

DIALECT GRAMMAR IN TWO EARLY MODERN SOUTHERN MIN TEXTS: A COMPARATIVE
STUDY OF DATIVE *kīt* 乞, COMITATIVE *cāng* 共 AND DIMINUTIVE *-guā* 仔

Hilary Chappell

Abstract

In this analysis, I use a typological perspective to compare certain grammatical features of modern Southern Min dialects such as Taiwanese and Amoy (Xiamen) with those found in the Southern Min translation of the *Doctrina Christiana* (ca. 1607) and a Southern Min grammar written in Spanish: *Arte de la lengua Chiō Chiu* (1620). The specific grammatical constructions and categories which are investigated are dative, causative and passive constructions formed with *kīt* 乞 (*khit*), ‘to give’; comitative, ablative and benefactive constructions formed with *cāng* 共 (*kā*) ‘with’ and the development of the diminutive marker *-kīa, -iā* and *-niā* 仔(-a) from the lexeme ‘son’.

The objective is to ascertain if these syntactic and morphological constructions have undergone any major grammatical changes over the last 4 centuries in Southern Min. In fact, some functions of these markers prove to be similar to Taiwanese Southern Min, such as certain uses of comitative *cāng* 共 (*kā*), while other markers appear to be distinct but are found elsewhere in Min dialects such as the passive and causative marker *kīt* 乞 (*khit*). The findings illustrate examples of grammatical renovation as the consequence of competing forms, phonological attrition and polysemous conceptual shift as the outcome of different paths of grammaticalization.¹

1. Introduction

Early 17th century missionary texts on Southern Min (or Hokkien) dialects provide an invaluable source for the diachronic study of the grammar of their modern counterparts as they are largely written in the special dialect characters for vernacular Hokkien and have romanized versions. The significance of these early documents cannot be underestimated, given the small number of works written in the colloquial form of Southern Min dialects that are available to us from earlier periods.

According to van der Loon (1967), the translation of the Catholic religious text, the *Doctrina Christiana*, into a Southern Min dialect was published by 1607 in

Manila. A lexicon (*Bocabulario*) and a grammar (*Arte*) were also compiled during the second decade of the 17th century in 1617 and 1620 respectively. Van der Loon describes each of these three works as a collaborative effort of Spanish Dominican missionaries and Chinese interpreters living in a Chinese Sangley community near Manila in the late 16th and early 17th centuries.²

There are also several Southern Min colloquial plays and manuals in existence which date back to the Ming and Qing dynasties such as the *Lijingji* 荔镜记 ‘The Romance of the Lychee Mirror’. These are written in a mixture of the Chaozhou and Quanzhou vernaculars and have been examined in studies such as Yue-Hashimoto (1991, 1998) on interrogative structures and grammar, Lien (1994a, 1995) on resultative verb compounds and Mei (1998) on pronoun fusion in Southern Min. Lien (1995) also considers hybrid literary genres such as Taoist liturgical texts. Such texts provide few clues however as to the pronunciation of the characters and words in these epochs, let alone facilitate easy reconstruction of the phonological systems. Nor do they allow us to discern when Mandarin characters (as opposed to the special dialect characters) should be given the literary or the colloquial reading in Southern Min. The romanized versions of the Southern Min *Doctrina Christiana* clarify this problem in most cases. Consequently, the rediscovery of the missionary texts in romanized and character form is a great boon to researchers in Chinese dialectology.³ Problems in interpretation for 19th and early 20th century documents on Australian languages have been described in McGregor (2008) with respect to missionary archives on Dampier Land languages and the degree of authenticity in representing the grammar and phonological systems.

2. Background to the documents used in the analysis

The following three early modern Southern Min documents have been consulted for this analysis: I next briefly describe their contents:

- (i) The translation of the Spanish version of the *Doctrina Christiana* into a Min dialect in character form is attributed to Dominican missionaries by Van der Loon (1967). It was blockprinted not earlier than 1607 by Keng Yong of the Parian, near Manila, although the translation of the some parts of it were possibly made as early as 1587.

In addition, two somewhat different romanized versions of the *Doctrina Christiana* also exist and form part of an untitled 337 page Spanish manuscript, which is held in the British Museum (Add. 25,317). Both the Spanish romanizations and Chinese characters for the *Doctrina Christiana* have been collated and reproduced in Appendix II to van der Loon (1967). I refer to this appendix in my analysis. The *Doctrina Christiana* has the following contents: the Sign of the Cross, the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, the Apostles' Creed, Salve Regina, the Fourteen Articles of Faith, the Ten Commandments, the Commandments of the Holy Church, the Sacraments of the Holy Church, the Fourteen Works of Charity, the Seven Mortal Sins, the Confiteor, the Catechism, the Mysteries of the Rosary, followed by the rules for hearing mass, days of fasting and abstinence, and the Act of Contrition.⁴

In a classic piece of investigative work, Van der Loon pinpoints the dialect used and described in this manuscript by Spanish Dominican missionaries in the Philippines as the vernacular of Haicheng (海澄), in the prefecture of Zhangzhou (漳州), as used around the turn of the seventeenth century (1967:132). He shows that it differed in certain phonological features from the dialect of Zhangzhou city, although it belongs to this subgroup of Southern Min (see Ting 1980: 5). Van der Loon concludes that the Sangleys or Chinese traders must have migrated from this port town in southern Fujian province, with many eventually settling in and around Manila.

Van der Loon also documents the lack of linguistic uniformity of this text revealed by its use of two orthographies: the special characters used for vernacular Hokkien during the Ming dynasty are strongly in evidence in the first part of this text up to the end of the catechism. This half is characterized as the basic *Doctrina* by van der Loon (1966: 22) and was probably translated in the 1590s during the early years of the Dominicans' mission, even though it may only have been blockprinted at a much later date, some time before 1607. Van der Loon points out that while the use of the vernacular in written works was widespread by the time of the late Ming period (1966: 13), subsequently, this practice was more thoroughly suppressed in southern Fujian province than anywhere else in China.

In the second part, the use of Hokkien characters is more limited, apart from the Act of Contrition, leading to the conclusion that there were at least two different sets of authors: Most likely the missionaries, Miguel de Benavides and Juan Cobo,

helped by Chinese interpreters, were responsible for the basic *Doctrina* while other Dominican missionaries translated the second section on the rosary, also with the help of Chinese collaborators, in the early 17th century.⁵

Van der Loon mainly investigates the phonology of the Min dialect represented by the *Doctrina Christiana*. Yue-Hashimoto (1998) takes issue with his bipartite division, showing that, in terms of both syntax and the lexicon, finer distinctions can be made, the colloquial-literary division between these two parts of the *Doctrina* not being in fact so rigid. She describes the *Doctrina* in terms of five main sections and claims that the section, Mysteries of the Rosary, being narrative in form, contains the highest proportion of classical (pre-Qin) elements, while the Catechism, is the most colloquial in its rhetorical question-answer format, while the remaining sections show a mixture of both colloquial Min and literary vernacular styles. Note that she defines ‘literary vernacular style’ as ‘a written style that probably approximates the standard language of the time.’ In view of this, I place the whole text under scrutiny for the purpose of seeking historical evidence on different stages of grammaticalization.

(ii) *Arte de la lengua Chiō Chiu*. The British Museum copy of this manuscript is catalogued as: “*Arte de la lengua Chiō Chiu*”, otherwise called *Chin-Chen* from a town of that name in the province of Fokien, in China. This is the copy referred to by van der Loon (1966, 1967). The place name *Chiō Chiu* clearly refers to Zhangzhou (1967: 97, 100) but van der Loon (1967: 105) is unable to precisely date the British Museum copy. From various clues, he deduces that it was probably made after the *Bocabulario* (Lexicon) was compiled in 1617.

A new copy of this manuscript has recently come to light from the Biblioteca Universitaria Provincial Barcelona.⁶ It is likely that the Barcelona copy is longer, if not more complete, than the British Museum copy since it has allowed scholars to precisely date the manuscript as written in the year 1620 (Yue-Hashimoto, 1998; Mei Tsu-lin, pers. comm.). This analysis makes use of the Barcelona copy of the *Arte*.

(iii) There is a third additional text which is worth mentioning here: *Grammatica Linguae Sinicae Popularis in provincia Chin Cheu* is a translation and redaction of *Arte de la lengua Chiō Chiu* described above. Specifically, it is a Latin translation from the original Spanish made by a Dominican chaplain, Bernardo Ribera, on behalf of Gottlieb Bayer who revised and published it in 1730 as part of his larger two volume work on the Chinese language *Museum Sinicum* (see also van der Loon 1967:

107).⁷ Note that Bayer omits all tone diacritics and Chinese characters, rendering it far less useful than the original. I have referred to it wherever the relevant part of the Barcelona manuscript is barely legible.

3. The Min dialect group

The Min group forms a very diverse group of dialects whose subdivisions are in the main not mutually intelligible. This dialect group makes up 4.1% of China's population. Its speakers principally live in the southeastern coastal province of Fujian with some incursions into the Guangdong region.

Regarding the history of the Min dialects, Bielenstein (1959) uses prefectural records to show that Fujian province was colonized at a much later period than other parts of South China due to its remoteness and inaccessibility. The first major migration occurred during the 3rd century AD, following two different paths from (modern day) Jiangxi in the west and Zhejiang in the north, while the second major migration occurred in the 7th century moving down the coast from these same two areas. However, the main formation period for Min took place earlier during the Han dynasty, most likely in Wu territory, with it emerging as an identifiable dialect group by the time of the Tang dynasty (7th – 9th centuries).⁸

Norman (1988, 1999) proposes the following classification for the heterogeneous Min group: The primary division is into Inland and Coastal (or Western and Eastern) Min, reflecting the two major historical routes of migration and settlement in the Fujian area, described above. Inland (Western) Min is specifically subdivided into Northwestern, Far Western and Central Min, while Coastal (Eastern) Min is subdivided into Northern and Southern Min.⁹ The Fuzhou, Gutian, Ningde, Zhouning, Fuding and Fuqing dialects are examples of Northern Coastal Min used in this analysis (which I abbreviate to 'Northeastern Min') while Taiwanese, Quanzhou, Zhangzhou, Amoy (Xiamen), Datian, Yongchun, Dongshan, Shantou (Swatow), Chaozhou [Teochiu], Chaoyang, Suixi and Hainanese dialects are examples of Southern Coastal Min (which I abbreviate to 'Southern Min'. Putian is considered an isolate by some (cf. Chen and Li 1991), as belonging to Southern Min by others (Ting 1980) or as a dialect intermediate between Northeastern and Southern Min (Norman 1999).¹⁰

After Xiamen became the economic centre of Fujian province in the 19th century as a treaty port, its dialect developed into an unofficial standard for Southern

Min, blending many features from the surrounding dialects of Zhàngzhòu and Quánzhòu (Ting 1980: 5-7). Migration to Taiwan from these districts in southern Fujian took place from the early Qing dynasty onwards, that is, from the mid 17th century, with the result that Southern Min speakers form the major linguistic group today constituting 73.3% of the population in Taiwan (Huang 1995: 21).

It is thus reasonable to use these modern Southern Min dialects to make a typological comparison with the 17th century Hâichéng dialect represented in the *Arte* and the *Doctrina Christiana*, particularly given that Taiwanese and Amoy are the best described in this dialect group while there is no contemporary description of the Hâichéng dialect to my knowledge (see also Yue-Hashimoto 1998). Reference is made to other Min dialects, as listed above, according to the data available.¹¹

4. Grammatical analysis

4.1 The grammatical function word *kir* [khit] 乞 < ‘to give’

In the *Doctrina Christiana*, passive, causative and certain kinds of dative constructions are all formed with the exponent *kir* 乞 (*khit*), a verb which means ‘to give, to cause, to entreat’. In the *Arte*, which provides the romanization *kít*, only its passive and dative uses are discussed, although van der Loon lists or exemplifies both the verbal meanings ‘to give, to ask’ and the causative meanings ‘to enable, to let (somebody do something) in Appendix I (1967: 140). The use of *kir* 乞 (*khit*) as a verb can be traced back to the Han and Wei dynasties (Zhang 1989).

It is typical of Southern Sinitic languages for passives, causatives and datives to share the same grammatical exponent, generally evolving from one of the verbs of giving (see Yue-Hashimoto 1993: 131). This is true of the Shanghai and Suzhou dialects of Wu, standard Hong Kong Cantonese, Meixian Hakka and Min dialects while Standard Northern Chinese, that is, Mandarin, generally uses a different set of sources from Southern Sinitic languages. Nonetheless, it too has identical exponents for causative and passive structures in the colloquial register but a separate morpheme for dative constructions (*gěi* < ‘give’). Norman (1982) and Hashimoto (1987) attribute this North-South contrast to an Altaic superstratum which triggered the development of the causative verbs *ràng* ‘let’ and *jiào* ‘tell’ into passive exponents in standard Mandarin. All these lexical sources for passive markers in Chinese languages are

quite common crosslinguistically: *be~become*, verbs of giving, perception verbs and contact verbs (see Heine et al 1993).

In fact, there are three possibly verbal usages of *kir* 乞 (*khit*) in the *Doctrina Christiana* where it precedes the verb *sia* ‘forgive’ (see also Yue-Hashimoto 1998). Note also that the romanization differs in one case from that used for its grammaticalized functions – *kiet* versus *kir* ~ *kît*. In this context, it shows the other main meaning of ‘beg, ask’:

Doctrina Christiana of the 17th century:

Verb₁ + Verb₂

(1) 乞 赦 人 罪

kiet sia – –

beg forgivepeople sin

‘(Jesus then prayed to God, the Father) and begged forgiveness for people’s sins’ [DC 19a, p. 170]¹²

In the contemporaneous *Lìjìngjì* [The Romance of the Lychee Mirror] (1581), written in a mixture of the Quánzhòu and Zhàngzhòu vernaculars, the same grammaticalized uses of *kir* 乞 (*khit*) can be found, according to Jiang (1989) and Yue-Hashimoto (1998). Contrasting to this, in contemporary Taiwanese Southern Min, the three construction types are all formed with the exponent *hō* which, in its turn, is related to a verb ‘to give’ (Tsao 1988). I next discuss dative, causative and passive uses of *kir* 乞 (*khit*) in that order. There are 24 tokens of *kir* 乞 (*khit*) in the *Doctrina* which can be classified into three uses as a verb of giving; three passives, five causatives and 13 uses where it introduces a dative or indirect object. Clearly its last use is the main one in this text while it can be conjectured that there are incipient developments in the direction of a causative and passive use, with the verbal use possibly on the wane.

4.2 *Dative constructions*

The *Arte* explains (1620: 3a) that only the genitive, dative and ablative cases use particles to mark these functions 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 *gúe* (个), while the dative uses preposed *kít* 乞 and the ablative one of the three particles *câng*, *câb*, or *tàng* (共, 甲, 同).¹³ Only examples with pronouns and *lâng* 人 ‘person’ are presented in the chapter on case in the *Arte*.

In this section, I examine dative or ditransitive constructions in Southern Min dialects which employ a special marker for the recipient (Goal or indirect object). Let us begin with an historical overview:

From Late Medieval Chinese (7th – 11th c.) up until the end of the Modern Chinese period (18th c.), the following word orders were available for datives according to Peyraube (1988, 1996):

- (2) **Dative structures in Late Medieval Chinese (7th – 11th c.)**
- (i) Verb + Indirect Object + Direct Object
 - (ii) Verb + **[Prep *yǚ* 與+ Indirect Object]** + Direct Object
 - (iii) Verb + Direct Object + **[Prep *yǚ* 與+ Indirect Object]**
 - (iv) **[Prep *yǚ* 與+ Indirect Object]** + Verb + Direct Object

Peyraube argues that the use of *yǚ* 與 is not a case of a lexical replacement of *yú* 于 found in Archaic Chinese. Rather, the source of the structures in (ii) and (iii) where the indirect object (or recipient) is marked by *yǚ* 與 is a serial verb construction $V_1 + V_2 + IO + DO$ which emerged during the Six Dynasties period ca. 4th – 5th centuries AD. Its special semantic features were: V_1 = verb of giving specifying manner and V_2 = one of three general verbs of giving including *yǚ* 與, *yǚ* 予 *wéi* 遗. 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 *yǚ* 與 by the early Tang dynasty, had grammaticalized into a preposition introducing the IO by the 9th century. In contemporary Mandarin, *yǚ* 與 has been replaced by *gěi* 给 ‘to give’. It appears that the Late Medieval period bears most relevance for the study of datives in Southern Min dialects which possess all the structures shown in (2), although using different forms, as will be shown.

In the *Doctrina Christiana*, there were thirteen examples of ditransitive constructions formed with *kit* 乞 but only three had the patient noun preceding a recipient noun:

NOUN_{AGENT} – VERB – NOUN_{PATIENT} – *KHIT* – NOUN_{RECIPIENT}.

Doctrina Christiana:

- (3) 做 一 件 好 事 乞 伊
cho cheg kia ho su kir y
 do one CLF good deed give 3sg
 ‘do a good deed for them’ [DC 12a, p.162]

There were ten examples in the *Doctrina Christiana* where the dative-marked noun directly followed the verb, having the form: NOUN_{AGENT} – VERB – *KHIT* – NOUN_{RECIPIENT} (– NOUN_{PATIENT}). In this construction, *kit* 乞 acts like a complement verb or verbal enclitic and the patient noun, if present, can either follow the recipient noun as in (4), or come before the verb in the immediately preceding context as in (5):

Doctrina Christiana:

- (4) 求 僚氏 保庇 生人。 賜 乞 伊 呀劳舍
kiu 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 8a-b, p.156]

- (5) 人 欠 衣裳。 我 可怜 施舍 乞 伊。
lang kiam y chio gua co leng sia si kir y
 person lack clothes 1SG take:pity bestow DAT 3SG
 ‘If people lack clothes, I take pity on them and give freely to them.’
 [DC 7b, p.155]

The main use of *kit* 乞 in this category appears however to be its development as a marker of the causee rather than the recipient, particularly in a kind of verb compound where V₁ = verb of giving and V₂ = *kit* 乞 and no patient noun occurs. In

this compound, V_1 is typically *su* 賜 ‘bestow’ (6 examples) or *pang* 放 ‘let go, set free’ (1 example) and it takes on the causative meaning ‘to enable, make’ in most of these examples (a total of 7/10 in the dative category where no patient noun occurred). This use – dative or causative – recalls the serial verb constructions of the Six Dynasties period of Early Medieval Chinese which eventually produced the prepositional dative marker *yǔ* 與 (see Peyraube 1996 and preceding description). It is exemplified by (6):

Doctrina Christiana:

- (6) 亦 保庇 灑 水 死 人 賜乞伊 受 嗷囉哩仔
ya po pi liam chui si lang su kir y siu Goloria
 also protect baptise water dead person bestow-give 3sg receive glory
 ‘and also to protect the Christian dead, enabling them to receive glory.’

[DC 8b, p.156]

In modern Taiwanese, *khít* cannot be used in these two kinds of dative constructions. Instead, *hō̍* is used to mark the recipient in a postverbal slot either directly following the verb or the patient noun (see Tsao 1988). Specifically the possible word orders corresponding to Medieval Chinese outline above are:

- (7) Constructions with *hō̍* in Taiwanese Southern Min corresponding to Medieval Chinese

- (i) VERB NOUN_{Recipient} NOUN_{Patient}
- (ii) VERB [*hō̍* + NOUN_{Recipient}] NOUN_{Patient}
- (iii) VERB NOUN_{Patient} [*hō̍* + NOUN_{Recipient}]

but:

- {(iv) [*kā* + NOUN_{Benefactive/Goal}] VERB NOUN_{Patient} }

The recipient noun is obligatorily marked by *hō̍* when it follows the patient noun as in structure (iii). When the recipient follows the verb directly, *hō̍* may be used to introduce it as in structure (ii) or be omitted as in double object structure given under (i) (Tsao 1988, Cheng 1997). The use of *hō̍* is exemplified by (8) and (9) for the structure

VERB – [*hō̍* + NOUN_{Recipient}] – NOUN_{Patient}.

The preverbal position for the prepositional phrase is not available however for *hō* in the function of a *benefactive* but only as a passive marker (see section 4.4 below). Instead we find several other prepositions introducing benefactive and goal nouns such as *kā* (discussed below in section 3).

Taiwanese Southern Min:

- (8) *i chhōan hòu guá chit-poe tē*
 he pass to me one-CLF tea
 ‘He passed me a cup of tea.’ [Tsao 1988: 179]

The same applies to the Xiamen dialect, shown in an example from Zhou (1991: 234, his characters and romanization):

Xiamen Southern Min:

- (9) 交 互 我 一 张 批
kau₁ ho₅ gua₃ tsit₇ tū₁ phue₁
 hand to 1SG one CLF letter
 ‘Hand a letter over to me.’

Next an example of the second type of dative construction in Taiwanese Southern Min is presented which has the form

VERB – NOUN_{Patient} – [*hō* + NOUN_{Recipient}]

where the prepositional phrase with *hō* is postposed after the patient noun:

- (10) 我 教 一 个 撇步 與 你
goá kā chit ê phièt-pō hō lí
 1SG teach one CLF trick to 2SG
 ‘I’ll teach you a trick.’

In the Suixi Southern Min dialect of Leizhou, the verb ‘to give’ which is *k’i* ㄍㄨㄛˊ can also be used as a dative marker in both construction types (ii) and (iii) (Yue-Hashimoto 1985: 353, 358-360). Similarly, Nakajima (1977: 221, 1979: 297) and

Chen and Li (1991: 42, 95, 299-302) give examples showing that Fuzhou 乞 *k'øyk*²³, Gutian *k'eiʔ~k'eiʔ*, Zhouning *k'eʔ*, Fuqing *k'øʔ* (all Northeastern Min); the Putian isolate *k'æʔ*, Datian *k'i~k'e*, Dongshan *k'əʔ*⁸ and Chaoyang *k'iʔ*² (all Southern Min) are all used both as verbs of giving and dative markers in the V- *khit* 乞 + Recipient Noun form (and some, but not all, as passive markers too).

In contrast to this, the Southern Min dialects of Taiwanese, Xiamen, Zhangzhou and Yongchun primarily use the marker *hō* in these functions. Note that Songxi (Western Min) is the only dialect from the other two groups of Central and Northern Min represented in Chen and Li's corpus of Min dialects which makes use of a cognate form with *khit* 乞 for at least the dative and passive uses. Therefore, we can conclude that the dative use of the cognates of *khit* 乞 is a consistent and widespread feature of Northeastern Min but less so in Southern Min where *khit* 乞 and *hō* are competing forms while it is not at all well-attested for Inland or Western Min. *Khit* 乞 is also employed across the board for the passive in the Northeastern Min. Further discussion of the grammaticalization of *khit* is provided at the end of the section.

There is also another marker of the dative or recipient in the two early modern Southern Min texts: In the *Doctrina Christiana*, the beginning of each section in the Mysteries of the Rosary contains a ditransitive sentence with the romanization *tou* underneath either the character 與 [*yù* in Mandarin, 'give'] or 度 in Southern Min which is phonetically [*t'ɔʔ*], also meaning 'to give (to)'.¹⁴ The prayer for the relevant beads of the rosary is being offered to Mary in each case, pronominally coded as *lu* 'thou, thee' in the example below:

Doctrina Christiana:

(11) 我 送 與 汝
gua sang tou lu
 'I offer it up to thee.'

[DC 24a, p.177]

There are 15 examples in the *Doctrina Christiana* of this postverbal complement use of *tou*, always in this same sentence. In contemporary Taiwanese, *hō* has to mark the recipient noun as explained above:

Taiwanese Southern Min:

- (12) 我 送 與 汝
goá sàng hō lí
 ‘I offer it to you.’

In addition to this, the morpheme *tōu* 度 [t'ɔʔ] is exemplified as a verb of giving in the *Arte* and glossed as such in van der Loon (1967: 141):

Arte

- (13) 汝 有 钱 一 个 度 我
lù ù chīⁿ chèg guè tōu guà
 2sg have money one CLF give me
 ‘If you have money, give me a dollar (coin).’
 (*Si tienes dinero un toston me da.*) [*Arte* 1620: 12]

This points to two conclusions:

- (i) In the early 17th century, the grammaticalization of *tōu* 度 had not progressed as far as that for *khit* 乞 since it still had a clearly verbal usage in addition to the dative marking function where it directly follows the verb. There is no evidence of the dative structure (iii) for *tōu* 度 as found in Medieval Chinese with a recipient NP postposed after the patient noun which would suggest the second stage of development (Peyraube 1988).
- (ii) There are elements of more than one Southern Min dialect in these 17th century texts, a point borne out in the exegesis of the grammar of the *Doctrina Christiana* given in Yue-Hashimoto (1998). Yue-Hashimoto (p. 5, p. 29) supposes that the *Doctrina Christiana* was intended for widest religious audience, and thus its language possibly represents a mixed Southern Min dialect in currency during the late 16th and early 17th centuries in Southern Fujian, one that was comprehensible to the

largest variety of dialect speakers. The verb [t'ɔ̃] is found in the Quanzhou dialect of Southern Min.

In the Quanzhou dialect, the morpheme [t'ɔ̃] can be used as a passive marker alongside *k'it* (Lin 1993: 243; Zhou 1993 and see section 4.4 below on the passive). Lin (1993: 259, 262) uses the character 與 *yǔ* in Mandarin) to represent this and later provides an example of the double object construction with the same morpheme used as the verb 'to give'. This is supported by Douglas (1873: 562) who defines *thò* as a verb meaning 'bestow, give' in the Quanzhou dialect equivalent to Amoy *hō*, 'to give, cause, sign of the passive in many phrases'.

For dative constructions in the language of the *Doctrina Christiana* and the contemporary Southern Min dialects of Taiwanese and Quanzhou, it can be concluded that although the forms may be different, in each case the source is the same: verbs of giving have grammaticalized into prepositional markers of the recipient (or Goal) in the postverbal position. Next, the development of causative and passive constructions from the dative use of these verbs of giving is discussed.¹⁵ Tsao (1988: 190), in particular, argues that the passive use of *hō* in contemporary Taiwanese developed out of this dative use whereby the goal marking function of *hō* was reanalysed as an agent marking one. The input to this reinterpretation from dative > agent may well have been its causative use however in pivot constructions. Consider the following example of the *hō* causative:

Taiwanese Southern Min:

- (14) 我 有 企 起 来 与 彼 的 人 过
goá ū khiā -khi -lâi hō hia ê lâng koè
 1sg have stand DIR CAUS those CLF person pass
 'I stood up in order to let those people pass.' [Cheng 1997: 222]

The causee in (13) is an agent of the motion verb *koè* 'pass' and the patient of the causative verb *hō* which can be understood in the enabling sense of 'allow for, let, so that'. The semantic development from give > dative > causative > passive is typical for verbs of giving as attested crosslinguistically (Heine et al 1993).

First the causative use of *khit* is discussed and compared with *hō*:

4.3 Causatives

There are five causative uses of *khit* in the *Doctrina Christiana*. Causative constructions formed with *khit*, or *hō* in contemporary Taiwanese, belong to the permissive type (see Shibatani 1976; Talmy 1976), expressing that the causative agent let, allowed or enabled the situation to happen. In this sense, four uses of *khit* occur with verbs that are semantically stative, such as *bat* 识 ‘to know’, *sin* 信 ‘to believe’ and *siu* 受 ‘to receive’, thus allowing disambiguation from the passive use. Only one use occurs with an active verb *cho* 做 ‘do’ but in an imperative ‘Do not let them do it again.’ [DC 8a, p.155].

(NOUN_{CAUSER}) *KHIT*_{CAUS.} NOUN_{CAUSEE} VERB

Doctrina Christiana:

(15) 先 七 件 乞 人 識 僚氏 根因。

seng chit kia kir lang bar Diosi kinyn

first seven item CAUS person know God origin

‘The first seven items enable people to know that God is the origin.’

[DC 3a, p.148, Fourteen Articles of Faith]

This is rendered in contemporary Taiwanese by the following translation:

Taiwanese Southern Min:

(16) 头 七 件 与 人 识 上帝 是 咱 的

thâu chhit kia" hō lāng bat Siōng-te sī lan ê

first seven item CAUS person know God be 1PL_{inc} POSS

起头

khí-thâu

origin

‘The first seven items enable people to know that God is the origin.’

The verb *su* 賜 ‘bestow’ is however by far the most common in its causative usage in the *Doctrina Christiana*. Of 30 examples, only 9 retain the verbal meaning of ‘bestow, grant’ while 21 show the development of a similar permissive causative meaning ‘enable’, doubtlessly via semantic shift from ‘(a person in a superior

position) granting someone the conditions or capacity to do something’. A seemingly curious phenomenon is the appearance of 10 compound causative verbs with $V_1 = su$ 賜 ‘bestow’ and $V_2 =$ either *khit* 乞 ‘give’ (8) or *u* 与 3f ‘give’ (2) recalling the grammaticalization of *yù* 与 ‘give’ into a preposition from V_2 position in similar serial verb constructions by Late Medieval Chinese (Peyraube 1988, 1996). The examples with *khit* as a kind of verb complement with a dative function are treated in the previous section, see example (6) and Chappell (in prep). There are also 10 examples of *su* 使 ‘cause, send’ used mainly in the directive sense of ‘make someone do something’.

It is interesting to note that the permissive causative use of *khit* occurs in the *Lijingji*, The Romance of the Lychee Mirror (1581), with a verb meaning ‘to know’ as given in Yue-Hashimoto (1998, p.15):

Lijingji (Romance of the Lychee Mirror 1581)

(17) 旦： 不通 乞 亞公 亞妈 知 (白 25B)
 NEG-IMP CAUS grandfather grandmother know

Heroine: “You mustn’t let granddad and grandma know.”

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 granddad and grandma.” The passive use of *khit* is the subject of the next section.

4.4 *Passives*

A brief historical overview of the development of the passive structures in Chinese precedes the discussion of the use of *khit* and *hō* in Southern Min dialects.

Beginning with the Early Medieval period (2nd – 6th centuries AD), the form with *wéi* + Agent Noun + *suǒ* + Verb (为...所) was the main passive structure until it was gradually overtaken by the *bèi* 被 passive, the dominant form during the Tang dynasty (618 –907 AD) as reflected in vernacular texts (Peyraube 1989).

Earlier, during the period from the Late Archaic to the Early Medieval, *bèi* is found used as a full verb in simple S-V-O structures with the meanings of ‘receive’, ‘suffer’ (Wang Li 1935, 1: 35; Peyraube 1989). In Peyraube’s view, its passive use developed out of a serial verb construction by analogy with the *wéi* ... *suǒ* form.

Moreover, by the middle of the Tang dynasty, it had become fully grammaticalized as a prepositional marker of the passive with the form introducing an agent in the majority: *bèi* + Agent Noun + Verb (Peyraube 1996: 178).

During the modern period from the 13th century onwards, *bèi* became relegated more and more to the written language so that it can be aptly described as a passive of more formal genres in its contemporary usage (see Chappell 1986, 2001b). In the modern period, the causative verbs *ràng* ‘let’ and *jiào* ‘tell’ also developed passive uses in Mandarin. Other markers of the passive such as 乞 *qǐ* ‘to request, give’, attested from the Yuan dynasty (13th century), did not last in the colloquial Northern Chinese koiné of the capital, disappearing from vernacular literature in approximately the 18th century (see Hashimoto 1987, Jiang 1989, Zhang 1989). However, it appears that the use of 乞 *qǐ* ‘to request, give’ has clearly been maintained in many contemporary Southern Min dialects, including the language of the *Doctrina Christiana* which has three such uses of *khit* 乞.

Let us next examine some examples of the passive use of *khit* 乞 in the *Arte* and the *Doctrina Christiana*: The *Arte* (1620: 8) explains that the passive can be formed by the particle *kît*: the thing which is the patient is placed in the first position, followed by *kît*, then the person who does the action and the verb: The following example of the active-passive contrast is provided:

Arte

(18) 我 打 簡仔
guà pà kǐn nìa [yo açore el muhacho]
 1sg hit child
 ‘I beat the child.’

(19) 簡仔 乞 我 打
kǐn nìa kît guà pà [el muhacho fue por me açotado]
 child PASS 1sg hit
 ‘The child was beaten by me.’ [Arte 1620: 8]

This is the only example of a passive sentence in the *Arte*. The three examples in the *Doctrina* all have the structure: (NOUN_{PATIENT}) *KHIT*_{PASS.} NOUN_{AGENT}
VERB

Doctrina Christiana:

- (20) 乞 本事 卑勞厨。 枉 法 釘死在 居律 上
kir Punsu Pilato ong huar teng-si tu Culut chiō
 PASS PontiusPilate unjust law nail-die at cross on
 “crucified by the unjust law of Pontius Pilate” (from the Apostles’ Creed)
 [DC 2a, p.146]

This can be translated into contemporary Taiwanese Southern Min by example (21):

Taiwanese Southern Min:

- (21) 與 彼拉多 枉 法 釘死 儻 十字架 上
hō Pi-liāp-to ong- hoat têng-sí ti sip-jī-kè (siōng)
 PASS Pilate unjust law nail-die at cross (on)
 “crucified by the unjust law of Pontius Pilate”

As can be seen by comparing (20) and (21), the main difference between the *Doctrina Christiana* and modern Taiwanese is lexical with the use of *khit* as opposed to *hō*.

Note that there are also 11 examples of passives formed with the literary *pi* 被 and that these all occur in the second half of the *Doctrina Christiana* in the more classical section on the Mysteries of the Rosary.

In Southern Min dialect texts such as the *Lijìngjì*, The Romance of the Litchi Mirror, from the Ming period which is a mixture of Quanzhou and Chaozhou dialects, the passive is also expressed with 乞 *khit* (Jiang 1989: 376, Yue-Hashimoto 1998: 15 – her example).

***Lijìngjì* [Romance of the Lychee Mirror 1581]**

- (22) 丑: 婆仔 乞 人 打 了 (白 21A)
 female:attendant PASS person hit finish

Clown: ‘The maid has been beaten up by someone.’

Regarding the synchronic situation, Zhou (1993), in particular, describes dialectal differences in the use of passive markers in Southern Min and claims that the Xiamen and Zhangzhou areas are quite close in their use of three main passive patterns with (i) *hō̄* + NP 與 (ii) *hō̄* + *lâng* or *hōng* 與人 and (iii) *khit* + *hō̄* + NP 乞與. For the third pattern, he provides the following example:

Xiamen Southern Min:

- (23) 走私货 槽 乞 與 海关 没收去
cháu-su-hè *chiâu* *khit* + *hō̄* *hái-koan* *boât-siu-khì*
 smuggled:goods all PASS customs confiscated-away

‘All the smuggled goods were confiscated by Customs.’

[= Example (12) in Zhou (1993: 81)]

By way of contrast, the Quanzhou dialect shows a different set of patterns: (i) *tng*³⁵ 传; (ii) *thō̄*² ~ *hō̄*² (度) 與 and (iii) *khit* 乞. The marker *khit* can combine with the first three passive morphemes *tng*³⁵, *thō̄*² and *hō̄*² to form compound markers which shows its productivity and wider use in this dialect.

It seems that the same description could be made for Taiwanese Southern Min as for Xiamen and Zhangzhou dialects: In modern Taiwanese, the use of *khi*+ *hō̄* as a compound passive marker is also possible (see Bodman 1955 for the same phenomenon in Malaysian Hokkien) and can be substituted for *hō̄* alone in example (21) or used as below. Often the character for the verb *khi* ‘to go’ is used as the written form for this marker, obscuring the relationship:

Taiwanese Southern Min:

- (24) 去 與 依 拍
khì *hōng* (<*hō* *lâng*) *phah*
 PASS PASS:person beat
 ‘get beaten up by someone’

This compound passive marker appears to be related to *khit* + *hō̄* + NP (乞+與+ NP) through lenition of the final consonant of *khit*, and is merely conveniently represented

by the homonym *khi* 去 go', for example, as in Bodman (1955). This would explain the remarkable functional and phonetic similarity between these two compound markers in the three dialects.¹⁶ The passive marker *hō* can also be used in a more restricted way in the Quanzhou dialect as described in Zhou (1993) where, however, *khit* is the preferred form.

Cognates of *khit* 乞 in this passive function are scattered across other Southern Min dialects such as Yongchun, Quanzhou, Datian, Dongshan, Chaoyang, Shantou (Swatow) and Suixi and generally in the Northeastern Min dialects of Fuzhou, Gutian, Ningde, Zhouning, Fuding and Fuqing (see Chen and Li 1991: 116; Yuan et al 1989: 278-279, 305; Nakajima 1979: 285; Huang 1996: 530 on Shantou; Feng 1993 on Fuqing). Some dialects which use a cognate of *khit* 乞 as the verb 'to give' and in the dative function do not necessarily use it in the passive function, for example, the passive marker in the isolate Putian *kek*⁵ does not appear to be related to the verb 'to give'/dative marker *k'æ?*. These data seem to suggest that *hō* may be the innovative or revived form in modern Southern Min, specifically for the Xiamen, Zhangzhou and Taiwanese varieties, given the historical data available on *khit* 乞 as a passive. Relevant to this thesis is the fact that Yongchun (Southern Min), located northwest of Quanzhou, uses *hō* as the verb 'to give' and the dative marker and as a passive marker alongside *khit* 乞, as too for at least the verbal meaning 'give' in Shunchang, an outlier Southern Min dialect in Western Min territory whose speakers migrated from Yongchun and Anxi in the 19th century (Chen and Li 1991: 458).

Furthermore, observe that both passive markers have grammaticalized out of the same class of verbs, namely verbs of giving, which leads us to conjecture that grammatical renovation occurred in the central Southern Min dialects of Zhangzhou, Xiamen and Taiwanese involving a reinvigoration of an already existing form (see Peyraube, 2000, for similar phenomena). This process is most complete in Taiwanese but has progressed to a lesser extent for the subdialect area of Zhangzhou and Xiamen and even less for the subdialect area of Quanzhou and Yongchun where *khit* is still highly productive.

If *khit* was the main form used for the passive in 17th century Southern Min dialects (as seen in the *Arte*, the *Doctrina Christiana* and the 16th century *Lìjìngjì*), then *hō* has made very little headway in taking over from *khit* in neighbouring

Quanzhou, and is similarly a competing form in Yongchun as a passive marker. Moreover, most other Southern Min dialects such as Dongshan and Datian in Fujian province, Chaoyang and Shantou in northeastern Guangdong province, Suixi on the Leizhou peninsula in Guangdong province, not to mention the dialects of Northeastern Min such as Fuzhou make use of cognates of *khit* in all these functions. Possibly the renovation of *khit* by *hō̄* in the passive function in the Zhangzhou dialect area postdated these early modern 17th century texts with the innovation slowly spreading to neighbouring areas such as Xiamen and Quanzhou, then northwest to Yongchun, eventually being transported to Taiwan which was settled from the time of the early Qing dynasty (mid 17th century onwards) largely from Zhangzhou and Quanzhou, as is well-known (see section 3).¹⁷

Cheng (1991, 2: 308) states that *yù* 與 ‘give’ is the etymological source for Taiwanese *hō̄* from which we can assume that both forms *khit* and *hō̄* probably co-existed in the Min dialect group from its early formation period, given that the two verbs can be traced back to at least the Han and Wei dynasties (Zhang 1989: 382). I argue therefore that in some contemporary dialect groups, *hō̄* is winning out and the compound passive marker *khit hō̄* is an intermediate hybrid form and a telltale sign of a residue of an earlier stage. Taiwanese, Xiamen and Zhangzhou exemplify this outcome within Southern Min. In other dialect groups such as Northeastern Min, *khit* predominates while in still others, such as Quanzhou, both are in use in conjunction with other passive markers, but there is a preference for the use of *khit*. The Quanzhou dialect has not undergone the same extent of change as Xiamen, Zhangzhou and Taiwanese dialects in the direction of functional replacement of *khit* by *hō̄*. This appears to be an archetypal example of different outcomes for competing morphosyntactic forms (see Wang 1969, Lien 1994b, 2001).

It is curious however that *khit* and *hō̄* developed a passive rather than a benefactive usage in preverbal position in modern Southern Min period. Other prepositions such as *kāng~kā* came to be employed in the benefactive function instead which is discussed in the next section. The structure with *yù* 與 in preverbal position is a relatively late one according to Peyraube (1988), taking place in the latter

half of the Tang dynasty (9th century), which means that this occurred after Southern Min dialects putatively split off from Northern Chinese. This gap in the range of functions of *khit* and *hō̄* in comparison with Medieval Chinese or Northern Chinese *gěi* merits the further attention of scholars. Table 1 compares diachronic and synchronic data from Min dialects on these three types of construction formed with verbs of giving.¹⁸

TABLE 1: DATIVE, CAUSATIVE AND PASSIVE MARKERS IN MIN DIALECTS

CONSTRUCTION TYPE 句法結構	17 th HOKKIEN TEXTS 十七世紀初 的閩 南話	MODERN MIN DIALECTS 現代閩語	
		Taiwanese Southern Min 台灣閩南話	OTHER MIN DIALECTS 其他閩方言
Ditransitive Verb – [Dative marker + IO] – DO Verb complement/enclitic: 動補結構 /動詞後綴 + 間 接 賓 語 (+ 值 賓)	乞 <i>kit</i> , <i>kir</i> [<i>khit</i>] 度 <i>tou</i> [<i>tho</i>]	與 <i>hō</i> ·	乞 <i>k'øyʔ</i> Fuzhou 福州 乞 <i>k'æʔ</i> Putian 莆田 與 <i>t'ɔ</i> Quanzhou 泉州 與 <i>hō</i> · Xiamen 廈門 與 <i>hō</i> · Zhangzhou 漳州 與 <i>hō</i> · Yongchun 永春 乞 <i>k'əʔ</i> ⁸ Dongshan 東山 乞 <i>k'iʔ</i> ² Chaoyang 潮陽 <i>k'i</i> Suixi 遂溪
Ditransitive Verb – DO – [Dative marker + IO] 雙賓語 結構 : VERB + 值賓 + <i>khit</i> + 間 賓	乞 <i>kit</i> , <i>kir</i> [<i>khit</i>]	與 <i>hō</i> ·	乞 <i>k'øyʔ</i> Fuzhou 福州 乞 <i>k'æʔ</i> Putian 莆田 與 <i>hō</i> · Xiamen 廈門 乞 <i>k'əʔ</i> ⁸ Dongshan 東山 乞 <i>k'iʔ</i> ² Chaoyang 潮陽 <i>k'i</i> Suixi 遂溪
Causative 使動式	乞 <i>kit</i> , <i>kir</i> [<i>khit</i>]	與 <i>hō</i> ·	乞 <i>k'əʔ</i> ⁸ Dongshan 東山
Passive 被動式	乞 <i>kit</i> , <i>kir</i> [<i>khit</i>]	與 <i>hō</i> · and 乞與 <i>khit</i> <i>hō</i> ·	乞 <i>k'øyʔ</i> Fuzhou 福州 乞 <i>k'it</i> Quanzhou 泉州; also 傳 <i>tŋ</i> ³⁵ ; <i>thɔ</i> ¹² 度~ <i>hɔ</i> ¹² 與 與 <i>hō</i> · Xiamen 廈門 and 乞與 <i>khit</i> <i>hō</i> · 與 <i>hō</i> · Zhangzhou 漳州 與 <i>hō</i> ·~乞 <i>k'it</i> Yongchun 永春 乞 <i>k'əʔ</i> ⁸ Dongshan 東山 <i>k'iʔ</i> ² Chaoyang 潮陽 ; Shantou 汕頭 <i>k'i</i> Suixi 遂溪 <i>puŋ</i> 分 Chaozhou 潮州, also <i>xɛʔ</i> <i>ɔn</i> 分 Hainan 海南

5. Benefactive, ablative and comitative *cāng* 共

The comitative ‘with, and’ meaning is expressed by the function word *cāng* for which the *Doctrina Christiana* uses either the characters 共, 和 or 與, the first two representing vernacular Hokkien and the third, literary Chinese. In the *Arte*, *cāng* (*kāng*) is described as having an ablative meaning (1620: 3) and combining with verbs of buying, selling, borrowing, lending and speaking (1620: 11-12). This is neatly echoed in the description given by Douglas (1873: 188) for the Amoy (Xiamen) comitative preposition *kā~ kāng*, although it represents just a subset of the functions identified in Tsao (1990) for contemporary Taiwanese. Douglas further observes (1899: 188) that as a preposition, Xiamen *kā~ kāng* can only be used with persons with the meanings of “‘to, from, for’, and often with the converse meaning to *hō*, the passive marker”.

Both these prepositional and connective uses of *cāng* (*kāng*) can be found in the *Doctrina Christiana* which contains 31 examples of this morpheme. The primary meaning is the comitative one of ‘and, with’ comprising 13 examples while the ablative ‘from’ meaning has ten, the benefactive ‘for’ meaning six and the goal sense ‘to’, two.

In its turn, the morpheme *cāng* in the two 17th century texts can be related to the Medieval Chinese *gòng* 共. According to Liu and Peyraube (1994: 187-188), the use of *gòng* 共 as a preposition ‘with’ is attested from the Early Medieval period (2nd – 6th centuries) onwards, while its use as a connective ‘and’ became common in the second half of the Late Medieval period, specifically from the Song dynasty onwards (10th – 13th centuries). Its lexical source can be traced back to a verb ‘to share (with)’ as used in pre-Qin Classical Chinese. By the end of the Eastern Han (2nd century AD), this verb had developed a grammaticalized function as an adverb ‘together’, the semantic input to the later uses of ‘with’ and ‘and’. This marker thus has a semantically similar source to the comitative in West African Benue-Kwa languages such as Yoruba and Engenni described in Lord (1993: 47-57) which are respectively ‘be included among, be together with’ and ‘bring along with’. *Gòng* 共 continued to be used as both a preposition and conjunction until the end of the 16th century after which it was subject to the process of renovation, being replaced by *hé* in Northern Chinese (see Liu and Peyraube 1994 for details). The functions of *kā* in Taiwanese are next briefly described.

For contemporary Taiwanese, Tsao (1990, 1991) identifies five main constructions using the marker *kā*: These are its use with ditransitive verbs to mark Goal and Source; its use with monotransitive verbs to mark the Patient with a similar, though broader function to the Mandarin disposal construction with *bǎ*; a benefactive use and its use as a passive prefix on the verb. Adopting Tsao's analysis, I give an example of each of the first four categories, adding in a fifth connective use, and making comparisons with the usage of *cāng* in the *Doctrina Christiana* and the *Arte*. The last use as a passive prefix is not relevant to the discussion of *cāng* as found in the two 17th century texts. Apart from the passive prefix, all these different uses of *kā* have the structure:

(NOUN_{AGENT}) – [共 *KA* – NOUN] – VERB

5.1 *Goal marker with ditransitive verbs of communication*

Kā marks ditransitive verbs of communication such as ‘teach’, ‘tell a story’, ‘ask a question’ and ‘make a phone call’ which Tsao labels as ‘outward verbs’. Tsao observes however that *kā* may not co-occur with ‘inward verbs’ with the sense of giving to mark the recipient. This is the exclusive province of the dative marker *hō*.

Taiwanese Southern Min:

- (25) 伊 共 我 講 一 項 事志
i kā guá kóng chit hàng tāichì
 3SG KA 1SG talk one CL matter
 ‘S/he talked to me about a matter.’

In the *Arte*, there are examples of this use with the speech act verbs *tâ* ‘to talk’ and *suè* ‘to discuss’.

Arte

- (26) 我 共 你 说 只 件 事
guà cāng lù suè chǐ kià" sù
 1SG KANG 2SG talk this CL matter
 ‘I talk to you about this matter.’ (*yo a ti digo este negocio*) [*Arte* 1620: 11]

Barclay provides a similarly equivocal example in the supplement to Douglas (1873: 90). In the *Doctrina*, there were ten ablative examples of *cāng*, five used with the verb *kei* ‘to separate, deliver, remove’ and five with the verb *kiu yīn cheng* 求人情 ‘beseech mercy (from God)’. The first verb is used in the V-O compound *kei-chue* as in (31) which could either have a literal ablative interpretation in the text of ‘take away our sins from us’ or the extended benefactive meaning ‘take away our sins for us’.

Doctrina Christiana:

(31) 是 巴礼 共 人 解罪
si Pale cang lang kei chue
 be padre KANG person absolve:sin
 (Penitence) is when the father absolves us of our sins.’
 [DC6b, p.153]

In such a case of polysemy, overlapping of interpretations is to be expected.

5.3 *Benefactive marker*

When *kā* is used as the benefactive marker ‘for’, the noun it marks is not an argument of the verb:

(32) **kā i khui**, ‘to open it for him, as a door [Douglas 1873: 188]

Taiwanese Southern Min:

(33) 你 的 衫 伊 会 kā 你 洗
lí é saⁿ i ē kā lí soé
 2SG POSS clothes3SG can KA 2SG wash
 ‘He can wash your clothes for you.’ [Cheng & Tsao 1995:23]

The following two examples from the *Doctrina Christiana* show this benefactive use of *cāng* (*kāng*) ‘for + Noun’:

Doctrina Christiana:

(34) 與 人 淨 水

cang lang cheng sui

KANG person cleansewater

[DC 24a, p.177]

‘(Christ commanded the disciples) to perform baptism for people.’

This benefactive sense of *cāng* is evident in six occurrences in the section on the Works of Mercy in the *Doctrina Christiana* including (34) which shows how this interpretation could develop from the comitative meaning. Example (34) can of course be translated into contemporary Taiwanese (35) with the use of *kā*:

Taiwanese Southern Min:

(35) 共 依 行 洗禮

kā lāng kiáⁿ sóelé

KA person perform baptism

‘(Christ commanded the disciples) to perform baptism on/for people.’

A further semantic extension to marking the patient is suggested by such examples as (34) whereby an action performed *for* someone (Benefactive) can be reinterpreted as an action performed *on* someone (Patient). This interpretation is however only in a nascent stage for the six benefactive examples found in the *Doctrina Christiana* whereas both case roles are possible for (35) which brings us to the next section on patient marking.

5.4 Patient marker with monotransitive verbs

Kā in contemporary Taiwanese Southern Min has a function similar to the disposal construction with *bǎ* in Mandarin where it marks a preverbal and typically referential direct object and co-occurs with a transitive action verb. Its usage is however broader than Mandarin *bǎ* in forming two major types of construction with and without telic predicates (for details, see Tsao 1990, 1991).

Taiwanese Southern Min:

- (36) 所以 阮 拢 共 裤 褪 起来
só - í gún lóng kā khò thng – khi lai
therefore 1PL all KA trousers take:off-DIR
‘So we all took off our trousers (to go swimming).’ [Jesse’s Story: 116-117]

The use of *kā* to unequivocally mark a patient was not found in either of the 17th century texts.¹⁹ There were however, two examples of literary *chiang* 將 in the second half of the *Doctrina* used in this function where it combines with other literary expressions such as the following patient NP *t’a siu chioc* ‘his hands and feet’:

Doctrina Christiana:

- (37) 將 他 手 足 釘 在 居律 上
chiang t’a siu chioc teng tu Culu chio
PRETR 3SG hand foot nail at Cross on
‘(They) nailed his hands and feet to the Cross.’ [DC 22a, p.174]

Many Southern Min dialects use a cognate of this pretransitive patient marker *chiang* 將, which belongs to the literary stratum, alongside the use of a colloquial level marker, typically a cognate of *kā* (see Table 1). Hybrid forms are quite common such as the following kind of construction in Taiwanese:²⁰

Taiwanese Southern Min:

- (38) 將 门 *kā* 关 起来
chiong mng kā kuiⁿ khilai
PRETR door KA close INCHOATIVE
‘Close the door.’ [Cheng & Tsao 1995: 37]

Typologically, the pretransitive use represents an interesting development for Sinitic languages which typically make use of a verb of taking or holding in this function of object marker, as is the case in many West African Benue-Kwa languages (Lord 1993). Wu dialects such as Suzhou and Shanghai, some Xiang dialects in

Hunan and some Hakka dialects use cognates of Mandarin *ná* 拿 ‘to take, hold’ while Meixian Hakka and Hong Kong Cantonese use cognate forms of *jiāng* 將, also ‘to take, bring’. In fact *jiāng* 將 is the exponent of the pretransitive common at the end of the Early Medieval period during the Sui dynasty (6th c. AD) which was replaced by *bǎ* 把 ‘to grasp, hold’ during the Tang dynasty for Late Medieval Chinese (7th – 13th centuries; see Peyraube 1996, Sun 1996).²¹

5.5 *Connective or comitative marker*

This forms by far the largest category of examples in the *Doctrina* with 13 occurrences of *cāng* in this function in the text. Twelve instances are used to connect equal status nouns as exemplified by (39) while the remaining one is used with the verb *pien lun* 辯論 ‘to debate, argue with’ (17b). Other comitative markers used in the *Doctrina* are *cab~hap* 合 and *peng* 并. These are explicitly defined in the *Arte* as meaning ‘with’ (1620: 3a, 3b) as, for example, *cáb lāng* 甲人 *con el hombre* ‘with the man’.

Doctrina Christiana:

(39) 乃 汝 子 西士氏 援 汝 身 與 神魂
nai lu chia Jesu uan lu sin cang sinhun
 then 2SG son Jesus support 2SG body **and** soul
 同 登 天 堂 受 福
tong teng t'ian tong siu hoc
 together ascend heaven receive blessing
 ‘Then your son Jesus took your body and soul up to Heaven to be blessed.’
 [Doctrina 26b, p.180]

This use is similar to that described by Cheng and Tsao (1995:28-31) for Taiwanese Southern Min *kap* 合 or *kah*. In modern Taiwanese Southern Min, *kap~kah* is used as conjunction between two nouns of equal syntactic status in a similar way to these 17th century texts:

Taiwanese Southern Min:

- (40) 伊 合 我 拢 有 去
i kap~kah~kā goá lóng ū khi
3SG with 1SG all have go
'S/he and I have both gone.' [Cheng & Tsao 1995: 29]

A development relevant to this study is that Southern Min *kah* and *kap* are evidently merging into a form indistinguishable from *kā* when used in an unstressed context, reinforced by similarities in meaning and function (see Cheng & Tsao 1995: 28-31).²² Note that Douglas (1873: 188, 196) specifically mentions that *kāng* 共 and *kap* 合 are the colloquial forms which can be grouped with *kā* and correspond to the reading form *kiōng*. Diachronically, this tendency is reinforced by the fact that the final phase in the development of the comitative markers in Chinese is to just such a conjunctive use (see Liu and Peyraube 1994 on *gòng*, *tóng* and *hé*). In other words, the pathway already exists upon which to analogize.

I conclude this section with a few observations comparing the phonetic form of the marker *cāng* reconstructed as *kang* (no tonal value) in the 17th century by van der Loon (1967: 140) with contemporary Southern Min dialects. Douglas (1873: 188, 196) explicitly describes *kāng* as Chinchew usage, that is, belonging to the Quanzhou dialect, and equates it with Amoy *kā*. This is confirmed for contemporary usage by Zhou (1991: 246) who explains that both 共 *kāʔ* and *kāŋ* can be used in the Xiamen or Amoy dialect while Lin (1993: 243) lists *kaŋ*↓ as the marker in the contemporary Quanzhou dialect corresponding to the three meanings in Mandarin of *bǎ*, *gěi* and *xiàng*: 把, 给, 向, that is, a pretransitive, a benefactive and a goal marker according to the examples provided. Fuzhou (Northeastern Min) also makes use of *kaʔ*↓ as an object marker in the disposal construction while the Chaozhou dialect (Southern Min) similarly uses *kaʔ*² for the pretransitive (Huang 1996: 665). Many other Min dialects use cognates of *kā* in all or some of these five functions, most showing the loss of the final velar nasal (see Table 2).

Hence it appears that the form has atrophied in Taiwanese from *kāng* to *kā* while both forms are maintained as allomorphs on the mainland in the case of the Xiamen dialect or retained as the full form in the more conservative Quanzhou

dialect: *kaŋ*↓. Therefore, the usage of *k āin* in modern Southern Min dialects such as Taiwanese shows preservation of a feature of Medieval Chinese grammar in Southern Min. Its range of functions on the other hand has increased significantly to include the patient marker usage among other new functions. These comparisons are displayed in the following table.

TABLE 2: COMITATIVE MARKERS AND THEIR SEMANTIC EXTENSIONS IN MIN DIALECTS

CONSTRUCTION TYPE 句法結構	17 th HOKKIEN TEXTS 十七世紀初 的閩南話	MODERN MIN DIALECTS 現代閩語	
		Taiwanese Southern Min 台灣閩 南話	OTHER MIN DIALECTS 其他閩方言
Comitative 伴隨標誌 'and', 'with'	共 <i>cāng</i> [<i>kang</i>]	共 <i>kā</i>	<i>køyk</i> ²³ ~ <i>køyŋ</i> Fuzhou 福州 <i>kak</i> ³ Putian 莆田 共 <i>kāʔ~kāŋ</i> Xiamen 廈門 <i>kaʔ</i> ³² Dongshan 東山 <i>kaʔ</i> ⁵ Chaoyang 潮陽 <i>kaŋ</i> Suixi 遂溪
Goal 標的標誌 'to' in preverbal position			<i>køyk</i> ⁵ Fuzhou 福州 <i>kak</i> ³ Putian 莆田 共 <i>kaŋ</i> Quanzhou 泉州 共 <i>kāʔ~kāŋ</i> Xiamen 廈門 <i>kǎ</i> ³ Dongshan 東山 <i>kai</i> ³ Chaoyang 潮陽
Source 來源標誌 'from' in preverbal position			共 <i>kāʔ~kāŋ</i> Xiamen 廈門 <i>kǎ</i> ³ Dongshan 東山 <i>kai</i> ³ Chaoyang 潮陽
Benefactive 受惠者標誌 'for, in place of' in preverbal position			共 <i>kaŋ</i> Quanzhou 泉州 <i>kāʔ~kāŋ</i> Xiamen 廈門 <i>kǎ</i> ³ Dongshan 東山 <i>kai</i> ³ Chaoyang 潮陽 but: 乞 <i>køyk</i> ²³ Fuzhou 福州 <i>kek</i> ⁵ Putian 莆田
Patient 受事者標誌 in the disposal construction	Not attested		<i>kaʔ</i> Fuzhou 福州 共 <i>kaŋ</i> Quanzhou 泉州 共 <i>kāʔ~kāŋ</i> Xiamen 廈門 <i>kǎ</i> ³ Dongshan 東山 <i>kaʔ</i> ² Chaozhou 潮州 <i>kaʔ</i> Hainan 海南
	將 <i>chiang</i>		<i>tsyoyŋ</i> ⁵⁵ ~ <i>tsiaŋ</i> Fuzhou 福州 將 <i>tsyæŋ</i> ⁵⁵ Putian 莆田 將 <i>tsioŋ</i> Quanzhou 泉州 將 <i>tsioŋ</i> Xiamen 廈門 將 <i>tsiaŋ</i> Chaozhou 潮州 <i>tsaŋ</i> ³³ Chaoyang 潮陽 將 <i>tsiaŋ</i> Hainan 海南 <i>lia</i> Suixi 遂溪

6. The diminutive

In Taiwanese, the diminutive of nouns is formed with the suffix *-á* 仔. Yang (1991) and Lien (1998) claim that its source morpheme is Southern Min *kiáⁿ* ‘son’. In this section, I show that these early 17th century texts provide additional support for this claim.

In the early 17th century grammar of Southern Min, the *Arte*, the following description is given for the diminutive (1620: 6a):

Arte:

(41)

“The diminutive is formed with the final particle *ia* or *nia* or *guia*:

<i>kéiguà</i>	圭仔	‘little chicken’ [<i>pollito</i>]
<i>bôguà</i>	帽仔	‘little hat’ [<i>sonbrerillo</i>]
<i>tóguà</i>	刀仔	‘little knife’ [<i>guedillito</i>].”

In contemporary Taiwanese, these three words correspond to *ke-á* ‘chicken, little chicken’; *bò-á* ‘hat’ and *to-á* ‘knife, small knife’ respectively, indicating partial bleaching of the diminutive feature. Note that only one of the variants listed in the *Arte* is illustrated by these three examples. I return to this after briefly discussing the etymology of the diminutive.²³

In modern Taiwanese Southern Min, the morpheme *-á* is used not only as a diminutive, but also as an empty marker of the noun category, sometimes with a meaning-discriminating function (see Lien 1998). I reproduce an example of each of this kind.

Taiwanese Southern Min:

(42)(i)	狗	狗仔	(ii)	鴨	鴨仔	(iii)	糖	糖仔
	<i>kâu</i>	<i>kâu-á</i>		<i>ah</i>	<i>ah-á</i>		<i>th’ng</i>	<i>th’ng-á</i>
	‘dog’	‘little dog’		‘duck’	‘duck’		‘sugar’	‘candy’

Lien also describes the development of a pejorative meaning of *á* when it is infixes between family and given names and for certain occupations:

- | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|---|
| (43) | 搬戏仔 | 牽猪哥仔 |
| | <i>puaⁿ hì-á</i> | <i>khan-ti-ko-á</i> |
| | ‘actor’ | ‘pigbreeder’ (a man who leads about a boar) |

This diminutive morpheme can be traced back to the lexeme for ‘son’, annotated as 子 *kĩáⁿ* in the *Arte* (1620: 2b, 11a, 12b), but with completely missing diacritics in the *Doctrina Christiana* (for example, *kia* ‘son’ 1607: 15b). In the *Arte*, it is used in the first chapter to exemplify the tone category which has nasalization, but again the tone diacritic is omitted in later examples. The form *kĩáⁿ* clearly corresponds however to contemporary Taiwanese and Amoy *kiaⁿ* ‘son’ for which the character 囡 is often used. Furthermore, the lexeme *kiaⁿ* is still used as a kind of suffix to mark the young of the species for animals, postposed after the reduced diminutive form:

- | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| (44) | 牛仔囡 | 狗仔囡 |
| | <i>gû-á-kiaⁿ</i> | <i>kau-á-kiaⁿ</i> |
| | ox-DIMN-offspring | dog-DIMN-offspring |
| | ‘calf’ | ‘puppy’ |

The diminutive suffix in contemporary Taiwanese Southern Min undergoes extensive morphophonemic alternation, described in detail in Lien (1998). This suggests that the three forms noted by the anonymous authors of the *Arte* are similarly allomorphs and that the initial illustration of this suffix with examples of only the one allomorph *-guìa* is purely fortuitous. These gaps notwithstanding, the *Arte* and the *Bocabulario* [Lexicon] furnish us elsewhere with examples of all these written variants, if not allomorphs, of the diminutive suffix in *-kia*, *-ìa* and *-nìa*.

In the *Doctrina Christiana*, only two real examples are to be found with a diminutive suffix and this involves a repetition in prayer form of one particular passage in the Mysteries of the Rosary relating how Mary made an offering to God at the temple of a pair of white doves 40 days after the birth of Jesus (see also Yue-Hashimoto, 1998: 17). There are also transliterations of the Spanish words for ‘person’ and ‘glory’ which use this morpheme but without its function – *piersonya* 别孙仔 (e.g. 10b/p.159) reconstructed as *piat sun iã* by van der Loon (1967: 142, f. 130) and *Goloria* 噉嘢哩仔:

Doctrina Christiana:

- (45) 送 一 对 白 鸽 仔
sang cheg tui pe kap —
presentone pair white dove
'(she) offered a pair of white doves (to God).' [DC 16b, p.167]

As the example shows, the Spanish romanization is missing precisely for the diminutive particle as it is for the entire preceding passage in narrative form which contains the same story. Fortunately, in the list of classifiers given at the end of the *Arte*, this noun appears under the entry for *tui* ì 'pair' (1620: 28).

Arte:

- (46) 四 对 鸽 仔
sỳ tui câb guìa
four pair dove DIMN
'four pairs of doves [*quatro pares de palomas*]'

An occurrence of a similar lexeme is also found in the *Bocabulario* [Lexicon], cited in van der Loon (1967: 142), but under a different form and glossed as a diminutive: *kap iã* 'young pigeon' (B.43b).²⁴ It is interesting to note Douglas' contradictory observation (1873: 196) of 250 years later wherein he states that the diminutive must not be used with *kap* 'pigeon' in order to avoid ambiguity with *kap-á* 'a small land frog'.

In the same list, there is also one serendipitous example for the lexeme 'window' with the second allomorph, which is rendered in this case as *-yà* (1620: 27), an alternative spelling to *-ià* (see van der Loon 1967: 110).

Arte:

- (47) 四 扇 窗 仔
sỳ sỳⁿ tángyà
four CLF window
'four windows [*4 ventanas*]'

These are nice examples since they show that even in the early 17th century, the diminutive suffix had developed a purely noun marking function: The head nouns do not mean ‘little window’ or ‘little dove’ as they are glossed neutrally as *ventanas* ‘windows’ and *palomas* ‘doves’ in the Spanish. There are also two further examples in the *Arte* which contain the word for ‘child’ 簡仔 *kĩn nĩa* furnishing us with the third variant of the diminutive (1620: 15). This is *gín-á* ~ *gín-ná* 囡仔 in modern Taiwanese (see the example of the passive in (19) with this lexeme).

However, van der Loon (1967: 142) reconstructs the ‘diminutival and familiarity suffix’ with only two allomorphs and these are *ngia* ~ *iã* 仔, presupposing a development of the nature *kiaⁿ* > *ɲia* > *iaⁿ* with only the nasal velar and zero initials in alternation. He lists the following additional examples from the *Bocabulario* [Lexicon].²⁵

- (48) *kin iã* (others said *kan iã*) boy, slave (B. 50b, 126b); *huan iã* Tagalogs (B. 25a)
kap iã young pigeon (B.43b); *sã ngia* coat (B.173b); *bo ngia/bo iã* hat (B.28b, 162b), *k’a tsing t’au ngia* toe (B. 41a)

As can be seen, only one of these examples has a diminutive gloss, *kap iã* ‘young pigeon’, strengthening the claim that this morpheme had at least two functions of diminutive and noun marker in the early 17th century. It also had the function of a predicate modifier with the meaning of ‘to Verb a little’ as a final example from van der Loon shows. This usage is not found in contemporary Taiwanese Southern Min though it may be readily understood:

- (49) *loh hou iã* ‘it rains a little’ (B. 109a)

Norman (1989, 1991) has claimed that the reconstructed form for ‘son’ - **kian* - is one piece of evidence for an Austroasiatic substrate in Min languages. Early references to this word can in fact be dated back to Medieval Chinese texts, cited by Yang (1991: 166) who proposes this same source for the diminutive suffix, based on evidence from the Tang poet Gú Kuàng 顧況 (725? – 816?). Gu Kuang annotates the character 囡 as meaning ‘son’ in colloquial Min in section 13 of the 上古之什

Shànggù zhì shé. Gú Kuàng gives the pronunciation as 蹇 which is *jiǎn* in contemporary standard Mandarin.

- (50) 𠵹 音 蹇, 闽 俗 呼 子 为 𠵹
Jiǎn yīn jiǎn mǐn sù hū zǐ wéi jiǎn
 (word) sound jiǎn Min common call son as jiǎn
 “The sound of this character 𠵹 is *jiǎn*, the Min commonly use *jiǎn* for ‘son’.”

On the comparative dialectal front, Yang (1991) also points out that the diminutive suffix in Chaozhou dialect of Minnan retains the full form of *kiáⁿ*.

- (51) 鼎仔
 Chaozhou: *tiaⁿ kiaⁿ* as opposed to Xiamen, Zhangzhou, Taiwanese: *tiaⁿ-á*
 ‘a wok’

In the Fuzhou dialect, the diminutive suffix and nominalizer is the cognate *kiəŋ* ↓ < ‘son’ which, similarly to Taiwanese and Xiamen, has various allomorphs (Yuan et al 1989: 302) while it is *kiəʔ* in Hainan and *aɿ ~ äɿ* 仔 in Quanzhou. This semantic shift for the more general case of ‘child’ > ‘diminutive exponent’ is well-attested in other languages of the world, for example, see Heine et al (1993) and Jurafsky (1996). The *Arte* provides ‘live’ evidence of this more sex-specific change from ‘son’ to the diminutive and noun marking functions proposed in Yang (1991) and Lien (1998).

7. Conclusion

The findings of this analysis can be summarized in the following manner. Several different diachronic processes can be observed in these data from the two early modern Southern Min texts when compared with contemporary accounts of the grammar of Southern Min dialects such as Taiwanese and Xiamen (Amoy):

- (i) *Grammatical renovation* appears to be the process which has affected the dative~passive~causative marker *khit* 乞, in particular for the central Southern Min

dialects of Taiwanese, Xiamen and Zhangzhou where *hō̄* 與 is the primary modern exponent. Both the forms *khit* 乞 and *hō̄* 與 probably co-existed over many centuries since both can be separately traced back to the verbal uses of ‘give, ask for’ in Late Archaic Chinese. At some stage they became competing forms when *hō̄* 與 was grammatically reinvigorated and developed the passive function in preverbal position which its cognate in standard literary Northern Chinese, *yǔ* 與, never developed. The morpheme *qī~khit* 乞 certainly had an incipient passive use as a verb meaning ‘to suffer’ as early as the 9th century Dun Huang Bianwen 敦煌变文 (Buddhist transformation texts written in the vernacular style) (see Jiang 1989: 372; Zhang 1989: 380). This was the point of time by which *yǔ* 與 had developed its preverbal benefactive usage, as earlier noted in section 4.2.

Renovation is a common and regular diachronic process: For example, the dative marker *yǔ* 與 was replaced by *gěi* 给 between the Modern Chinese and contemporary periods for Mandarin, circa 18th century (Jiang 1989, Zhang 1989, Peyraube 1996: 179). The same process probably affected the use of *tôu* [thō] 度 as a verb complement and marker of a following recipient (indirect object). This verb of giving is also superseded by *hō̄* 與 in contemporary Taiwanese, assuming for the moment it existed in an earlier stage of the language. A simpler explanation however for *tôu* [thō] 度 is that it represents a Quanzhou element in the *Doctrina Christiana* that continues to be used in the contemporary dialect, where it has also developed this passive function in the preverbal position. Again, this would suggest a relatively recent development for both *hō̄* 與 and *tôu* [thō] 度 of their passive usage.

(ii) The comitative ~benefactive~source~goal marker *cāng* [kāng] 共 illustrates a case of phonological attrition on the one hand and broadening of functions on the other: In contemporary Taiwanese, this marker has the form *kā* thereby showing loss of the final velar nasal. The full form, *kaŋ* ↓, has been retained in other Southern Min dialects such as the Quanzhou dialect while it is a possible allomorph in Amoy or Xiamen, allowing us to link it with *cāng* [kāng] 共 and the Medieval Chinese

comitative. The grammatical functions of *kā* as described in Tsao (1990, 1991) have increased to include its use as a pretransitive marker of the patient noun, similar in function to Mandarin *bǎ*, and a passive prefix on the verb. The morpheme *kā* also forms a hybrid structure with *chiong* 將 in contemporary Taiwanese, a patient marker which belongs to the literary stratum. There are just two examples of *chiang* 將 in this function in the *Doctrina Christiana*.

It is possible that omission of the patient marking use of *cāng* simply represents a gap in the translation of the *Doctrina Christiana* and the grammatical description given in the *Arte* by the missionaries. Typologically, this latter development into a patient marker represents a divergence within Sinitic since most of its branches use an exponent which has grammaticalized from a verb of taking or holding.

(iii) For the diminutive marker, the *Arte* provides us with incontrovertible evidence that Taiwanese Southern Min *-á* evolved from the morpheme for ‘son’: it explicitly lists *la ~ nà ~ guà [kia]* as the three variant forms that could be used as a diminutive suffix in this 17th century dialect. This shows us that a process of phonological atrophy was in train since nasalization or some kind of nasal ending appears to have been lost by this time for some of the variants, a process which conforms to that described in Lien (1998) for the Taiwanese Southern Min diminutive.

Furthermore, all three categories exemplify some kind of conceptual shift from (i) a fully lexical verb *khit ~ hō* ‘give’ to a postverbal dative marker, then into a causative marker and finally into a passive marker; (ii) a preposition ‘with’ to a prepositional kind of case marker of Source, Goal, Benefactive and Patient in the case of *kā*, then finally into a connective use, which can be traced back to its Medieval Chinese usage as a comitative preposition ‘with’ and eventually to the verb *gòng* ‘share (with)’ in Archaic Chinese and (iii) the noun for ‘son’ to a diminutive and noun-marking suffix *-á*.

If it is true that the phonological system of the *Doctrina Christiana* represents the Haicheng subdialect of the Zhangzhou Southern Min group, as van der Loon (1967) argues, then the dative, causative and passive morphosyntax appears to be at variance with this, showing more grammatical features of the contemporary Quanzhou dialect than of Zhangzhou or Xiamen (and by inference, Taiwanese, where the Zhangzhou *qiāng* or ‘accent’ dominates).²⁶ This is reinforced by one piece of

evidence from Yue-Hashimoto's analysis of the same texts (1998). She observes that the *Doctrina Christiana* only employs the VP-NEG neutral question form, apart from two instances where the romanization is at variance with the character text, indicating the use of the particle *a* as in the form VP - *a* - NEG. The VP-NEG neutral question form is also the dominant form in Quanzhou as opposed to Xiamen where both are in free variation, according to Yue-Hashimoto (1998: 31).

Conversely, it may be that the Quanzhou dialect is simply more conservative in its grammar than the Zhangzhou dialect and for this reason remains closer in its passive, dative, comitative and other constructions formed with *kaŋ* to the language of these 17th century texts. Further large scale dialect research is needed to reveal the precise diachronic and synchronic relationships more clearly than this present sketch could hope to achieve.

References

- Arte de la lengua Chiō Chiu*. 1620. Manuscript from Biblioteca Universitaria Provincial Barcelona (Handwritten title: *Gramatica China*). Anonymous author(s).
- Bayer, Gottlieb Siegfried [Theophili Sigefridi Bayeri]. 1730. *Grammatica Linguae Sinicae Popularis in provincia Chin Cheu*. In: *Museum Sinicum: in quo sinicae linguae et litteraturae ratio explicatur*. St Petersburg: Imperial Academy (ex typographia academiae imperatoriae), Vol 1: 137-165.
- Bielenstein, Hans. 1959. "The Chinese colonization of Fukien until the end of the T'ang." In: Søren Egerod and Else Glahn (eds.) *Studia Serica Bernhard Karlgren Dedicata: Sinological studies dedicated to Bernhard Karlgren on his seventieth birthday*. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 98-122.
- Bodman, Nicholas Cleaveland. 1955. *Spoken Amoy Hokkien*. Kuala Lumpur: Government Federation of Malaya, 2 vols.
- Chappell, Hilary. 1986. Formal and colloquial adversity passives in standard Chinese. *Linguistics* 24.6: 1025-1052.
- Chappell, Hilary. 1999. The double unaccusative in Sinitic languages. In: Doris L. Payne and Immanuel Barshi (eds.) *External Possession and related noun incorporation constructions*. (Typological Studies in Language Series 39). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 197–232.
- Chappell, Hilary. 2001a. Language contact and areal diffusion in Sinitic languages: problems for typology and genetic affiliation, In: Alexandra Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.) *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 328–357.
- Chappell, Hilary. 2001b. Synchrony and diachrony of Sinitic languages: A brief history of Chinese dialects. In: H. Chappell (ed.) *Sinitic grammar: synchronic and diachronic perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–28.
- Chappell, Hilary. 2008. Variation in the grammaticalization of complementizers from *verba dicendi* in Sinitic languages. *Linguistic Typology* 12.1: 45-98.

- Chappell, Hilary and Alain Peyraube. 2006. The diachronic syntax of causative structures in Early Modern Southern Min. In Dah-an Ho (ed.) *Festschrift for Ting Pang-Hsin*. Taipei : Academia Sinica, 973-1011.
- Chen Zhanqiang and Liu Rulong. 1991. *Mǐnyǔ Yánjiū* [Research on Min dialects]. Beijing: Yuwen Publishers.
- Cheng, Robert. 1974. Causative constructions in Taiwanese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 2.3: 279-324. Reprinted in R.Cheng (ed), 201-251.
- Cheng, Robert. 1991. Tóngyǐyǔ xiànxàng zài Tái Huá duìyì cíkù-li de chūlǐ wèntí: tiáojiàn hé cùchéng jiégòu [The problem of processing synonymous expressions in Taiwanese Mandarin Lexicon – the case of conditional and causative constructions]. Di'èr jiè Zhōngguó jìngnèi yǔyán jí yǔyánxué guójì yántǎohuì lùnwénjí. Nankang: Academia Sinica. Reprinted in R.Cheng (ed). 279-319.
- Cheng, Robert Liangwei (ed.) 1997. *Taiwanese and Mandarin structures and their developmental trends in Taiwan. II: Contacts between Taiwanese and Mandarin and restructuring their synonyms*. Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing Co.
- Cheng, Ying and Tsao, Feng-fu. 1995. Mǐnnányǔ 'kā' yòngfǎ zhī jiǎn de guānxi [Relationships between the uses of 'kā' in Southern Min]. In Tsao Feng-fu and Tsai Meihwei (eds.) *Papers from the 1994 conference on language teaching and linguistics in Taiwan*. 1: 23-46. Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co.
- Doctrina Christiana en letra y lengua china*. n.d. Attributed to Miguel Benavides, Juan Cobo and their Chinese interpreters. Manila: Keng Yong. Blockprinted ca. 1607. Douglas, Carstairs. 1873. *Chinese-English dictionary of the vernacular spoken language of Amoy, with the principal variations of the Chang-Chew and Chin-Chew dialects. Supplement by Thomas Barclay*. London: Trübner & Co. Reprinted by SMC Publishing Inc., Taipei, in 1990.
- Feng, Aizhen. 1993. *Fúqīng fāngyán yánjiū* [Research on the Fuqing dialect]. Beijing: Shehui Kexue Publishers.
- Gasparri, Peter Cardinal. 1932. *The Catholic Catechism*. London: Sheed and Ward.
- Grootaers, Willem. 1943. La géographie linguistique en Chine. *Monumenta Serica* 8: 103-166.
- Heine, Bernd, Tom Güldemann, Christa Kilian-Hatz, Donald A. Lessau, Heinz Roberg, Mathias Schladt and Thomas Stolz. 1993. *Conceptual shift: a lexicon*

- of grammaticalization processes in African languages*. [Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 34/35]. Cologne: Institut für Afrikanistik.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Elisabeth Closs Traugott. 1991. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Huang Borong. 1996. *Hànyǔ fāngyán yǔ fǎ lèibiǎn* [Concordance of Chinese dialect grammar] Qingdao: Qingdao Publishers.
- Huang Shuan-fan. 1995. *Yǔyán, shèhuì yǔ zúqún yìshí* [Language, society and national consciousness]. Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co.
- Jiang, Lansheng. 1989. Bèidòng guānxìcǐ ‘chī’ de láiyuán chūtàn [A preliminary investigation of the passive marker ‘chi’]. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 5: 370-377.
- Jurafsky, Daniel. 1996. Universal tendencies in the semantics of the diminutive. *Language* 72.3: 533-578.
- Lin, Liantong. 1993. *Quánzhōu fāngyánzhì* [A record of the Quanzhou dialect]. Beijing: Shehui Kexue Publishers.
- Lien, Chinfa. 1994a. The order of ‘Verb-Complement’ constructions in Taiwan Southern Min. *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies* 24.3: 345-369.
- Lien, Chinfa. 1994b. Lexical diffusion. In: R. E. Asher (ed.) *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Volume 4: 2141-2144. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Lien Chinfa. 1995. Language adaptation in Taoist liturgical texts. In: David Johnson (ed.). *Ritual and scripture in Chinese popular religion. Five studies*. Chinese Popular Culture Project Publications (CPCP3). University of California at Berkeley, 219-246.
- Lien, Chinfa. 1998. Táiwān Mǐnnányǔ cízhù ‘á’ de yánjiú [Research on the Taiwanese Southern Min suffix á]. In: *Dì èr jìe Táiwān Yǔyán Guójiè Yántǎohuì Lùnwén Xuǎnjí* [Selected papers from the Second International Symposium on Languages in Taiwan], 465-483.
- Lien, Chinfa. 2001. Competing morphological changes in Taiwanese Southern Min. In: H. Chappell (ed.) *Synchronic and diachronic perspectives on the grammar of Sinitic languages*, 309-339.
- Lin, Liantong and Chen Zhan tai. 1989. *Yóngchūn fāngyánzhì* [Yongchun dialect record]. Beijing: Yuwen Chubanshe.
- Liu, Jian and Alain Peyraube. 1994. History of some coordinative constructions in Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 22.2: 179-201.

- Lord, Carol. 1993. *Historical change in serial verb constructions* (Typological Studies in Language 26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- McGregor, William. 2008. Missionary linguistics in the Kimberley, Western Australia. *Historiographia Linguistica*, vol. 35 no. 1/2, pp. 121-162.
- Medhurst, W.H. 1832. *A dictionary of the Hok-kèèn dialect of the Chinese language according to the reading and colloquial idioms: Containing about 12,000 characters*. Macao: East India Company.
- Mei, Tsu-Lin. 1998. The time of the formation into fusion words of the Southern Min plural personal pronouns. *Paper presented at the International Workshop on Chinese dialects in memory of Li Fang-kuei*. August, 1998. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Nakajima, Motoki. 1977. *Mǐnyǔ Dōng Shān dǎo fāngyán jīchǔ yǔhuìjì* [A study of the basic vocabulary of the Min dialect in the Tung Shan island]. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Nakajima, Motoki. 1979. *Fújiàn hànǚ fāngyán jīchǔ yǔhuìjì* [A comparative lexicon of Fukien dialects]. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Norman, Jerry. 1982. Four notes on Chinese-Altaic linguistic contacts. *Tsinghua Journal of Chinese Studies* 14.1-2: 243-247.
- Norman, Jerry. 1988. *Chinese*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norman, Jerry, 1991. The Min dialects in historical perspective. In Wang, William W.-Y. (ed.) *Languages and dialects of China*. Journal of Chinese Linguistics Monograph Series #8: 325-360. Berkeley: Project on Chinese Linguistics.
- Norman, Jerry, 1999. Voiced initials in the upper register of Mǐnbēi dialects. Seminar presented at the Linguistics Institute, Academia Sinica, 25th January 1999.
- Peyraube, Alain. 1988. *Syntaxe diachronique du chinois: évolution des constructions datives du 14e siècle av. J.-C. au 18e siècle*. Paris: Collège de France, Institut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises.
- Peyraube, Alain. 1989. History of the passive constructions in Chinese until the 10th century. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*
- Peyraube, Alain. 1996. Recent issues in Chinese Historical Syntax. In: C-T James Huang & Y.-H. Audrey Li (eds.) *New Horizon in Chinese Linguistics*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 161-214.

- Peyraube, Alain. 2000. Westernization of the Chinese Grammar in the 20th century : myth or reality ? *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* vol. 28-1, 1-25.
- Sagart, Laurent. 2001. "Vestiges of Old Chinese derivational affixes in modern Chinese dialects." In: H. Chappell (ed.) *Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives on the Grammar of Sinitic Languages*, 123-142.
- Shengjing. Taiyu Hanziben* [The Holy Bible. Taiwanese Han Character]. 1996. Taipei: Shengjing Gonghui.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1973. Semantics of Japanese causativization. *Foundations of Language* 9: 327-373.
- Sin Ku Iok ê Seng Keng*. 1995. Amoy Romanized Bible. Taipei: The Bible Society in the R.O.C.
- Sun, Chaofen. 1996. *Word-Order Change and Grammaticalization in the History of Chinese*. Stanford: Stanford UP.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1976. Semantic causative types. *Syntax and Semantics* 6, 43-116.
- Ting, Pang-Hsin. 1980. *Táiwān yǔyán yuánliú*[The origin and development of Taiwan's languages]. Taipei: Student Book Co.
- Ting, Pang-Hsin. 1983. Derivation time of colloquial Min from Archaic Chinese. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 54.4.
- Tsao, Feng-fu. 1988. The functions of Mandarin *gěi* and Taiwanese *hōu* in the double object and passive constructions. In: R.L. Cheng & S.F. Huang (eds.) *The structure of Taiwanese: a modern synthesis*. Taipei: Crane Publishers, 165-208.
- Tsao, Feng-fu. 1991. On the mechanisms and constraints in syntactic change: Evidence from Chinese dialects. *International Symposium on Chinese Languages and Linguistics* 2: 370-388.
- Van der Loon, Piet. 1966. The Manila incunabula and early Hokkien studies. Part I. *Asia Major. New Series* 12: 1-43.
- Van der Loon, Piet. 1967. The Manila incunabula and early Hokkien Studies. *Asia Major- New Series* Part II: 95-186.
- Wang Li. 1935[1980]. *Hànyǔ Shǐgǎo* [Draft history of the Chinese language] (2 vols). Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Wang, William S-Y. 1969. Competing change as a cause of residues. *Language* 45: 9-25.

- Wang, William S-Y. 1996. Linguistic diversity and language relationships. In: In: C.-T. James Huang & Y.-H. Audrey Li (eds.) *New Horizons in Chinese Linguistics* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 36). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 235-267.
- Williams, S. Wells. 1874/1896. *A syllabic dictionary of the Chinese language; arranged according to the Wu-fang Yuen Yin, with the pronunciation of the characters as heard in Peking, Canton, Amoy, and Shanghai*. Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press.
- Yang, Hsiu-fang. 1991. *Táiwān Mǐnnányǔ Yǔfǎgǎo* [A grammar of Taiwanese Southern Min]. Taipei: Ta An Press.
- Yuan Jiahua et al. [1960]1989. *Hànyǔ fāngyán gàiyào* [An outline of Chinese dialects]. Beijing: Wenzhi Gaige.
- Yue-Hashimoto, Anne. 1985. *The Suixi dialect of Leizhou: A study of its phonological, lexical and syntactic structure*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Yue-Hashimoto, Anne. 1991. Stratification in comparative dialectal grammar: a case in Southern Min. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 19.2: 139-171.
- Yue-Hashimoto, Anne. 1993. *Comparative Chinese dialectal grammar: Handbook for investigators* (Collection des Cahiers de Linguistique d'Asie Orientale 1). Paris: Ecoles des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales.
- Yue-Hashimoto, Anne. 1998. The Min translation of the *Doctrina Christiana*. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*
- You Rujie. 1992. *Hànyǔ fāngyánxué dǎolùn* [Chinese dialectology]. Shanghai: Shanghai Jiaoyu Press.
- Zhang Huiying. 1989. Shuò “gěi” hé “qǐ” [On gěi and qǐ]. *Zhōngguó Yǔwén* 5: 378-383, 401.
- Zhou Changji. 1991. *Mǐnnánhuà yǔ pǔtōnghuà* [The Southern Min dialect and standard Chinese]. Beijing: Yuwen Publishers.
- Zhou Changji. 1993. Xiàménhuà de bèidòngjù [Passive sentences in the Xiamen dialect]. *Zhōngguó Yǔwén* 80-85.

Acknowledgements:

This analysis was carried out during research visits to the Centre de Recherches Linguistiques sur l'Asie Orientale, CNRS/EHESS, Paris, during June and July, 1998 and National Tsing-Hua University, Hsin Chu, from October 1998 to March 1999 with the findings being presented at the *Troisième Colloque International sur la Grammaire du Chinois Ancien* held in Paris in June 1998; and also at seminars in the Linguistics Institutes at National Tsing-Hua University (December 1998) and Academia Sinica (January 1999) on the same topic. Funding for this research is provided by an Australian Research Council Large Grant "A semantic typology of complex syntactic constructions in Sinitic languages".

I would like to thank the following colleagues for their comments, ideas and criticisms: Ang Ui-jin, Christoph Harbsmeier, Chu-Ren Huang, Jiang Lansheng, Charles Li, Li Jen-kuei, Chinfa Lien, Jerry Norman, Alain Peyraube, Laurent Sagart, Stanley Starosta, Feng-fu Tsao, Anne Yue-Hashimoto and Debra Ziegeler. I have greatly profited from discussions with Chinfa Lien and Feng-fu Tsao while revising this paper at National Tsing-Hua University, Hsin Chu in early 1999.

I would also like to acknowledge Imogen Yu-chin Chen for her assistance in translating sections of the *Doctrina Christiana* and in providing modern Taiwanese equivalents for the relevant examples as well as Catherine Travis for the translation of the Spanish in the relevant parts of the *Arte*. Dr Chen made use of *Shengjing. Taiyu Hanziben* [The Holy Bible. Taiwanese Han Character] (1996) and *Sin Ku Lok ê Seng Keng* [Amoy Romanized Bible] (1995) to confirm biblical nomenclature for the translations into Taiwanese Southern Min while I referred to Gasparri (1932) for the appropriate wording in the English translations of the catechisms. The regular caveat applies that the author remains solely responsible for any errors or misinterpretations contained in this article.

Abbreviations:

CAUS causative verb or marker; CL classifier; DAT dative marker; DIR directional verb complement; DMN diminutive; DO direct object; IMP imperative; IO indirect object; NEG negative; PASS passive marker; PL plural; POSS possessive or genitive marker; PRETR pretransitive or disposal marker of patient noun; SG singular; 1 2 3 for 1st, 2nd and 3rd person pronouns.

NOTES

¹ I use the term ‘grammatical renovation’ in preference to both ‘renewal’ which refers to ‘the replacement of a dying form by a newer, usually periphrastic, form with a similar meaning’ (Hopper and Traugott 1991: 164) and to ‘lexical replacement’ which, similarly, is not entirely accurate for describing this phenomenon of one grammatical function word being replaced by another. I thank Debra Ziegeler for insightful discussion on this and other principles involved in grammaticalization processes.

² According to van der Loon (1967:101, f.22), the term ‘Sanglej’ used for the Chinese population living in and around the Manila district may have its etymology in either *cháng lái* 常来 ‘to come often’ or *shāng lái* 商来 ‘to come for trading’ given the fact that these immigrants first came to the Philippines as traders. Lien Chinfa (pers. comm.) suggests Southern Min *seŋli* 生理 ‘trade, mercantile business’ as a more apt etymology.

³ The character and romanized versions of the Southern Min *Doctrina Christiana* have been collated in the appendix of van der Loon (1967) to the great benefit of subsequent researchers.

⁴ See Yue-Hashimoto (1998) and van der Loon (1966) for a more detailed description of the contents.

⁵ Van der Loon (1967: 105) further observes that Franciscan missionaries must have made the copy now held in the British Museum since ‘St Francis’ is regularly substituted for ‘St Dominic’ in the text, apart from several oversights which neatly allow him to make this inference.

⁶ I am grateful to Alain Peyraube for making the manuscript from the Barcelona University Library available to me. Note that the Barcelona copy is given a separate title in handwriting of *Gramatica China* on the frontispiece while the original title is somewhat obscure and illegible on the second page. This explains the delay for scholars to realise it was none other than the *Arte de la lengua Chiō Chiu*. Prof. Peyraube is of the view that the Barcelona *Arte* predates the copy held in the British Museum (pers. comm.). During a visit to London in June 1998, I was unable to view the British Museum copy of the *Arte* due to an ongoing relocation of the rare manuscripts to a new building in St Pancras. For this reason, I have not yet compared it with the Barcelona copy.

⁷ The SOAS Library in London holds a copy of this work. Comparing T.S. Bayer’s Latin translation with the Barcelona copy of the *Arte* shows that the main section on the grammar is longer in the original Spanish version with an added appendix of cardinal numerals and classifiers. Otherwise, the data and grammatical description more or less correspond, given some rearrangement of the 9 chapters on the part of Bayer.

⁸ See You (1992) and Sagart (2001) for further discussion of different views on the formation of the Min dialects.

⁹ Norman (1999) divides Inland Min into three groups: the Jiàn dialects, Shàowǔ and Yǒng’ān.

¹⁰ Many scholars also use ‘Amoy’ (the anglicization of *Ē-mîg* 廈門 or Xiàmén in Mandarin) as a cover term for this group of Southern Min dialects, including

Taiwanese, for example, Williams (1896:xxxiii) and Douglas (1899: 609). Similarly, ‘Hokkien’ (from Fújiàn 福建, the name of the province) commonly refers to Southern Min dialects as in Medhurst (1832), Bodman (1955) and van der Loon (1966, 1967) despite the fact that Northern Coastal Min and Western Min dialects all belong to this geographic area too.

¹¹ Little syntactic data is available for Western Min apart from Chen and Li (1991).

¹² Thanks to Stella Norman for her perceptive remark in pointing out this more apt interpretation. All the citations from the *Doctrina Christiana* refer to the reproduction given in Appendix II to 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 (who reproduces the two sets of original transcriptions underneath the characters) while I have added in the interlinear glossing and translation into English. Most of the tone diacritics for the Spanish romanization have been omitted in the available copies of these manuscripts. For some syllables, the romanization is missing, indicated by ‘-’ as in example (1) above. I express my thanks to Chinfu Lien and Imogen Chen for sharing their native speaker intuitions with me for Taiwanese Southern Min. I remain responsible for any errors in interpretation.

¹³ The Chinese characters given in the parentheses refer to those used in the *Arte* and do not necessarily reflect the true etymological source.

¹⁴ Van der Loon (1967: 133) reconstructs this verb with an aspirated initial *t’ou*.

¹⁵ Tsao (1994) also discusses the use of *hō* in a special pivot construction and an imperative construction with resultative verb compounds which, not being attested in the two 17th century texts, are not further discussed here.

¹⁶ In informal fast speech, the pronunciation is not necessarily distinct for *khit* 乞 and *khi* 去 ‘go’ since *khit* 乞 tends to be unstressed in this context. This would also exemplify a regular tone change from 4th tone to 3rd tone (*yīnrùshēng* to *yīnqùshēng*) (F. Tsao, pers. comm.). The use of *khi* ‘go’ in this passive function could nonetheless be seen as semantically appropriate for the expression of adversity which it strongly codes (Chu-Ren Huang, pers. comm.), which can be related to its use as a co-occurring directional verb in the *hō* passive (Tsao 1988).

¹⁷ This conjecture assumes for the present that Zhangzhou is the centre of innovation, given van der Loon’s attribution of the language of the 17th century *Doctrina Christiana* to this dialect area. The direction of change may however have commenced in Quanzhou, given certain grammatical features of these texts which reflect contemporary usage in this dialect (see conclusion). Quanzhou, the famed Zaitoun in Marco Polo’s depiction of China, was also an important trading port in Ming times until the harbour became silted up.

¹⁸ This table purports neither to be exhaustive in any way of all Min dialects nor to be complete in its details for the use of each marker in the dialects for which data was available in the form of published lexica, concordances and grammars. As can be immediately viewed from the table, there was a dearth of information particularly on causatives in Min dialects in the four main references consulted, namely Yuan (1960), Nakajima (1977, 1979) and Chen & Li (1991). Note that the phonetic form for each marker quotes the original source and the characters are reproduced from these texts when they are provided without any comment on their authenticity as to the etymological source.

Yuan (1960): Fuzhou, Chaozhou, Hainan, Xiamen

Nakajima (1977): Dongshan

Nakajima (1979): Fuzhou, Putian, Dongshan, Chaoyang

Yue-Hashimoto (1985): Suixi
Lin and Chen (1989): Yongchun
Chen and Li (1991): Fuzhou, Putian, Xiamen, Zhangzhou, Quanzhou, Yongchun (18
Min dialects are represented in this volume)
Zhou (1991): Xiamen
Lin (1993): Quanzhou

Note that unrelated markers are used for the passives and datives in three of the representative dialects for Western Min (classified as Northern and Central Min in this reference) listed in Chen and Li (1991).

¹⁹ Lien (1995: 231) lists *kā* as having a patient-marking function in the Chuang Lin Taoist liturgical texts he examines from the Ming period. It certainly could be a contextual inference in some of the examples in the *Doctrina* but not a full-fledged component of meaning for the latter text in my view.

²⁰ In this use of *kā*, fusion and contraction with a following third person singular pronoun has occurred, a regular feature in Min dialects. Tsao views this form as the input to the development of the passive prefix use of *kā*.

²¹ See Huang (1996: 656-665) for details on the pretransitive in these dialects. Some other dialect groups employ cognates of the verb *gěi* 给 ‘to give’ or *bāng* 帮 ‘to help’ as a patient marker which has typically developed a benefactive meaning ‘for’ in Northern Chinese, particularly for *bāng* 帮 ‘to help’ in colloquial Taiwanese Mandarin.

²² Tsao Feng-fu considers these morphemes as forming a word family (pers. comm.).

²³ Note that for the diminutive form *-guia*, there is no nasalization marked while the tone diacritic is different from that for the lexeme for ‘son’, 子 *kǐa*ⁿ, the former representing the traditional *shǎng-shēng* category, realised as a high falling tone in Amoy and Taiwanese and the latter representing the *yīnqù* low falling tone (see *Arte* and van der Loon 1967: 109-113). Furthermore, in the Spanish romanization *k-* is used interchangeably with *gu-* and *qu-* for the unaspirated voiceless velar plosive initial /k/. In the Church romanization, these suffixes would thus correspond to *-kiá*, *-niá* and *-iá* respectively.

²⁴ In the Barcelona copy of the *Arte*, nasalization is clearly not marked on the examples of the diminutive suffix which could of course be due to a number of factors. Since van der Loon (1967) presents a masterly reconstruction of the phonological system of the dialect represented by the *Doctrina Christiana*, I have no reason or basis to disagree and will leave this problem of the different allomorphs/forms occurring in the *Bocabulario* and the *Arte* and the stages of grammaticalization that these might evidence to phonologists to unravel.

I note also that van der Loon reconstructs only two forms for the diminutive *ngia* ~ *iã* on the basis of the data in both these texts and, presumably for this reason, a different form for ‘hat’ *bo ngia/bo iã* from that given in (41) above (see example (48) below). He claims (1967: 142, f.130) that *ngia* is mainly used after words ending in a vowel and *iã* only after those ending in consonants. See Lien (1998) for a discussion of this problem of the path of phonological attrition for this suffix concerning the issue of whether nasalization preceded consonantal loss or vice versa for the diminutive.

²⁵ I have had no access to this document for the same reason as given in Note 5.

²⁶ I am indebted to Chinfu Lien for this observation.