\tilde{u}$ 與 by the early Tang dynasty, had grammaticalized into a preposition introducing the IO by the 9th century. In contemporary Mandarin, $y\tilde{u}$ 與 was eventually replaced by $ge\tilde{u}$ 給 ‘to give’. Most pertinent for this study is the fact that $khit^4$ is the preposition used for the postverbal dative constructions shown in (ii) and (iii) (see Chappell, 2000). Thus, when $khit^4$ is used in preverbal position, in a structure like (iv), it acts as either a causative verb or a passive marker. For these two uses, see sections 4.1.3 and 4.1.4.
meaning of ‘to give’ is in fact not greatly attested in the database, a problem we tackle in the final section.

4.1.3. *Causative usages of *khit*₄ 乞*

The two main causative usages of *khit*₄ 乞* comprise 46/102 examples in our 16th century sample of texts. We have collapsed the causative verb usage (32/102) with the causative complementizer usage (14/102) for semantic reasons even though they belong to different construction types.

4.1.3.1. *Causative verb*: NP*CAUSER*  *khit*₄ 乞* – NP*CAUSEE* – VP

The distinguishing syntactic feature of this construction is that *khit*₄ 乞* is found in the original *V₁* slot of the clause, the site for its grammaticalization into a causative verb along the second pathway of its development, outlined in §3.4 above. In this position, it never grammaticalizes into a dative or benefactive marker ‘to’ or ‘for’. Dative/benefactive markers based on *give* verbs typically develop this function only in the postverbal position in Min dialects, that is, from an original *V₂* (see Chappell 2000).

There are just three causative verb uses of *khit*₄ 乞* in the *Doctrina Christiana* as compared with 29 from the sample of the *Lì Jìng Jì* 荔鏡記. All express that the causative agent let, allowed or enabled the situation to happen, similar to the use of *hou*⁷ 與 in contemporary Taiwanese or *ràng* 讓 in standard Mandarin. This meaning is evident in the next example from the *Doctrina Christiana* and can be compared with its translated Mandarin counterpart. Causative constructions formed with *khit*₄ 乞* thus belong to the permissive type (see Shibatani 1976; Talmy 1976; Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002).

NP*CAUSER*  *khit*₄ 乞* – NP*CAUSEE* – VP

(22) Early Modern Southern Min :

先 七 件 – – 識 僚 氏 根 因。

*seng chit kia kir lang bar Diosi kinyn*

first seven:CLF giveCAUS person knowGod origin

‘The first seven items enable people to know that God is the origin.’ [DC p.148]

(23) Translation into Mandarin:

前 七 件 事 是 讓 人 們 知 道 神

*qían qījiàn shì shì ràng rénmen zhīdào shén*

first seven:CLF matter be yieldCAUS person know God

是 萬 物 之 源.

*shi wànwù zhī yuán*

be all:things GEN origin

‘The first seven items enable people to know that God is the origin.’
An example from the Li Jing Ji 荔鏡記 follows:

(24) 乞 伊 磨
\[\text{khit}^4 \text{ i}^1 \text{ boa}^5\]
give\text{CAUS} 3sg rub
‘Let him polish (the mirror).’ [LJJ Act 19, line 061]

In causative function, \(\text{khit}^4\) co-occurs with both transitive and intransitive \(V_2\), but also with semantically stative verbs, such as \(\text{bat}^4\) 識 (bar) ‘to know’ in (18) above. Some of the transitive and intransitive \(V_2\) are: 去 \(khi^3\) ‘to go’, 行 \(kia^5\) ‘to walk’, 返 \(huan^2\) ‘to return’, 過 \(kue^3\) ‘to cross’, 睡 \(k’un^3\) ‘to sleep’, 坐 \(tse^7\) ‘to sit’, 說 \(seh^4\) ‘to speak’ ‘to explain’, 買 \(be^2\) ‘to buy’. There are numerous examples where it co-occurs in negative imperatives such as in the two examples which follow:

(25) 第 三 件。人 作 不 著。我 可 怜
\[\text{tei sa kia lang cho m tio gua co leng}\]
ORD three CLF people do NEG right 1SG take:pity

cau hun y bo kir  y chay cho
chide 3SG NEG give\text{CAUS} 3SG again do
‘The third item: People do wrong things. I take pity on them and chide them. I do not let them do it again.’ [DC p. 155]

(26) 旦：不通 乞 哑 公 哑 媽 知
\[\text{m7– thang}^1 \text{ khit}^4 \text{ A}^1-\text{kong}^1 \text{ A}^1-\text{ma}^2 \text{ chai}^1\]
\text{NEGIMP} \text{give\text{CAUS} grandfather grandmother know
}
Heroine: ‘You mustn’t let grandad and grandma know.’ [LJJ Act 15, line 20]

The semantic transition to a passive interpretation can be clearly seen in an alternative English translation of ‘You mustn’t let it be known by grandad and grandma’. However, the number of examples is too small to claim that the construction favours stative verbs as \(V_2\) in its declarative form. The passive use of \(\text{khit}^4\) is the subject of §4.1.4.

4.1.3.2. Causative complementizer
The remaining 14 uses of \(\text{khit}^4\) connect clauses and thus, two events or situations:
Clause\text{1} – \(\text{khit}^4\) \(\text{Caus}\) – Clause\text{2} where \(\text{EVENT}_1\) enables \(\text{EVENT}_2\) to take place. This is similar to the category of purposive causatives described in Song (1996) where there is no causative entailment, that is, where the causative implicature is defeasible (see also our definition of causativity in terms of a counterfactual inference in §1). We reproduce two examples here from the Doctrina Christiana with sin 信 ‘to believe’ and siu 受 ‘to receive’, both semantically stative verbs and an example from the Li Jing Ji 荔鏡記. The causative sense of enablement is clearly expressed and permits translation into English by means of
the causative complementizer ‘so that, in order that’, if not by the verb ‘enable’ itself.

(27) 你 共 僚 氏 求 人 情。
    lu cang Diosi kiu xin cheng
2SG ABL God ask:for mercy

乞 阮 受 西 士 奇 尼 實 道
    kir guan siu Jesu Kiristo
give COMP 1PL receive Jesus Christ

所 愿 簡 福。
    sou guan ge hoc
that:which wish LIG blessing

‘You asked for mercy from God so that we could receive the blessing that Jesus Christ wished us to have.’ (OR: to enable us to receive the blessing) [DC p.147]

(28) 第 二 件。公丕馬常。是 巴禮
    tei xi kia Conpirmacion si Pare
ORD two CL Confirmation be priest

王 共 人 打 十 字 號。抹 山 廚 油
    ong cang lang pa chap xi ho bua Santo yu
king BEN people make ten word mark rub Holy Oil

乞 人 專 心 信 僚 氏 道 理。
    kir lang chuan sim sin Diosi to li
give COMP people wholehearted believe God doctrine

‘The second: Confirmation is when the bishop does the sign of the cross for people and anoints them with the Holy Oil so that (to enable) people believe singlemindedly in God’s truth.’ [DC p.153]

There is a similar use of *hou* in Taiwanese Southern Min. Consider the following example of a *hou* causative:

Taiwanese Southern Min:

(29) 我 有 企 起 來 與 彼 的 人 過
    goa2 u7 khia2–khia2–lai5 hou7 hia1 e5 lang5 koe3
1SG have stand–DIR CAUS those CLF person pass

‘I stood up in order to let those people pass.’ [Cheng 1991/1997: 222]

The causee in (29) *hia1 e5 lang5 ‘those people’ is an agent of the motion verb *koe3 ‘to pass’ and the patient of the causative verb *hou* which can be understood in the enabling sense of ‘to allow for, to let, so that’.
4.1.4 Passive use of *khit⁴ 乞*

NP_{PATIENT} – *khit⁴ 乞* – NP_{AGENT} – VP

There are 14 passive sentences in the sample from the *Li Jing Ji* 荔鏡記 with *khit⁴ 乞* as a marker of the agent in the passive; and three such uses in the *Doctrina Christiana*. All of the latter three instances refer to the same event of the crucifixion and show *khit⁴ 乞* in the preverbal position, one of which is reproduced here.

NP_{patient} – *khit⁴ 乞* – NP_{agent} – VP

(30) 乞 本事 卑劳厨。枉 法 钉死 在 居律上
      kir  Punsu  Pilato  ong  huar teng-si  tu  Culut chiõ
      PASS  Pontius  Pilate  unjust  law  nail-die  at  cross  on

‘Crucified by the unjust law of Pontius Pilate.’ [DC, p.146]

Similarly, we provide one example from the *Li Jing Ji*:

(31) 乞 五娘 打
      khit⁴ goo⁷-niu⁵  phah⁴
      PASS  (name)  beat

‘Be beaten by Lady Wu-Niang.’ ’ [LJJ Act 14, line 181, data from Lien 2002]

We have claimed above in §3.4 that the passive use is a further step in grammaticalization from the causative use. Indeed, semantically a close relationship can be observed between the permissive causative meaning of ‘let an event happen’, for example, by giving permission or even by not preventing it, and the passive meaning of undergoing an event, typically one that could not be avoided (Chappell 1984).

To conclude this analysis of the uses of *khit⁴ 乞* in the *Doctrina Christiana*, we have shown that *khit⁴ 乞* has three main grammaticalized uses as a dative preposition, a causative verb or complementizer and as a passive marker, introducing the agent. This involves two different serial verb constructions formed with *khit⁴ 乞*, where *khit⁴ 乞* can either be in V₁ or V₂ position and, hence, two pathways of grammaticalization:
Pathway 1 for \( \text{khit}^l \) ‘give’:

\[
V_1 + V_2[\text{khit}^l] > \text{dative marker introducing indirect object or recipient}
\]

(ii) Pathway 2 for \( \text{khit}^l \) ‘give’:

\[
V_1[\text{khit}^l] + V_2 > \text{causative verb}
\]

causative complementizer

introducing a new clause

passive marker introducing agent\(^{17}\)

The appearance of \( \text{qì} \) in its use as a causative verb and as a dative marker can be traced back to the transition between the Late Medieval period and Early Modern Chinese (see Jiang 1989 and Zhang (1989) and relevant examples in §3 above). While these functions have become obsolete in standard Mandarin, it is interesting to find that they are, by way of contrast, preserved in many Min dialects, including Quanzhou, Fuzhou, Chaoyang, Shantou and Suixi (Chappell 2000). Our corpus of historical documents confirms that these uses were already in existence for Early Modern Southern Min by the time of the 16th century, which can be seen as an inheritor of the Medieval Chinese usage.

The next section examines the use of the verb \( \text{su}^2 \) ‘to grant’ in the function of causative verb.

4.2. \( \text{su}^2 \) ‘to cause’, ‘to send’ \( \text{NP}_{\text{CAUSER}} - \text{su}^2\text{使} - \text{NP}_{\text{CAUSEE}} - \text{VP} \)

The causative verb \( \text{su}^2\text{使} \) has two pronunciations in modern Southern Min, which are \( \text{su}^2 \) (literary) and \( \text{saì}^2 \) (colloquial). There are eleven examples of this verb in the Doctrina Christiana and all are given the reading pronunciation of \( \text{su} \), as consistently indicated by the romanization, (noting that the tonal value has been omitted). According to Lien (2003), \( \text{saì}^2 / \text{su}^2 \) is frequently found in causative usage in the Li Jing Ji, though it is no longer a productive causative type in contemporary Taiwanese Southern Min.

Structurally, \( \text{su}^2\text{使} \) causatives are pivot constructions in which the causee NP is both the direct object of the preceding \( \text{su}^2\text{使} \) and subject of the following \( V_2 \). In terms of function, the construction codes an intentional kind of causative when combined with transitive and intransitive verbs. However, when it combines with stative verbs, \( \text{su}^2\text{使} \) forms non-intentional experiencer causatives, that is, where the causer has not intended to bring about a certain result, as shown by examples (29) and (30). In contrast to this, \( \text{su}^3 \text{賜} \)

\(^{17}\) The derivation proposed by Chang (2006) of causative > permissive > unwilling permissive > passive does not seem to hold here for \( \text{khit}^l \). The passive could have directly evolved from the permissive stage without any intervening ‘unwilling permissive’ stage (see our semantic description above of the passive/causative relationship).
‘to grant’ and \(khit^4\) ‘to give’ form only intentional causative constructions. An example of each kind of \(su^2\) 使 causative is next given:

(32) Intentional \(su^2\) 使 causative: \(\text{NP}_{\text{CAUSER}} – su^2 \text{ 使 } – \text{NP}_{\text{CAUSEE}} – \text{VP}\)

\(u\ ci\ tec\ tiang\ chip\ ta\ siu\ su\ ta\ chu\ t’a\)

\( \text{give 3SG bamboo-staff hold 3SG hand CAUS self strike 3SG} \)

‘(They) gave him a bamboo staff and holding his hand, made him beat himself.’

[DC p. 172]

Example (27) also shows that the causer can be a mere mortal. In other words, a highly revered person as the causer is not a semantic requirement of this construction, unlike \(su^3\) 賜 ‘to grant’ as will be shown in §4.4. The same causative verb \(su^2\) 使 is also found in the \(Li Jing Ji\) 荔鏡記 (Lien 2003), who describes it as a productive causative verb in this period. Here is one example with the verb \(soeh^4\) ‘to say’ from this Ming dynasty play.

(33) Intentional \(su^2\) 使 causative: \(\text{NP}_{\text{CAUSER}} – su^2 \text{ 使 } – \text{NP}_{\text{CAUSEE}} – \text{VP}_{\text{ACTION}}\)

\(gun^2\ cha^7\ bo^7\ jit^8\ sai^2\ lek^4\ Chhun^1\ lai^5\ kang^7\ li^2\ soeh^4\)

\(1\text{PL yesterday CAUS (name) come to 2SG say} \)

‘I had Iek-Chun (the maid) tell you yesterday.’ [LJJ Act 14. line 08, (Lien 2003:8)]

(34) Experiencer \(su^2\) 使 causative: \(\text{NP}_{\text{CAUSER}} – su^2 \text{ 使 } – \text{NP}_{\text{CAUSEE}} – \text{VP}_{\text{STATIVE}}\)

\(su\ chi\ tay\ ke\ hua\ hi\)

\(\text{CAUS 3SG everyone rejoice} \)

‘…and made everyone rejoice.’ [DC p.176]

(35) Experiencer \(su^2\) 使 causative: \(\text{NP}_{\text{CAUSER}} – su^2 \text{ 使 } – \text{NP}_{\text{CAUSEE}} – \text{VP}_{\text{STATIVE}}\)

\(\text{(no romanization)}\)

\(2\text{SG what:reason CAUS 1SG with 2SG father receive} \)

\(\text{this kind grief} \)

‘Why did you cause your father and me to endure such grief?’ [DC p.168]

The main predicate verbs (\(V_2\)) in the \(su^2\) 使 causative construction include modal verbs such as ‘to be able’; intransitive verbs such as ‘to return’, ‘to arrive’ and ‘to come’; stative verbs such as ‘to be glad’, ‘to endure grief’; and dynamic active verbs such as ‘to hit’ and ‘to carry (on back)’. There are 11 in total in the Doctrina Christiana.
Table 2: Verbs occurring in the $su^2$ 使 causative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive (2)</th>
<th>Intransitive (4)</th>
<th>Modal (2)</th>
<th>Stative (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$hu$ 负 ‘to carry (on back)’</td>
<td>$chi$ 至 ‘to arrive’ $lai$ 来 ‘to come’ $seng$ 升 ‘to ascend’ $hue$ lai 回来 ‘to return’</td>
<td>$leng$ 能 (x 2) ‘to be able’</td>
<td>‘to endure grief’ $hua$ hi 欢 喜 (x 2) ‘to be glad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ta$ 打 ‘to hit’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, two negative imperative forms are found in this text: Combined with the negative imperative marker, $bók$ 莫, it is interesting to find that $su^2$ 使 takes on the semantically unpredictable meaning of an unwilling permissive ‘don’t let’:

(36) $su^2$ 使 causative in negative imperative form:

$$bók 没 -su^2 使 -NP_{CAUSEE} -VP_{STATIVE}$$

莫 使 惡 鬼 來 迷 我

$boc$ $su$ $kiap$ $cui$ $lay$ $bey$ $gua$

NEG CAUS bad ghost come deceive 1SG

‘Don’t let the devil come to tempt me.’ [DC p.171]

This could be profitably compared with the example containing $mò$ jiào 莫教 from the Medieval Chinese period in §3. One final example of $su^2$ 使 could be interpreted with the lexical meaning of this verb as ‘to send’:

(37) Lexical verb $su^2$ 使

使 我 死 後。升 天 見 他 面。

$su$ $gua$ $si$ $au$ $seng$ $tian$ $ki$ $ta$ $bin$

CAUS 1SG die after ascend heaven see 3SG face

‘After I die, send me up to Heaven to see his face.’ OR: ‘make me ascend to Heaven.’ [DC p.169]

Nonetheless, this example is more likely to be interpreted causatively as ‘to make’ or ‘to cause me to go up to Heaven’. This is a ‘midway’ example which gives an insight into how semantic shift takes place. In the examples with $su^2$ 使 ‘to make’, ‘to have’, ‘to send’, different kinds of causative agents are permitted, including ordinary mortals, as in example (35), in contrast with the $su^3$ 赐 ‘to grant’ causative where only revered personnages such as Saint Mary, or God, are found in the causer NP slot. Similarly, however, for the intentional subtype of this causative construction, the causation has to be carried out by an agent in a more powerful position than the causee. This is, semantically speaking, one of the features in the prototype for a directive causative (Shibatani 1976, Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002; Chappell 1984): the causee has to do what the causer wants him/her to do.

In conclusion to this section, we suggest that there is one single grammaticalization pathway for $su^2$ / $sai^2$ 使, out of which it forms two causative construction subtypes:
Lexical verb \(su^2\) ‘to send’ > causative verb ‘make’

a. intentional causative where \(V_2\) = transitive or intransitive action verb
b. experiencer causative where \(V_2\) = stative verb or adjective

Interestingly, it did not develop a passive or dative function in Southern Min or in Mandarin. This can be attributed to its predilection for stative verbs to which it is restricted in contemporary Mandarin. The possibility of co-occurrence with the non-dynamic predicate type can be traced back to the period for Archaic Chinese. An example with 使 ‘to send’, ‘to cause’ from a 2\(^{nd}\) century BCE text follows, representing the end of the Classical period (cited in Wei Pei-chuan 2000: 837):

(38) 弱者 使之強，短者 使長，貧者 使

\[ruó-zhē shī zhī qiáng, duăn-zhē shī cháng pin-zhē shī\]

weak: NOM cause 3SG strong short: NOM cause long poor: NOM cause
duō liáng
many grain

‘Make the weak strong, the short long and the poor to have enough grain.’
(Mā Wáng Duī, Han Tombs 马王堆 汉 墓 面 錦 書)

Su\(^2\)/ sai\(^2\) 使 is thus a continuation of an Archaic Chinese analytic causative, no longer used in contemporary Taiwanese Southern Min, although it still may be found in this function in certain other Southern Min dialects. It is also used in standard Mandarin, particularly in formal registers, as an unintentional experiencer causative (Chappell 1984). As far as the historical documents are concerned, su\(^2\)/ sai\(^2\) 使 is a productive form in the Lì Jìng Jì 荔 鏡 記 (Lien 1999, 2003) and occurs in the Doctrina Christiana with a higher frequency than for khit\(^4\) 乞: There are 11 su\(^2\) 使 causatives versus just 3 khit\(^4\) 乞 causatives.

4.3. su\(^3\) 赐 ‘to grant’, ‘to bestow something upon someone’

\[\text{NP}_{\text{CAUSER}} - su^3 \text{ 赐} - \text{NP}_{\text{CAUSEE}} - \text{VP}\]

The verb su\(^3\) 赐 ‘to grant’ is the most common of the causative verbs in the Doctrina Christiana. Of 32 examples, only 10 retain the lexical verb meaning of ‘to grant’ or ‘to bestow’ while a further 22 show a development into the basic causative meaning of ‘to make’ or ‘to cause’ in contrast to the central meaning of enablement found with the khit\(^4\) 乞 causative.

Included in this group are 9 complex causative verbs with \(V_1 = su^3 \text{ 赐} \) ‘to grant’ and \(V_2 = \) either khit\(^4\) 乞 ‘to give’ (8) or u\(^5\) 與 (= Mandarin yù) ‘to give’ (1). The complex causative verbs, where khit\(^4\) 乞 or u\(^5\) 與 serve to mark the oblique function of the following NP as a causee, are treated in the following section, §4.3.1. In this section, we concentrate on the analysis of the 23 examples where su\(^3\) 赐 is used on its own. Seventeen show causative usage and six its basic lexical meaning.
Table 3: Lexical versus causative usages of $su^3$ 赐 ‘to grant’ and its complex verbs in the *Doctrina Christiana*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical verb</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Causative verb</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simple verb:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$su^3$ 赐 ‘to grant’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$su^3$ 赐 ‘to make’</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complex verb:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$su^3$-$khit4$ 赐乞 (3) or $su^3$-$u$ 賜與 (1) ‘to grant’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$su^3$-$khit4$ 赐乞 ‘to enable’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb $su^3$ 赐 ‘to grant’ used alone as a causative verb appears at first to present a very unusual case of a verb of giving used in this function: First, examples of this verb in other contemporaneous texts such as the *Li Jing Ji* 荔鏡記 are not common. Furthermore, it appears that $su^3$ 赐 ‘to grant’ is very rarely used as a causative verb in Archaic or Medieval Chinese texts. Here is one example of its lexical use from the *Li Jing Ji* 荔鏡記 with the $thek^3$ $su^3$ 敎 赐 ‘to bestow something upon someone (as said of an emperor)’:

(39) $thek^3$ $su^3$ $kiam^3$ $in^3$ $su^5$ $sin^1$
bestow sword seal with self

‘Take the sword and seal with me that was bestowed by the emperor.’

*Li Jing Ji* 荔鏡記 Act 2, line 021

Second, as a verb of giving, the meaning of $su^3$ 赐 is highly semantically specific, since it refers to the act of giving by the emperor, if not a high-ranking superior, in presenting something to a person of lower rank (Carstairs Douglas dictionary 1873: 461), reflected in its nominal use as well: un$^1$-$su^3$ 恩賜 ‘gracious gift, as from emperor’. Yet, there is general consensus that when a process of grammaticalization begins, its source is typically an hyperonym, that is, a superordinate, a high frequency basic verb with a general meaning (Peyraube 1999). For example, SAY verbs may evolve into quotatives and eventually complementizers, whereas such a development is highly unlikely for their hyponyms whisper and chatter. Nonetheless, the source of a causative verb in a verb of giving is typical for Sinitic languages, as discussed in §3.4.

Third, we note that in light of the religious nature of the text, it is not surprising that $su^3$ 赐 ‘to grant’, a special verb used for the act of giving with reference to emperors or high superiors in Chinese, would be adopted in this translation for cases where the causer is either God, the Holy Spirit or Saint Mary who is evidently accorded great reverence, particularly in the Catholic faith to which these religious texts pertain. In fact, all the causers (or bestowers) in the 32 examples exclusively refer to this set of personnages, specifically Saint Mary in 17 examples, God in 12 and the Holy Spirit in 3. Thus, this supports our claim that $su^3$ 赐 ‘to grant’ would be the appropriate verb, if any, for high status causers. The subset of 23 examples with $su^3$ 赐 used alone further brings this into
relief: for the 6 lexical verb uses of \(su^3\) 賜 ‘to grant’, it is, not surprisingly, God who bestows a blessing or grace upon his subjects, while it is mainly Mary for the causative uses of \(su^3\) 賜 ‘to grant’ (15/17) in the context of the section in the _Doctrina Christiana_ on the Mysteries of the Rosary. These 14 mysteries are recited in the form of a prayer and supplication to Mary.

In the grammar of Mandarin written by Francisco Varo and dating from the late 16\(^{th}\) century, a similar causative usage of Mandarin \(c\dot{\mathfrak{i}}\) 賜 ‘to grant’ is found in one of the examples, reproduced below (for the translated English edition, see Coblin and Levy 2001: 121).

(40) 天主賜與我爱你
\[t'i\'en\ ch\dot{\mathfrak{u}}\ ç\ddot{\mathfrak{u}}\ i\dot{\mathfrak{u}}\ g\dot{o}\ g\dot{\alpha}\ n\]
God grant to 1SG love 2SG
‘Grant me Lord that I may love you’.

Varo observes in fact that \(\ddot{\mathfrak{c}}\ddot{\mathfrak{u}}\) 賜 should be anteposed to 與 \(i\dot{\mathfrak{u}}\) to form a verb of giving ‘if the person who gives is a superior’ (Coblin and Levy 2001: 63). In connection with this point, it is interesting to note that Khmer has two verbs of giving, \(\ddot{\mathfrak{a}}\dot{\mathfrak{o}}\dot{\mathfrak{y}}\) whose direction of transfer is from a superior down the social hierarchy to those inferior in status, and \(c\ddot{\mathfrak{u}}:n\) whose direction is upwards to those superior in status, (Bisang 1992: 395, 424). It is thus not remarkable in terms of the present discussion to find that only the verb of giving to someone lower in status can be used as a causative verb (you cannot tell a higher status person to perform an action). This is the case in Khmer where only \(\ddot{\mathfrak{a}}\dot{\mathfrak{o}}\dot{\mathfrak{y}}\) has developed a causative usage (Bisang 1992: 439), even though both \(\ddot{\mathfrak{a}}\dot{\mathfrak{o}}\dot{\mathfrak{y}}\) and \(c\ddot{\mathfrak{u}}:n\) can be used as dative/benefactive markers. The pragmatics of usage for these verbs of giving in Khmer thus neatly explains the case of \(su^3\) 賜 ‘give’ in Early Modern Southern Min. It also brings to mind the complex linguistic situation intertwining the use of different verbs of giving and receiving in contemporary Japanese with the relative social status of the interlocutors.

The fourth piece of evidence is the fact that Carstairs Douglas dictionary (1873: 562) gives \(su^3\) as the reading pronunciation for colloquial \(th\dot{\mathfrak{o}}\ [thou^3]\) 度 ‘to give’. Indeed, the selection of \(su^3\) 賜 ‘to grant’ as the character linked with this romanization makes sense in terms of the literary – colloquial or \(w\mathfrak{e}n\mathfrak{–}b\mathfrak{a}i\) distinction 文白異讀 prevalent in Min dialects, a consequence of stratification due to prolonged contact with Mandarin (see §2 above, Mei and Yang 1995). Many examples of this interesting phenomenon are discussed in Lien (2001). This stratification has led to \(su^3\) 賜 being paradigmatically linked with \(thou^3\) 度 ‘give’, even though the two lexemes are not etymologically related.\(^{18}\) Moreover, the associated register distinction lends further credence to the choice of \(su^3\) 賜 ‘to grant’ as being in conformity with the elevated written style of early Southern Min found in the _Doctrina Christiana_, and thus, appropriate for sacred texts. This more literary style is particularly in evidence in the section on the Mysteries of the Rosary where a large proportion, 17/23 of the causative examples with \(su^3\) 賜 ‘to grant’ are to be found, mainly with Mary appearing as the causer (15/17) (see van der Loon 1967, Yue-Hashimoto 1999 on questions of register).

\(^{18}\) We are indebted to Chin-fa Lien for this enlightenment.
It appears to be the case that the development of *su*³ 賜 ‘to grant’ into a causative verb has occurred via semantic shift from ‘a person in a superior position granting a lower status person the conditions or capacity to do an action or enter into a new state of affairs’. This causative construction codes the sense of an empowerment of the causee, as opposed to the directive sense of ordering the causee to carry out an action (for which see §4.2 above on *su*²/ *sai*²使 ‘to send’, ‘to cause’). This point will become clearer once the examples have been discussed in more detail below.

The lexical and grammaticalized uses of the verb *su*³ 賜 can be clearly differentiated on the basis of their syntax. The lexical use of *su*³ 賜 ‘to grant’ occurs in the basic frame: NP_SUBJECT – *su*³ 賜 – NP INDIRECT OBJECT – NP DIRECT OBJECT.

(41) **lexical use of *su*³ 賜 ‘to grant’, ‘to bestow’**:

```
NP SUBJECT – su³ 賜 – NP INDIRECT OBJECT – NP DIRECT OBJECT
```

*su lu tay hoc* bestow 2SG great blessing

‘and bestows a great blessing (on you)’ [DC p.181]

In other words, as a ditransitive lexical verb, *su*³ 賜 ‘to grant’ has two postverbal noun slots, the first for the indirect object or recipient noun, and the second for the direct object or patient. This corresponds to the basic structural pattern for datives in Archaic Chinese, Medieval Chinese and for contemporary Southern Min dialects; not to mention, standard Mandarin. Another dative *su*³ 賜 construction exists, however, where the indirect object may occur after the direct object, provided it is preceded by a dative preposition such as *khit*⁴ 乞 or *u 與*.

(42) **NP SUBJECT – *su*³ 賜 – NP DIRECT OBJECT – khit⁴ 乞 ( u 與) – NP INDIRECT OBJECT**

```
Diosi  su  hoc  kir  lu
God  bestow  blessing  to  2SG
‘God has bestowed a blessing upon you.’  [DC p.145]
```

As pointed out in Chappell (2000: 258), and observed earlier in §4.1.3.1, the preverbal position is not available for *khit*⁴ 乞 as a marker of a recipient (that is, a dative or benefactive marker), since in this position it takes on the role of a causative verb (or passive marker).

In contrast to this, the causative construction has generally only one postverbal NP slot for the causee which is followed by the second verb in the predicate: NP_CAUSER – *su*³ 賜 – NP_CAUSEE – VP;

(43) **NP_CAUSER – *su*³ 賜 – NP_CAUSEE – VP**

```
lu  su  gua  u  guan  sim  liam  keng
2SG  CAUS 2SG  have-care-and-exertion recite text
‘You enable me to recite the doctrine with care and exertion.’  [DC p.171]"
Causative \(su^3\) 託 can occur with a range of different verb types. These are listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive action</th>
<th>Intransitive action</th>
<th>Modal</th>
<th>Stative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>liam keng 念經 ‘recite texts’</td>
<td>lai 來 (x2) ‘come’ ay 要 ‘want’</td>
<td>hua hi 歡喜 ‘be glad’; cheng kiet 清潔 (x 2) ‘be clean’; m ay 不要 (x2) ‘not like, desire’ u Galaça 有呀 勞 舍 ‘to have Grace’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Verb types in the \(su^3\) 託 causative construction [Total = 17]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive action</th>
<th>Intransitive action</th>
<th>Modal</th>
<th>Stative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>liam keng 念經 ‘recite texts’</td>
<td>lai 來 (x2) ‘come’ ay 要 ‘want’</td>
<td>hua hi 歡喜 ‘be glad’; cheng kiet 清潔 (x 2) ‘be clean’; m ay 不要 (x2) ‘not like, desire’ u Galaça 有呀 勞 舍 ‘to have Grace’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from this table that the intransitive and stative uses of the \(su^3\) 託 causative construction far outweigh its usage with transitive action verbs [13/20]. This may be due to the small number of examples and could thus be seen as a mere gap in the data. Putting it another way, Table 4 shows that \(su^3\) 託 does not occur with highly transitive verbs; those represented are either activity verbs or verbs of low affect (as defined in Hopper and Thompson 1980). However, it cannot be fortuitous that the stative kind of predicate is particularly well-suited to the semantic nature of the causative that \(su^3\) 託 forms, an intentional causative where the causer (Mary or God) wants to bring about a certain result state, usually a propitious one for the causee, an ordinary mortal. The two examples which follow show such a usage:

(44) 你 託 我 不 要 只 世 上 假 歡 悅

\[lu\ su\ gua\ m\ ay\ chi\ si\ chio\ ke\ hua\ hi\]

2SG bestow\_{CAUS} 1SG NEG desire this world on false joy

‘You enable me to no longer desire the false joys of this world.’ [DC p.172]

(45) 我 今 求 汝。汝 託 我 神 魂 清 潔

\[gua\ ta\ kiu\ lu.\ lu\ su\ gua\ sin\ hun\ cheng\ kiet\]

1SG now implore 2SG 2SG bestow\_{CAUS} 1SG soul clean

‘I hereby entreat you to make my soul clean.’ [DC p.168]

The example in (45), in particular, reveals the power relation between causer and causee in its entreaty to Mary to cleanse the soul. This kind of causative does not entail an order being given to the causee who is obliged to carry it out, as with \(su^2/sai^2\) 使, but rather causation of a new situation or state of affairs brought about by some special force or
power attributable to the causer, evidently an unremarkable situation in this particular kind of religious context, discussing the fourteen mysteries of the Christian faith.

Even for the four instances where a transitive action verb is used, the overall meaning is stative for two, as in (43) with ‘enable me to recite the doctrine with care and exertion’ which focuses on the manner and result state, and for the verb it-tioc 億 著 ‘to think upon’ which is used with the adverb siang 常 ‘usually’, ‘generally’ in the clause ‘you enable me to always think about your son, Jesus Christ’. The two examples with kiu 求 ‘to implore’ are part of a larger phrase kiu yin cheng 求人情 ‘to beg for compassion’, ‘to ask a favour’ and, although transitive in form and semantically active, we would like to propose that it is the result state which is being focused upon by the use of this particular causative verb. Let us now examine the complex verb su kir (su3-khit4 賜乞) ‘to bestow something upon someone’.

4.3.1 Complex verbs formed with su3-khit4 賜乞 ‘to bestow’

The complex causative verb with su kir (su3-khit4 賜乞) mirrors the situation for su3 賜 used alone. There are eight examples in the Doctrina Christiana which use the verb su kir (su3-khit4 賜乞) that show both its lexical use as a verb meaning ‘to bestow’(5/8) and a causative use as a verb meaning ‘to make’, ‘to cause’ (3/8). There are also two further related examples of interest that should be included here, one where the complex verb is su3-u5 賜與 and the other where it is pang-kir (pang3-khit4 放乞) ‘to allow’; in other words, 9 examples in all of su3 賜 as V1 in a complex verb. The use of hit4 乞 as V2 in 9 of these examples recalls the grammaticalization of yù 與 ‘to give’ into a preposition from V2 position in similar serial verb constructions by the time of Late Medieval Chinese (Peyraube 1988, 1996).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical verb ‘to grant’</th>
<th>Total Causative verb ‘to enable’</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>su3-khit4 賜乞</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>su3-khit4 賜乞</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su3-u5 賜與</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>pang3-khit4 放乞</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us first look at the lexical use of these complex verbs: In this construction, hit4 乞 has a double role: on the one hand, it acts like a complement verb in a V1–V2 complex, yet on the other it serves to introduce the indirect object. The direct object, if present, can either follow the recipient noun as in (46) or be preposed before the verb in the immediately preceding context as in (47):
LEXICAL USE OF su kir (su³-khit⁴ 賜乞)

(46) NPAGENT – su kir (su³-khit⁴ 賜乞) – NPINDIRECT OBJECT (– NPDIRECT OBJECT)

求 僑氏 保庇 生人。 賜 乞 伊 呀 勞舍
kìu Diosi po pi se lang su kir y Galaçia
entreat God protect live:person bestow give 3SG grace
‘(I) entreat God to protect the living and bestow upon them Grace.’ [DC p.156]

(47) Clause-initial direct object

(NPDIRECT OBJECT) – NPAGENT – su kir (su³-khit⁴ 賜乞) – NPINDIRECT OBJECT

日 日 所 用 箯 物。今 旦 日
yìt yìt sei ong ge mi kín toa yìt
day day that:which use LIG thing today

你 賜 乞 阮。
lù su kir guan
2SG bestow give 1PL
‘The things we use every day, you grant us today.’
[cf. ‘Give us this day our daily bread.’ [DC p.144]

The pertinent use of khit⁴ in this complex verb appears to be its development as a marker of the causee rather than the recipient, particularly when no patient noun occurs. In this connection, su-khit⁴ 賜乞 takes on the causative meaning of ‘to enable, make’. There are five clear examples of this use, where the interpretation has to be a causative one and not one of ‘bestow’. Two of these are reproduced in (48) and (49) below:

(48) NPCAUSER su-khit 賜乞 NPCAUSEE VP

汝 賜 乞 我 要 效 汝 子 受 艱難
lu su kir gua -- hau lu kía sìu can lan
2SG CAUSGIVE 1SG want imitate 2SG son receive suffering
‘You make me want to imitate your son’s suffering.’ [DC, p.171]

(49) NPCAUSER su-khit 賜乞 NPCAUSEE VP

你 賜 乞 阮 稱 畏 你 名
lu su kir guan cheng suan lu mìa
2SG CAUSGIVE 1PL express:admiration 2SG name
‘You cause us to revere your name.’ (‘Hallowed be thy name.’) [DC, p.144]

It is also instructive to note that one of the three examples classified as a lexical use of su-kir 賜乞 is in fact midway between the lexical and causative use. This is the following example which shows how su-kir 賜乞 may have developed its causative usage of enablement.
(i) *Causative interpretation*: ‘And to also protect the Christian dead, so that they can receive glory.’ (literally: ‘enabling them to receive glory’)  
(ii) *Lexical interpretation*: ‘and grant them the receiving of glory.’ [DC p.156]

As there are too few examples of *su-kr* 賜乞 as a causative verb, we are not in a position to make any strong claims about this construction, apart from mentioning that the verb in the main predicate is typically a transitive one, and thus implies an agentive causee, as in (48) and (49).

Finally, it is worth noting that there is one example of a causative with *kio*, cognate with Mandarin *jiao* 叫 ‘to make’. It is also found as a causative verb in the *Li Jing Ji*:

(51) 叫 人 死 身 再 活 起 來
kio lang si sin chay ua ki lay
CAUS people die body again live arise come
‘(God) will make us live again after we die.’ [DC, p.162]

5. CONCLUSION

We conclude our analysis of Early Modern Southern Min causatives with a résumé of our findings, placed in a diachronic perspective: All three main causative structures described in this study represent pivot constructions from the point of view of syntax: NP_CAUSER – causative verb – NP_CAUSEE – VP. The most frequent causative verb in the *Doctrina Christiana* is *su 賜* (22), a causative of ‘empowerment’ which may co-occur with all verb types, though it particularly favours non-transitive verbs, if not verbs low on the transitivity scale. In nine cases, it occurs in the Doctrina Christiana as part of a verb complex with *khi^4* 許 as *V_2*.

We propose that the causative verb *su 賜*, as for its lexical use ‘to bestow’, conveys respect for high status causers, particularly appropriate in the given context of a collection of religious texts with frequent supplications to God, Mary and Jesus. Although it is not attested in other contemporaneous Southern Min texts such as the *Li Jing Ji*, nor in earlier periods of Chinese, we note a similar use in the 17th century Mandarin of Varo’s grammar. Furthermore, a description of [sir] 賜 being used as a passive marker in the Xiang dialect of Loudi has recently come to light (Wu 2005: 195).

The next most frequent causative verb in the text is *su^2* 使 with 11 tokens, a directive causative in its intentional form ‘make’. Contrasting to this, it also forms a subtype of unintentional causatives with experiencer verbs. *Su^2* 使 is no longer productive in modern Southern Min dialects such as Taiwanese, although it is used in standard Chinese and is
attested as a causative verb from the period of Archaic Chinese.

Although there were only a few examples of causative use of khit⁴ 乞 in the Doctrina Christiana (5 tokens), it is common in the far longer text of the Li Jing Ji with a total of 41 tokens in the representative sample used, making it overall the most frequent causative verb, in fact, for the two 16th century texts. Khit⁴ 乞 forms a permissive ‘let’ type of causative. In some contemporary Southern Min dialects it is still used in this function, for example in Dongshan, Jinjiang and Jieyang (see tables for the uses of khit⁴ 乞 in Southern Min dialects in Chappell 2000 and Lien 2002; and the discussion thereof). In the Taiwanese, Xiamen and Zhangzhou varieties of Southern Min it has been replaced by hou⁷ 與. The verb khit⁴ 乞 is attested as a causative from the Late Medieval period.
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