



HAL
open science

Ya33 ‘give’ as a valency increaser in Jinghpo nuclear serialization: From the benefactive to the malefactive

Guozhen Peng, Hilary Chappell

► To cite this version:

Guozhen Peng, Hilary Chappell. Ya33 ‘give’ as a valency increaser in Jinghpo nuclear serialization: From the benefactive to the malefactive. *Studies in Language*, 2011, 35 (1), pp.128-167. 10.1075/sl.35.1.05pen . hal-03929413

HAL Id: hal-03929413

<https://hal.science/hal-03929413>

Submitted on 8 Jan 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

YA³³ ‘GIVE’ AS A VALENCY INCREASER IN JINGHPO NUCLEAR SERIALIZATION:

From the benefactive to the malefactive

Guozhen Peng¹ and Hilary Chappell²

Pre-publication version

1. Guozhen PENG: guozhen.peng@gmail.com

Centre de recherches linguistiques sur l’Asie orientale (CRLAO)

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS)

131 Boulevard Saint-Michel, 75005 Paris FRANCE

2. Hilary CHAPPELL : hmchappell@gmail.com

Centre de recherches linguistiques sur l’Asie orientale (CRLAO)

Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) /

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique(CNRS)

Sinotype, EHESS, 4 rue Küss, 75013 Paris FRANCE

Abstract

This paper analyzes serial verb constructions in Jinghpo formed by ya^{33} ‘give’, arguing that it has the function of a valency-increasing device in nuclear serialization: the use of ya^{33} allows the licensing of an additional beneficiary argument as a core argument to the lexical verb. We demonstrate that the benefactive usage is extended to malefactive semantics via the expression of possession, which thus yields a coherent account of the syntactic requirement for three participants in both types of construction. Moreover, the malefactive usage of ya^{33} is shown to be distinct from that of adversative passive markers derived from the verb ‘give’ in other East and Southeast Asian languages, both in clause structure and syntactic function. Finally, we propose that the nuclear type of serialization, integral to the typological profile of Jinghpo, a SOV language, is a determining factor in the reanalysis of ya^{33} . The analysis is based on the variety of Jinghpo spoken in Luxi county, Yunnan province, China, using fieldwork data.

Key words: valency, applicatives, differential patient marking, ‘give’ verbs, benefactive, malefactive, passive

***Ya*³³ ‘give’ as a valency increaser in Jinghpo nuclear serialization**

1. Introduction

In this paper, we intend to present a comprehensive syntactic and semantic description of the *ya*³³ ‘give’ serial verb construction in Jinghpo, an SOV language of the Tibeto-Burman language family, from a typological perspective. We argue that *ya*³³ acts as a valency increasing device, adding a benefactive argument to the lexical verb. In other words, it has an applicative-like function. From this well-attested grammaticalized function for *give* verbs, it further extends to a malefactive use.

In general, SOV languages in the sinophoric¹ zone of Tibeto-Burman family differ from neighbouring SVO Sinitic languages in that verbs are stringed together without nominal interpolations (Matisoff 1991:444), a feature especially prominent in Jinghpo. This structural type has also been described as ‘nuclear serialization’ in the relevant literature, the standpoint adopted in this analysis.² *Give* serial verb construction and the grammaticalization of *give* verbs have been widely discussed for SVO languages in East and Southeast Asia, where it is cross-linguistically common for ‘give’ verbs to grammaticalize into prepositions, dative and benefactive markers, permissive-causative complementizers, and passive markers (Jiang 1999; Zhang 2003; Chappell & Peyraube 2006; Yap & Shoichi 2007). In contrast, there seems to be few detailed studies on the *give* construction in SOV languages of the Tibeto-Burman family, even though such constructions have been mentioned for certain of the languages (see Matisoff 1974, 1991; Smeall 1975; LaPolla 2003; Peterson 2010 among others). In these earlier works, *give* verbs are characterized as encoding a broad meaning of benefaction in its auxiliary usage, with little or no discussion of *give* verb nuclear serialization itself and its influence upon the potential semantic and syntactic development for such verbs in specific languages. Therefore, few descriptions are available as to how the nuclear serializing feature correlates with the evolution of *give* verbs.

An equally poorly documented area of study for SOV languages of the Tibeto-Burman family is the semantic extension from benefaction to malefaction. Radetzky and Smith (2010:106-114) have reported that, differing from many of those languages in Europe which have a generalized and semantically underspecified ‘affectedness construction’ to express both benefactive and malefactive meanings, languages of South and East Asia overwhelmingly use different morphemes and constructions for the benefactive as opposed to the malefactive. Although benefactive constructions in some languages can occasionally be found used in malefactive contexts, there are many restrictions on this kind of usage. Consequently, little is known on the semantic extensions of benefactives.

Therefore, the primary objective of this paper is twofold. First, we will argue that the particular feature of nuclear serialization contributes to shape the function and the grammaticalization pathways of the verb ‘give’ in Jinghpo. When compared with languages belonging to the same area such as Mandarin Chinese, we observe that Jinghpo does not have semantically-governed (or non-derived) ditransitive verbs and, thus, obligatorily requires the overt morphological marking of *ya*³³ ‘give’ to code the benefactive meaning. Second, we will demonstrate that the same verb morpheme, *ya*³³ ‘give’, is extended from the meaning of benefaction to malefaction, though this semantic transformation is accompanied by a structural change to the benefactive *ya*³ construction. Furthermore, we will show that the identical coding with the same morpheme *ya*³³ ‘give’ for both the role of beneficiary and maleficiary is not solely context- or pragmatics- based, as previously suggested for European languages (Creissels 2010:33; Kittilä and Zuniga 2010:20-21; Kiyosawa and Gerdts 2010:156).

The presentation will be developed as follows: In section 2, we briefly introduce some basic syntactic features of the Jinghpo language that are related to our discussion, including clause-final inflection words and essential syntactic features related to nominal marking and serial verb constructions. Section 3 focuses on the process of how *ya*³³ is extended from the verbal meaning ‘give’ to the benefactive meaning and then on to the malefactive meaning. Three other verbs that perform

similar syntactic functions are shown to be at a relatively lower stage of grammaticalization than *ya*³³ in that their meanings have not undergone similar desemanticization process. In section 4, the argument is presented in favour of considering that *ya*³³ ‘give’ has an applicative-like function in nuclear serialization, adding a recipient or benefactive argument to the transitive lexical verb. This valency-increasing function is kept in the malefactive usage, albeit with some slight changes in structure. Though *ya*³³ ‘give’ remains homophonous with its full verb form, in section 5, *ya*³³ ‘give’ is argued to be in a transitional phase of grammaticalization between a full verb and an auxiliary. In section 6, we address the question of how the nuclear serialization feature determines the particular grammaticalization pathway of *ya*³³ and thus the way it develops, rather than taking some of the different pathways seen for ‘give’ verbs in certain other languages in East and Southeast Asia. Section 7 presents the conclusion.

2 Basic features of the Jinghpo language

The Jinghpo or Kachin people are distributed across southwestern China, northern Burma, and northeastern India. In China, they are also known as the Jinghpo (景颇), and mainly live in the Dehong Dai and the Jinghpo Autonomous Prefecture of Yunnan Province, including the following counties: Yingjiang, Ruili, Lianghe, Longchuan, and Luxi.³ The 2007 census gives the figure of those living in China as 135,421. In the Kachin State of Burma, the population is approximately 900,000 (Lewis 2009).

Jinghpo is an SOV language. It is generally agreed that it belongs to the Jinghpo sub-branch of the Tibeto-Burman branch within the Sino-Tibetan language family (Dai and Diehl 2003:401).⁴ In Jinghpo, there are many grammatical features commonly shared by other Tibeto-Burman languages, such as using animate patient-marking to disambiguate semantic roles, as well as some interesting features of its own, including a rich set of causative prefixes and clause-final inflection forms. In this section, we will briefly introduce a number of syntactic features in Jinghpo that are related to our main discussion which follows.

2.1 Clause-final inflection words

Highly complex clause-final inflection words constitute a typical feature of the Jinghpo language.⁵ These portmanteau forms, apart from indicating the person and number for the agent and the patient, also incorporate meanings of mood, direction, and aspect (Dai and Diehl 2003:407).⁶ For example, *se*²⁵⁵*ai*³³ simultaneously indicates the agent is first person singular and the patient is third person, the predicate is declarative in mood while perfective in aspect; *rit*³¹*ga*²³¹ fuses the agent in third person with consultative mood and the direction of the verb toward the speaker.

However, as the language changes, clause-final inflection words in Jinghpo are being simplified more and more. For example, in declarative sentences, the particles which indicate person and number of both agents and patients, such as *se*⁵⁵*ai*³³ ‘1SGAG; 3SGP;PFV’, are being replaced by portmanteau forms indicating only the agent, such as *sa*³³*ngai*³³ ‘1SGAG;PFV’. Further complicating the picture, portmanteau forms that denote third person agent, such as *sai*³³ ‘3SGAG; PFV’ and *ai*³³ ‘3SGAG, IPFV’ have generalized to be used very frequently for first and second person agents with a consequent change in meaning. According to all the conversational data collected during fieldwork, we found that *sai*³³ and *ai*³³ are the most widely used clause-final inflection words for agents of all persons with both transitive and intransitive verbs. Thus, the declarative third person portmanteau forms no longer mark information for person and number. They have evolved to a certain extent into markers that only code perfective and imperfective aspect.⁷ Nonetheless, in written data, cases of complex inflectional words indicating both agent and patient are found somewhat more frequently.

2.2 Differential patient marking *hpe*²⁵⁵ and agent marking *e*³¹

Given that Jinghpo is basically a SOV language with both the patient and the agent preceding the verb, when both referents are animate, ambiguity arises as to which is the agent and which, the patient, since OSV order is also possible. The differential patient marker *hpe*²⁵⁵ is thus applied to disambiguate

semantic roles as shown in (1).⁸ In the cases where there is no ambiguity between the respective roles of the two arguments NPs, *hpe*²⁵⁵ is omitted, as in (2). The crucial function of this type of marking is to single out an animate argument that might otherwise be interpreted as an actor, as performing a role other than actor. This line of analysis concerning patient marking is already discussed in detail in the relevant literature (Comrie 1989:122; LaPolla 1994:64; Matthias 2008; Malchukov 2008 among others).

- (1) *Wa*²³¹*yi*³¹ *wa*²³¹*la*³¹ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *ga*³¹*wa*⁵⁵ *nu*²⁵⁵*ai*³³.
 female pig male pig DPM Bite 3SGAG;3P;PFV
 ‘The female pig bit the male pig.’ (Dai and Xu 1992:257)

- (2) *Shi*³³ *shat*³¹ *sha*³¹*du*³³ *nga*³¹ *ai*³³.
 3SG Food cook PROG IPFV
 ‘He is cooking food.’

In the ditransitive sentence, exemplified in (3), it is the human recipient, that takes the differential patient marker *hpe*²⁵⁵.

- (3) *Shi*³³ *ngai*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *gum*³¹*hpro*³¹ *la*³¹*tse*³³ *ya*³³ *sai*³³
 3SG 1SG DPM Money one hundred give PFV
 ‘He gave me one hundred dollars.’ (Dai and Xu 1992: 370)

Since the theme is inanimate, *hpe*²⁵⁵ is used to mark the recipient (or beneficiary) to disambiguate it from the agent, just as it functions in monotransitive clauses with two animate nouns.⁹ Thus, the differential patient marking in Jinghpo is doubtless due to the impact of animacy in that animate recipients are disambiguated in the same way as animate patients, while the zero marking of inanimate themes corresponds to that for inanimate patients (see Kittilä 2006 and Malchukov 2008 for detailed discussion on animacy in case marking). Since ditransitives typically have at least two animate NPs, the general rule for disambiguation comes into force, such that one of these NPs, namely the recipient, is marked by *hpe*²⁵⁵.

In addition to the differential patient marker *hpe*²⁵⁵, there is another nominal marker *e*³¹ which is optionally used after the agent noun. As discussed in LaPolla (1994) and McGregor (2010), optional agent marking is highly typical of many Tibeto-Burman languages. The primary factor in the decision to use or not to use the agent marking in Jinghpo is not to discriminate between the semantic roles, but to explicitly highlight the agentivity of one of the referents. The contrast shown between (4a) and (4b) provides clear evidence that *hpe*²⁵⁵ can be used to differentiate the agent from the patient, while *e*³¹ cannot be used alone for the same function. Example (4c) indicates that the only function of *e*³¹ is to emphasize the agentivity of the relevant noun in an otherwise fully grammatical sentence. To sum up, there is a choice as to whether to use *hpe*²⁵⁵ or both *hpe*²⁵⁵ and *e*³¹ as in (4a) or (4c), but it is not grammatical to use only *e*³¹ alone as in (4b).

- (4) a *wa*²³¹*la*³¹ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *ga*³¹*wa*⁵⁵
 *Wa*²³¹*yi*³¹

Jinghpo is a heavily verb serializing language. A serial verb construction may be provisionally defined as a single clause in which two or more finite verbs occur without any overt marker of coordination, subordination or syntactic dependency of any other sort, a definition which basically tallies with the definition proposed by Aikhenvald (2006:1)¹⁰ Serial verb constructions are monoclausal; their intonational properties are the same as those of a monoverbal clause, and they have one tense, aspect and polarity value.

Serial verb constructions fall into two types according to the structure of the clause. One is formed by consecutive sequences of two or more verbs as they occur in the verb complex: NP₁-NP₂-[NP₃... NP_n]-V₁-V₂-[V₃V_n]. The other is formed by sequences of constructions, each consisting of a verb and its direct object NP : V₁NP₁-V₂NP₂-[V₃NP₃V_nNP_n).. These two types are called nuclear and core serialization respectively (Foley and Van Valin 1984: 77, 190, 197; Solnit 2006: 146). Thus, the verbs in the former type are contiguous, while they are non-contiguous in the latter.

Nuclear serialization is common in Oceanic languages (see, for example, Crowley 2002, Brill 2007). The Tibeto-Burman languages are equally remarkable for their productive use of nuclear serialization in which long sequences of verbs may be strung together or concatenated by simple juxtaposition without nominal interruptions, thus forming complex verbal nuclei (Matisoff 1991:444).

Jinghpo is a good case in point, in which nuclear serialization is extremely widespread. Given that the word order in Jinghpo is OV, the order of verb serialization determines that all the nominal elements, including agent, patient, goal or beneficiary occur on the left-hand side, while the entire series of verb heads, no matter how many there are, occurs on the right-hand side. We illustrate this with the three examples below. In examples (6) and (7), the verb sequence includes four verbs and three verbs respectively, whereas in (8) the number of verbs serialized is five. All the participants of the event, the agent, the patient, the theme and the goal, are located on the left side of each series of verbs, without being inserted in this series.

- (6) *Sau*³¹*go*³¹ *wa*³¹ *di*³¹ *dut*³¹ *sha*⁵⁵ *mu*²³¹!
- Saugo go pick Sell Eat 2PLAG;IMP

‘Go to pick saugo (a kind of fruit used for seasoning) and sell it for a living.’ (*Dialogue 2: 338*)

- (7) *Shi*³³ *nga*⁵⁵ *ga*³¹*ba*³¹ *shing*⁵⁵*noi*⁵⁵ *e*³¹ *rim*³¹ *bang*³³ *ya*³³¹¹
- 3SG fish Big Basket In catch put give

*u*²³¹*ai*³³.

3SGAG;3P;IPFV

‘He catches big fish and puts them in the basket.’

- (8) *Hkru*³³*du*³¹ *e*³¹ *ka*³³*gyin*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *hpun*⁵⁵ *ding*³¹*shan*³³ *la*⁵⁵*ngai*⁵¹
- turtledove AG ant DPM tree Branch one

<i>ga</i> ³¹ <i>bye</i> ²³¹	<i>do</i> ²³¹	<i>ja</i> ³¹ <i>khra</i> ³¹	<i>bang</i> ³³	<i>ya</i> ³³	<i>u</i> ²³¹ <i>ai</i> ³³ .
trample	break	cause-fall	Put	give	3SGAG;3P;IPFV

‘The turtledove tramples down a tree branch and gives it to the ant.’

In Jinghpo, not only are nominal elements not permitted to be sandwiched between verbs in series, neither can certain other types of grammatical elements, such as negation markers or adverbs. Inflection markers also occur once and only once, and this is necessarily in the clause-final position.

This particular phenomenon of nuclear serialization has been discussed in the literature under other names. For example, Smeall (1975) describes that in the Lolo-Burmese languages certain subsets of verbs concatenate into tightly bound strings of verbs into which neither NP arguments nor any other morphemes can intrude. He calls these verbs ‘incorporable verbs’ to emphasize the tightness of the bonds which link them. The strings themselves seem to function as unitary predicates in simple sentences. Pronominal arguments are optionally expressed in most sentences, but if they are overt, they may not intrude into any part of the verb series, but would rather be found strung out in initial position in a relatively free order. Matisoff (1979) provides a particularly detailed description of juxtaposed verb concatenations in Jinghpo (or what we are calling ‘nuclear serial verb constructions’), classifying them into different types according to the semantic relationships they denote.

There are two further points worth mentioning here. First, there is no morphological distinction between non-finite and finite forms for verbs in nuclear serializations in Jinghpo. All the verbs in (6), (7) and (8) may occur on their own as a full verb in non-serialized sentences with exactly the same form. Second, nuclear serializations in which nuclear verbs are obligatorily contiguous might suggest an analysis as lexical compounds. There is no denying that contiguous serial verbs are easily subjected to lexicalization processes (Aikhenvald 2006:50).

However, the examples above in Jinghpo suggest that nuclear serialization constitutes a genuine type of syntactically complex predicate rather than a compound. This can be seen in the fact that aspect markers may intervene between certain verbs. In fact, it is precisely this type of nuclear serialization which favours the kind of grammaticalization creating auxiliary verbs which code aspectual information and modify the preceding lexical verb, for example, *kau*⁵⁵ and *ton*³¹. These aspectual markers denote, respectively, that the action described by the main verb is finished and that the result of the action is maintained. Some of these auxiliary verbs, including *kau*⁵⁵, have developed to the extent that they are rarely used as full verbs. Matisoff (1991: 398-400) characterizes this feature for Southeast Asian languages of the sinospheric zone as the general tendency of the verb category to develop into verb particles when in V₂ position, intended to refer to any verb in a series semantically modifying its immediately preceding verb.¹² Depending on the language, these can include particles that show a range of functions including aspect markers, modal auxiliaries, causative markers, clause linkers and benefactives.

It is exactly this type of syntactic reanalysis which is pertinent in the case of *ya*³³. We suggest that the same kind of process is currently underway for *ya*³³ ‘give’ which, although not showing any signs of attrition in terms of phonetic change, has clearly developed a new syntactic function, concomitantly reflected in its desemanticization to the benefactive and malefactive uses. Significantly, its use is obligatory in ditransitive, benefactive and malefactive clauses in this role as a valency increaser, thus unequivocally signalling a conventionalization of its usage (Heine 2002:85).

Furthermore, this kind of reanalysis, characterized by an apparent lack of any formal change, structural or phonetic, is a quite typical phenomenon for the non-inflectional serializing languages found in East Asia (see, for example, Matisoff 2001 on Lahu, Matthews 2006 on serial verb constructions in

Cantonese, Chappell 2008 on reanalysis of *say* verbs in Sinitic languages).¹³ Hence, the parameters used to identify components of the grammaticalization process such as extension and desemanticization (or bleaching of meaning), decategorialization and reanalysis can be detected for ya^{33} ‘give’ in Jinghpo, but not that of phonetic erosion (see Heine & Kuteva 2007: 33-46 & chapter 5 for a discussion of these 5 parameters). Extension and desemanticization are discussed in §3, while the first signs of decategorialization for ya^{33} are treated in §5.

3. Desemanticization and extension: from full verb to benefactive to malefactive

In this section, we will discuss in detail the process of desemanticization of the verb ya^{33} . There is an initial derivation to the benefactive meaning ‘to’, ‘for’ and ‘instead’ from the verbal meaning ‘give’. This takes place through extension of its use in serial verb constructions to a much broader context of use, reflected in the expansion of the ya^{33} construction to co-occurrence with non-transferral verbs. The malefactive usage of ya^{33} with the meaning ‘to someone’s detriment’ represents a further evolution in the grammatical development of ya^{33} , ensuing upon its benefactive one, whereby it completely loses any semantic trace of its original lexical source in ‘give’. Three other verbs that perform similar syntactic functions are shown not to undergo any such similar desemanticization process.

3.1 From full verb to benefactive

Verbs of giving frequently turn up as the exponents of benefactive constructions, as is the case in Jinghpo. Lord (1993) specifically notes that in African languages, such as Twi, Yoruba, Ewe and Awutu (Kwa, Niger-Congo), the preposition introducing recipient and benefactive noun phrases is often similar in form to, or homophonous with, a verb meaning ‘give to’ or ‘show to’. Matisoff (1991) points out that in the East and Southeast Asian area, verbs of giving are used as benefactive prepositions in Lahu (Tibeto-Burman), Thai (Tai), Yao Samsao (Hmong-Mien), and Vietnamese (Austroasiatic). The verb ‘give’ has also been reported as a benefactive applicative marker in Haka Lai (Kuki-Chin subgroup of Tibeto-Burman). In Mandarin, the benefactive marker is *gěi*, which can be directly related to the verb ‘give’, a situation which is found in many other Sinitic languages as well as in Japanese and Korean. Of particular relevance for our study, this source is well documented for several linguistic areas where SVCs are common, including West Africa, Southeast Asia and New Guinea in addition to certain types of serializing pidgin and creole languages (Creissels 2010: 40-47).

Before we begin to discuss the benefactive usage of ya^{33} , we first give an example to illustrate that ya^{33} can still be used as a full verb meaning ‘give’.

(9) NP1–NP2–NP3– ya^{33}

<i>Dui³¹la³³</i>	<i>nang³³</i>	<i>hpe²⁵⁵</i>	<i>gum³¹hpro³¹</i>	<i>ga³¹de³¹</i>
grandfather	2SG	DPM	Money	how much

ya^{33}	<i>a²³¹ni⁵¹</i>
give	3/1SGAG;IPFV;Q

‘How much money did grandfather give you?’ (*Dialogue 2: 166*)

In the benefactive usage, *ya*³³ ‘give’ serialization, which contains a lexical verb as the first verb and *ya*³³ ‘give’ as the second verb, usually introduces either a recipient or benefactive argument. An example of this construction is provided below:

(10) *Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *lai*³¹*ka*³³ *la*⁵⁵*ngai*³³ *ma*³¹*ri*³³ *ya*³³ *n*³³*ngai*³³
 1SG 3SG DPM Book One buy give 1SGAG;IPFV

(i) ‘I buy a book to give him.’ (RB)

(ii) ‘I buy a book instead of him.’ (DB)

(iii) ‘I buy a book for him.’ (PB)

This sentence might have three benefactive interpretations: it could be interpreted as either the agent ‘is buying a book to give to him’ as a present or ‘buying a book instead of him’ in cases where the beneficiary is too busy to go to the bookshop, or ‘buying a book for his benefit’ in cases of helping him to broaden his view on a certain subject. These meanings correspond to Van Valin and LaPolla’s (1997: 383-4) classification of benefactive semantic subtypes: recipient beneficiary (RB), deputative beneficiary (DB), and plain beneficiary (PB). Among these, the recipient beneficiary differs from the deputative beneficiary and plain beneficiary in that the original verbal meaning of ‘give’ is still kept in recipient beneficiary use, while in the latter two cases the meaning of *ya*³³ merely indicates a generalized notion of the benefactive. The original meaning of ‘give’ has disappeared or has already been bleached. Therefore, for our purposes, it suffices to make a distinction between just recipient and beneficiary with the latter including deputative and plain beneficiary semantic subtypes.

Whether or not *ya*³³ ‘give’ introduces a recipient or a beneficiary depends on the choice of verbs it co-occurs with in the SVC. Only verbs of transfer (with the transfer in either possible direction, thus including both verbs of giving or receiving, such as *dut*³¹ ‘sell’ and *ma*³¹*ri*³³ ‘buy’) or verbs of fabrication (such as *ga*³¹*lo*³³ ‘do’, ‘make’) can introduce a recipient beneficiary, since these classes of verbs all involve transfer of possession or control. With non-transferral verbs, there is no recipient interpretation, evidence of an extension having taken place which licences the benefactive interpretation. Moreover, this extension to a broader context of use accompanies the desemanticization process affecting its source, the original lexical verb of giving (Heine 2002). For example, (11) and (12) with the verb *hkrut*³¹ ‘wash’ and *ye*⁵⁵ ‘sweep’, respectively, can only lead to a benefactive reading. Since these verbs do not involve transferring of any kind of concrete object, it naturally follows that the recipient reading is not available. The only relevant reading for such sentences is the beneficiary one. Thus, the desemanticization of the verb *ya*³³ can be easily detected with these verbs.

(11) *Ngai*³³ *nang*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *pa*³³*long*³³ *hkrut*³¹ *ton*³¹ *ya*³³ *sa*³³*ngai*³³.
 2SG 2SG DPM clothes Wash AUX give 1SGAG;PFV

‘I washed clothes for/instead of you.’

(12) *Ngai*³³ *nang*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *dun*⁵⁵ *ye*⁵⁵ *ya*³³ *sa*³³*ngai*³³.
 1SG 2SG DPM floor Sweep give 1SGAG;PFV

‘I swept the floor for/instead of you.’

In fact, in the case of beneficiary semantics, there is no restriction on the choice of verbs, so long as the predicate is compatible, in its given context, with the constructional meaning of the benefactive, namely, carrying out an action for the benefit, or good, of someone else. Thus, even verbs of destruction can be compatible with the benefactive *ya*³³ construction. This is illustrated in (13) with the verb *sat*³¹ ‘to kill’. An event such as that of killing may be considered unfortunate in a majority of contexts. However, in the benefactive construction, it is interpreted as something desirable for the beneficiary or something that the beneficiary wanted to happen.

- (13) *Ngai*³³ *Ma*³¹ *Ko*²⁵⁵ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *u*³¹ *sat*³¹ *ya*³³ *sa*³³*ngai*³³.
 1SG Ma Ko DPM chicken Kill give 1SGAG;PFV
 ‘I killed the chicken for/instead of Ma Ko.’

3.2 From benefactive to malefactive

Malefactive constructions code an event or situation which is unfortunate for the affected argument (Radetzky & Smith 2010: 99). In certain languages, benefactive constructions may express a more general meaning of affectedness, lending themselves to a malefactive interpretation. This is particularly true of semantically underspecified ‘dative of interest’ constructions in many European languages, which can express both benefactive and malefactive situations (Radetzky & Smith 2010:106-114; Creissels 2010:3). This extended use of the benefactive construction seems, at first blush, also to be observed in Jinghpo. However, we will argue that this semantic transformation is accompanied by structural changes to benefactive *ya*³³, creating a derived and thereby separate malefactive construction. Furthermore, the malefactive usage of *ya*³³ in Jinghpo is restricted to describing situations in which the theme and the maleficiary have a possessive relation.

This is illustrated in examples (14) to (16), in which the maleficiary is specifically disadvantaged by the fact that his or her possession is negatively affected. In (14), the hunter is harmed by virtue of his foot being bitten by an ant. This example shows the locative strategy for coding the possessum, *la*³¹*go*³³ *ko*²⁵⁵ ‘foot-on’:

- (14) *Ka*³³*gyin*³³ *e*³¹ *ma*³¹*khkyu*³¹ *wa*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *la*³¹*go*³³ *c*
 ant AG hunter Man DPM foot on

*ga*³¹*wa*⁵⁵ *ton*³¹ *ya*³³ *u*²³¹ *ai*³³.
 bite AUX give 3SGAG;3P;IPFV
 ‘The ant bites the hunter on his foot (and the hunter is negatively affected).’

The next example, example (15), uses a genitive NP for coding the possessive relation. The Jingling bird is adversely affected due to the fact that her children have been trampled to death by an elephant.

- (15) *Ma*³¹*gui*³³ *go*³¹ *jing*³¹*ling*⁵⁵ *u*³¹ *a*²³¹ *ga*³¹*sha*³¹ *ni*³³
 Elephant TOP Jingling bird POSS child PL

<i>hpe</i> ²⁵⁵	<i>ga</i> ³¹ <i>bye</i> ²³¹	<i>sat</i> ³¹	<i>kau</i> ⁵⁵	<i>ya</i> ³³	<i>sai</i> ³³ .
DPM	trample	kill	AUX	give	PFV

‘The elephant trampled and killed the Jingling bird’s children (to her detriment).’

In example (16), the possessum is overtly coded in a modifying clause *Ning*³³*ji*³³*dui*³¹ *ga*³¹*lo*³³ *ai*³³ *dai*³³ ‘the one that grandpa made’. The sentence means grandpa is harmed in the sense that what he made was taken away by other people (an X in this particular case). Furthermore, this example is interesting in that it provides us with clearcut evidence for the desemanticization of *ya*³³ ‘give’ in that it is able to co-occur with its antonym ‘take’. This represents a further evolution in the grammatical development of *ya*³³, which completely loses any semantic trace of its original lexical source in ‘give’.

(16)	<i>Ning</i> ³³ <i>ji</i> ³³ <i>dui</i> ³¹	<i>ga</i> ³¹ <i>lo</i> ³³	<i>ai</i> ³³	<i>dai</i> ³³	<i>mung</i> ³¹	<i>wa</i> ³¹	<i>la</i> ⁵⁵	<i>ya</i> ³³	<i>kau</i> ⁵⁵	<i>sai</i> ³³ .
	2SG.POSS.grandpa	make	NMLZ	one	too	come	take	give	AUX	PFV

‘(People in Mangshi) also took that one your grandpa made.’ (*Dialogue 1*: 206)

Thus the malefactive differs from the benefactive since, instead of a three-argument structure, it has a two-argument structure with either a possessive or locative NP, if not a nominal clause coding the possessor, who is the maleficiary, and the possessum. In contrast to this, in the benefactive construction, the beneficiary and the theme do not have to be in a possessive relation. If there does exist such a relation, it can be expressed with a genitive NP phrase. For example, (11) can also be changed to the following.

(17)	<i>Ngai</i> ³³	<i>nang</i> ³³	<i>a</i> ²³¹	<i>pa</i> ³³ <i>long</i> ³³	<i>hkrut</i> ³¹	<i>ton</i> ³¹	<i>ya</i> ³³	<i>sa</i> ³³ <i>ngai</i> ³³ .
	2SG	2SG	POSS	clothes	wash	AUX	give	1SGAG;PFV

‘I washed clothes for/instead of you.’

The examples in Jinghpo have shown that the malefactive usage of *ya*³³ represents a further development from the benefactive usage to code the adversative effect of an event on a possessor in a distinct though related construction. Indeed, Radetzky and Smith (2010:106-114) survey languages of South and East Asia including Sino-Tibetan languages, languages of India and other non-Sino-Tibetan languages of this area, as well as Japanese and Korean, and conclude that without exception, either different morphemes or different constructions are used for the benefactive and malefactive. Although benefactive constructions in some languages can occasionally be found extended to malefactive situations, there are many restrictions on this kind of usage. While the constructions with *ya*³³ in Jinghpo represent a clear case of using the same morpheme to mark both the benefactive and the malefactive, they nonetheless use a different syntactic configuration and argument structure.. Furthermore, a major finding of our analysis concerns the derivational relationship between the benefactive and the malefactive via the expression of possession with the maleficiary realized as the possessor. Furthermore, this is a relationship which has rarely received much attention in cross-linguistic studies, despite the many descriptions available on benefactives, ‘external possessor’ and dative of interest constructions..

The semantic extension from benefactive to malefactive in Jinghpo is also important in that the relation between them is not solely context- or pragmatics-based, although the same morpheme *ya*³³ is used in both cases. Kittilä and Zuniga (2010:20-21) point out that the reason for why the role of

beneficiary and the role of maleficiary are not clearly distinguished from one another is due to the fact that a given event can be seen as either beneficial or detrimental for an indirectly affected participant, depending on the context and the speaker's judgment. Kiyosawa and Gerds (2010:156) also show how contextual information is used to distinguish between the benefactive and the malefactive readings explicitly for Salish languages.

However in Jinghpo, the distinction between malefactive and benefactive interpretations of *ya*³³ has become conventionalized in the form of different syntactic configurations.. The comparison between (18) and (19) shows clearly that the three-argument construction in (18) only yields one of the benefactive readings whereas, the two-argument construction with a genitive NP phrase in (19) yields the malefactive interpretation.¹⁴

(18) *Ngai*³³ *Ma*³¹ *Ko*²⁵⁵ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *u*³¹ *sat*³¹ *ya*³³ *sa*³³*ngai*³³.
 1SG Ma Ko DPM Chicken kill give 1SGAG;PFV
 'I killed the chicken for/instead of Ma Ko.'

(19) *Ngai*³³ *Ma*³¹ *Ko*²⁵⁵ *a*²³¹ *u*³¹ *sat*³¹ *ya*³³ *sa*³³*ngai*³³.
 1SG Ma Ko POSS Chicken kill Give 1SGAG;PFV
 'I killed Ma Ko's chicken to his detriment.'

In other words, only the two-argument possessive construction is available to express the malefactive meaning. The three NP structure will inevitably lead to a benefactive interpretation.

3.2 Other verbs with benefactive meanings

Apart from the verb *ya*³³, three other verbs can be found in V2 position in the serial verb construction that seem to perform a similar function to *ya*³³. These verbs include *dan*⁵⁵ whose verbal meaning is 'to show', *jo*²³¹ which also means 'to give' and *lom*³¹ which means 'to participate' as a verb. Nonetheless, we will show that these verbs are not as grammaticalized as the verb *ya*³³ in expressing benefactive semantics. *Dan*⁵⁵ 'show' and *jo*²³¹ 'give' can only be used for basic recipient semantics but not for plain benefactive or deputative benefactive meanings. As for the verb *lom*³¹ 'to participate', although it can express 'helping somebody to do something', this is the lexical meaning of the verb itself. Thus, it does not form a benefactive construction in the grammaticalized and abstract sense discussed.

The verb *dan*⁵⁵ 'show' is used for such verbs which indicate transferring of an abstract entity, as in the case of verbs of communication, such as information, songs and stories, for example, *tsun*³³ 'say', *hkon*⁵⁵ 'sing', *h kai*³¹ 'tell'. *Ya*³³ cannot be used for these verbs. This is shown by the contrast in acceptability in (20).

(20) *Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *mu*⁵⁵ *dai*³³ *tsun*³³ *dan*⁵⁵ (**ya*³³) *sa*³³*ngai*³³.
 1SG 3SG DPM matter that tell show 1SGAG;PFV
 'I told him that matter.'

It can also be used after other kinds of verbs, including activity verbs, as in the following example:

- (21) *Ngai*³³ *nang*³³ *hpe*⁵⁵ *ga*³¹*lo*³³ *dan*⁵⁵ *na*³³!
- 1SG 2SG DPM do show IRR

‘I will do (it) and show (it) to you. (A more literal translation: I-do-show-you) ‘

However, both (20) and (21) do not convey any deputative benefactive meanings with the sense of ‘instead of a person’ or plain benefactive meanings with the sense of ‘for a person’. This conforms to Creissels’ (2007:33) observation that the verb ‘show’ seems to license recipients or goals rather than beneficiaries proper.

The verb *jo*³¹ also means ‘give’ as a verb. Thus, it is interchangeable with *ya*³³ in a basic ditransitive sentence. For example, *ya*³³ in sentence (9) can be substituted by *jo*³¹ without a great change in meaning, as indicated in (22).

- (22) *Dui*³¹*la*³³ *nang*³³ *hpe*⁵⁵ *gum*³¹*hpro*³¹ *ga*³¹*de*³¹
- grandfather 2SG DPM money how much

*jo*³¹ (*ya*³³) *a*³¹*ni*⁵¹

give 3/1SGAG;IPFV;QUE

‘How much money did grandfather give you?’

However, when being used in V₂ position in a serial verb construction, *jo*³¹ is not as widely used as *ya*³³. It is interchangeable with *ya*³³ only after verbs of transfer or of fabrication, as in (23) and (24).

- (23) *Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *hpe*⁵⁵ *nga*³³ *la*⁵⁵*ngai*³³ *dut*³¹ *jo*³¹ *sai*³³.
- 1SG 3SG DPM ox one sell give PFV

‘I sold a cow to him.’

- (24) *Ga*³¹*sha*³¹ *yan*³³ *hpe*⁵⁵ *lu*³¹*sha*⁵⁵ *ga*³¹*lo*³³ *jo*³¹ *u*³¹ *ai*³³.
- child two DPM Food make give 3SGAG;3P;IPFV

‘She cooks delicious food and gives it to her two children. ‘

In addition, sentences (23) and (24) differ from *ya*³³ benefactive serialization in that they only have the recipient beneficiary interpretation of ‘to a person’, not ‘instead of a person’ or ‘for a person’, as indicated earlier. According to the native speakers’ judgments, when using *jo*³¹, the transferral meaning of ‘give’ is more prominent. For example, sentence (24) has the meaning that cooking and giving are more or less separate events, whereas, when using *ya*³³, this distinction becomes blurred and is thereby less obvious. Thus *jo*³¹ is limited to expressing the recipient, while *ya*³³ may express both recipient and beneficiary. This is clear evidence that *jo*³¹ is not as grammaticalized as *ya*³³, since it does not have the

benefactive usage. It is only used in its original verbal meaning of giving. It can thus be predicted that *jo*³¹ cannot replace *ya*³³ after verbs that do not belong to the transferral or creation type, such as *hkrut*³¹ ‘wash’ and *ye*⁵⁵ ‘sweep’, since recipient beneficiary readings are not available for these verbs. This prediction is borne out, as indicated by the following example:

- (25) **Ngai*³³ *nang*³³ *hpe*⁵⁵ *dun*⁵⁵ *ye*⁵⁵ *jo*³¹ *sa*³³*ngai*³³.
 1SG 2SG DPM floor sweep give 1SGAG;PFV

Intended meaning: ‘I swept the floor for you.’

The verb *lom*³¹, on the contrary, is interchangeable with *ya*³³ with verb classes other than transferral or creation. For example, if we substitute *ya*³³ in example (25) by *lom*³¹ ‘to participate’, we obtain the following sentence.

- (26) *Ngai*³³ *nang*³³ *hpe*⁵⁵ *dun*⁵⁵ *ye*⁵⁵ *lom*³¹ *sa*³³*ngai*³³.
 1SG 2SG DPM floor sweep help 1SGAG;PFV

‘I helped you in sweeping the floor.’

However, the meaning of the sentence also changes slightly when *ya*³³ is substituted by *lom*³¹. With *ya*³³, it means ‘I swept the floor instead of you’ or ‘I swept the floor for you’, whereas with *lom*³¹, it means ‘I helped you by participating in sweeping the floor with you’. To be more specific, in *ya*³³ serialization, the benefactive meaning expressed by *ya*³³ is more abstract and generalized, and cannot be interpreted by its original verbal meaning of giving, while in *lom*³¹ serialization, the benefactive meaning is indicated by the lexical meaning of the verb itself. Thus, the verb *lom*³¹, similar to verb *jo*³¹, cannot be regarded as a grammaticalized element denoting general benefactive semantics. This provides further support for our claim that the desemanticization of *ya*³³ is well under way.

4. The nuclear serial verb construction as a benefactive valency increasing device

In this section, we argue that *ya*³³ acts as a valency increasing device, adding a recipient or benefactive argument to the lexical verb. In other words, it has an applicative-like function. Jinghpo does not have semantically-governed (or non-derived) ditransitive verbs and, thus, obligatorily requires the *ya*³³ ‘give’ serial verb construction to code three arguments and the benefactive meaning. Furthermore, we will demonstrate that the valency increasing function in the benefactive construction can offer a coherent account for the fact that the malefactive construction also requires the interpretation of three participants to convey the malefactive meaning.

4.1 Nuclear serial verb construction status

In the recipient and benefactive construction, the verb *ya*³³ ‘give’ combined with a lexical verb clearly constitutes a case of nuclear serialization because, as discussed in §2.3.3, the patient noun phrase governed either by a lexical verb or the verb *ya*³³ ‘give’ must always occur before the complex nucleus. Compared with (27a), (27b) in which the recipient pronoun occurs immediately before the verb of giving

which governs it, and (27c) in which *ya*³³ is directly postposed after the recipient noun *shi*³³ ‘3SG’ are both ungrammatical in Jinghpo.

(27)a *Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *sha*³¹*kram*³³ *ka*³³ *ya*³³ *sai*³³
 1SG 3SG DPM letter write give PFV
 ‘I wrote a letter to him.’

b **Ngai*³³ *sha*³¹*kram*³³ *ka*³³ *shi*³³ *ya*³³ *sai*³³
 1SG Letter write 3SG give PFV
 Intended meaning: ‘I wrote a letter to him.’

c **Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *ya*³³ *sha*³¹*kram*³³ *ka*³³ *sai*³³
 1SG 3SG give letter write PFV
 Intended meaning: ‘I wrote a letter to him.’

In addition, negation markers must precede the complex nucleus rather than be placed inside it in order to correctly code the scope relations. This can be seen in the following example:

(28)a *Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *sha*³¹*kram*³³ *n*³³ *ka*³³ *ya*³³ *sai*³³.
 1SG 3SG DPM letter not write give PFV
 ‘I did not write to him.’

b **Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *sha*³¹*kram*³³ *ka*³³ *n*³³ *ya*³³ *sai*³³.
 1SG 3SG DPM letter write not give PFV
 Intended meaning: ‘I did not write to him.’

Another important feature derived from the nuclear serialization is the relatively free order for all the nominal elements located on the left-hand side of the verb series. In Jinghpo, the construction displays considerable flexibility, given the clear differentiation of roles made possible by marking with *hpe*²⁵⁵. Either the agent precedes the recipient, or vice versa, as can be seen in (29). For native speakers, both orders are frequently used. The difference lies in pragmatics or discourse, that is, whether the speaker wants to focus on the agent or the recipient (or beneficiary) or which order makes the discourse more coherent in certain contexts.¹⁵

(29)a *Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *sha*³¹*kram*³³ *ka*³³ *ya*³³ *sai*³³

1SG	3SG	DPM	letter	write	give	PFV
-----	-----	-----	--------	-------	------	-----

‘I wrote a letter to him.’

b

<i>Shi</i> ³³	<i>hpe</i> ²⁵⁵	<i>ngai</i> ³³	<i>sha</i> ³¹ <i>kram</i> ³³	<i>ka</i> ³³	<i>ya</i> ³³	<i>sai</i> ³³
3SG	DPM	1SG	letter	write	give	PFV

‘It was to him that I wrote a letter.’

In a situation where the theme is definite, the order becomes even more flexible to the extent that nearly all possible word orders are acceptable. This follows the principle of the greater the degree of definiteness, the higher the theme in the topical hierarchy. Example (30) illustrates an example with a definite theme, ‘I washed that item of clothing for you’. In this sentence, there are three noun phrases: *ngai*³³ ‘1SG’, *nang*³³ ‘2SG’, *pa*³³*long*³³ *wo*⁵⁵*ra*³¹ ‘that item of clothing’. All possible orders of these three noun phrases are acceptable, as shown in examples (a) to (f), while noting that native speakers have different judgments with respect to the naturalness of these sentences, out of context.

(30)

<i>Ngai</i> ³³	<i>nang</i> ³³	<i>hpe</i> ²⁵⁵	<i>pa</i> ³³ <i>long</i> ³³	<i>wo</i> ⁵⁵ <i>ra</i> ³¹	<i>hkrut</i> ³¹	<i>ton</i> ³¹
1SG	2SG	DPM	clothes	that	wash	AUX

*ya*³³ *sa*³³*ngai*³³.

Give 1SGAG;PFV

‘I washed that item of clothing for you.’

a	1SG	2SG <i>hpe</i> ²⁵⁵	that item of clothing
b	1SG	that item of clothing	2SG <i>hpe</i> ²⁵⁵
c	that item of clothing	1SG	2SG <i>hpe</i> ²⁵⁵
d	that item of clothing	2SG <i>hpe</i> ²⁵⁵	1SG
e	2SG <i>hpe</i> ²⁵⁵	1SG	that item of clothing
f	2SG <i>hpe</i> ²⁵⁵	that item of clothing	1SG

4.2 *Ya*³³ as a benefactive valency increaser

4.2.1 Obligatoriness of *ya*³³ in the benefactive construction

A corollary of the syntactic reanalysis and decategorialization of *ya*³³ is its conventionalization in this new role as marker of the benefactive. In other words, *ya*³³ is obligatory in the benefactive construction, since its absence clearly results in ungrammaticality, as illustrated by examples (31) to (33).

- (31) *Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *nga*³³ *lang*⁵⁵*ai*³³ *dut*³¹ *(*ya*³³) *sai*³³.
 1SG 3SG DPM ox one sell give PFV

‘I sold an ox to/for/instead of him.’

- (32) *Shi*³³ *Ma*³¹ *Ko*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *lu*²³¹*sha*⁵⁵ *ga*³¹*lo*³³ *(*ya*³³) *u*²³¹*ai*³³.
 3SG Ma Ko DPM Food make give 3SGAG;3P;IPFV

‘She cooks some food to give Ma Ko (or: for/instead of Ma Ko).’

- (33) *Ngai*³³ *nang*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *dun*⁵⁵ *ye*⁵⁵ *(*ya*³³) *sa*³³*ngai*³³
 1SG 2SG DPM floor sweep give 1SGAG; PFV

‘I swept the floor for/instead of you.’

This is an important syntactic property of the benefactive construction, marking the new syntactic status of *ya*³³ as a valency increasing device. As exemplified in (31) to (33), *ya*³³ is obligatory for all three main kinds of verb classes discussed so far, including transferral, fabrication and non-transferral activity verbs. This forms a clear contrast with *give* verbs used in the ditransitive constructions of many other languages of the Asian area. Taking Standard Mandarin, a Sinitic language, as an example, transferral verbs do not need the recipient marker *gěi* in the double object construction, as indicated in (34).

- (34) *Wǒ* *sòng* (*gěi*) *tā* *yī* *běn* *shū*.
 1SG present Give 3SG one CLF book

‘I’m giving him a book.’ (literal translation: ‘I present give him a book.’)

The recipient or benefactive argument in Jinghpo must be introduced by the verb *ya*³³ ‘give’, even for verbs of giving. In other words, Jinghpo does not have semantically-governed (or non-derived) ditransitive verbs compared with Mandarin Chinese, and needs overt morphological marking to code the dative/benefactive meaning in a specialized serial verb construction. Thus, to express a recipient or a beneficiary argument, the language is obliged to use the verb ‘to give’ *ya*³³.

From this it can be deduced that *ya*³³ acts as a benefactive valency increaser¹⁶ whose syntactic contribution to the construction is limited to licensing the expression of the additional participant of a beneficiary, the defining property in fact of such a grammatical marker. Its function is evidently based on its source semantics of ‘give’ and the fact that ‘give’ is a three place predicate. In this way, it can be seen to act like an applicative marker in languages that use special affixes on the verb for this purpose. We concur with Peterson’s definition (2010:1) that applicative constructions restructure clauses to allow for the coding of a thematically peripheral argument or adjunct as core object argument. (see also Jeong 2007: 3-4 for a similar definition). And they typically mark a benefactive or instrumental role (Bresnan & Moshi 1990), which corresponds to Jinghpo in the case of the former. As also discussed in Peterson (2010:41), the most common obligatory applicative construction is in fact this beneficiary type, which has no alternative oblique instantiation for its applicative noun. Note that this contradicts the general claim made by Kittilä and Zuniga (2010:4) that beneficiaries are typically optional and are more often

coded by non-core cases or adpositions with non-applicativized verbs, while recipients can be semantic arguments of non-derived verbs.

We have already noted that *ya*³³ may be used with several different verb classes, including transferral, fabrication and destruction. However, it is equally important to observe that the valency increasing function of *ya*³³ has not yet been fully extended to intransitive verbs, as indicated by the ungrammatical example in (35a). To ‘save’ this sentence, we need to make use of a postposition *a*²³¹ *ma*³¹ *tu*³³ ‘for the sake of’, which has evolved from a noun phrase meaning ‘one’s share’, and place it after the beneficiary noun phrase, as shown in (35b). Because *a*²³¹ *ma*³¹ *tu*³³ ‘for the sake of’ is an independent postposition, it can be used to introduce an argument on its own, as shown in (36), without needing to co-occur with *ya*³³ ‘give’, which is thus optional in this construction.

(35a) **Ngai*³³ *nang*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *sa*³³ *ya*³³ *de*²³¹!

1SG 2SG DPM go give IMP

Intended meaning: ‘I go for your sake!’

b *Ngai*³³ *nang*³³ *a*²³¹ *ma*³¹ *tu*³³ *sa*³³ (*ya*³³) *de*²³¹!

1SG 2SG for the sake of go (give) IMP

‘I go for your sake!’

(36) *Ngai*³³ *nang*³³ *a*²³¹ *ma*³¹ *tu*³³ *sa*³³ *de*²³¹!

1SG 2SG for the sake of go IMP

‘I go for your sake !’

In standard Mandarin Chinese, the benefactive marker *gěi* ‘give’ cannot combine with intransitive verbs either. This is shown in (37).

(37) **Wǒ* *gěi* *Nǐ* *qù*!

1SG give 2SG Go

Intended meaning ‘I go for your sake!’

This is different from the benefactive valency increaser in some other languages, in which the verb ‘give’ is compatible with intransitive verbs. For example, *hây* ‘give’ can be used after intransitive verbs in Standard Thai (Tai) (Jenny 2010: 384-385). His example (18) adapted from a modern Thai novel is reproduced here as (38).

(38) *Hàak cam.pen khâa câ? taay hây ?eŋ dây.*

if necessary 1FAM FUT die GIVE 2FAM GET
 ‘If necessary, I can/am ready to die for you.’
 (‘in your place’: DEPUTATIVE; ‘for your sake’: PURE BEN)

Intransitive predicates require deputative or beneficiary interpretations, as example (38) illustrates. Even though the Jinghpo benefactive ya^{33} construction is not restricted to the basic recipient interpretation, as we have shown, it still cannot take intransitive verbs. One explanation for such crosslinguistic contrasts might be that a benefactive valency increaser used with intransitive verbs is at a more advanced stage of grammaticalization in such languages, a stage not yet achieved by ya^{33} ‘give’ in Jinghpo nor $g\ddot{e}i$ in Mandarin.

4.2.2 Obligatoriness of three participants in the malefactive construction

Similarly to the benefactive ya^{33} , which requires three participants corresponding to three core arguments, the malefactive ya^{33} construction also requires three participants. However, there is a difference, as these three participants correspond to only two core arguments. Consequently, we make an important distinction between arguments of the verb and participants referenced in the clause which may not correspond to a core argument in every case. As pointed out in section 3.2, the malefactive usage of ya^{33} in Jinghpo seems to be restricted to situations in which the theme and the maleficiary have a possessive relation. In other words, the maleficiary is disadvantaged by the fact that his or her possession is negatively affected. Two examples are repeated below, the first one containing a genitive possessive NP, followed by the second that has a locative possessive NP.

NP_{1(AGENT)} – [N_{2(MALEFICIARY)} – GEN – N₃]NP_{2(PATIENT)} – V₁ Aux V₂= ya^{33}

(39) *Ma³¹gui³³ go³¹ jing³¹ling⁵⁵ u³¹ a^{ʔ31} ga³¹sha³¹ ni³³*
 Elephant TOP Jingling Bird POSS child PL

hpe^{ʔ55} ga³¹bye^{ʔ31} sar³¹ kau⁵⁵ ya³³ sai³³.
 DPM trample kill AUX give PFV

‘The elephant trampled and killed the Jingling bird’s children (to her detriment).’

NP_{1(AGENT)} – NP_{2(MALEFICIARY PATIENT)} – NP_{3LOC} – V₁ Aux V₂= ya^{33}

(40) *Ka³³gyin³³ e³¹ ma³¹khkyu³¹ wa³³ hpe^{ʔ55} la³¹go³³ ko^{ʔ55}*
 ant AG hunter Man DPM foot on

ga³¹wa⁵⁵ ton³¹ ya³³ u^{ʔ31} ai³³.
 bite AUX Give 3SGAG;3P;IPFV

‘The ant bites the hunter on his foot (and the hunter is negatively affected).’

Given the possessive relation between the maleficiary and the theme, the example above in (40) also has an alternative expression with a genitive NP, as shown in (41).¹⁷

(41)	<i>Ka³³gyin³³</i>	<i>e³¹</i>	<i>ma³¹khkyu³¹</i>	<i>wa³³</i>	<i>a²³¹</i>	<i>la³¹go³³</i>
	Ant	AG	hunter	man	POSS	foot
	<i>ga³¹wa⁵⁵</i>	<i>ton³¹</i>	<i>ya³³</i>	<i>u²³¹ ai³³</i>		
	bite	AUX	Give	3SGAG;3P;IPFV		

‘The ant bites the hunter’s foot (and the hunter is negatively affected).’

The common characteristic shared by the preceding three examples is that although there are just two core arguments, an agent and a patient, the different events all involve three participants coded by three separate nouns, two of which have a possessive relation: the agent, the maleficiary (possessor) and the theme (possession). Moreover, this possessive relation can be coded in Jinghpo by either a locative strategy as (40) or by a genitive noun phrase as in both (39) and (41), depending on the conceptualization of the event by the speaker. In the minimal pair of sentences in (40) and (41), it is the hunter who is viewed as the patient in (40) in what has often been called the inalienable ‘possessor ascension’ construction (or ‘external possessor’ construction). The hunter is directly affected by what has happened specifically to his foot, the latter coded in the locative, while in (41), with the genitive NP, it is the foot which is viewed as the patient, and almost as an entity separate from the hunter (see Chappell & McGregor 1996:6-7 *inter alia*).

In a situation where only two participants are involved, and there is no explicit coding of a possessive relation and thus the possibility of a detrimental interpretation is precluded, it is ungrammatical to use *ya³³* to form a malefactive for such transitive predicates. For example, if we only describe the fact that the ant bites the hunter or the elephant trampled and killed the Jingling bird, *ya³³* is not permitted, as in (42) and (43).

(42)	* <i>Ka³³gyin³³</i>	<i>e³¹</i>	<i>ma³¹khkyu³¹</i>	<i>wa³³</i>	<i>hpe²⁵⁵</i>	<i>ga³¹wa⁵⁵</i>	<i>ton³¹</i>
	ant	AG	Hunter	man	DPM	bite	AUX
	<i>ya³³</i>	<i>u²³¹ ai³³</i>					
	give	3SGAG;3P;IPFV					

Intended meaning: ‘The ant bites the hunter.’

(43)	* <i>Ma³¹gui³³</i>	<i>go³¹</i>	<i>jing³¹ling⁵⁵</i>	<i>u³¹</i>	<i>hpe²⁵⁵</i>	<i>ga³¹bye²³¹</i>	<i>sat³¹</i>	<i>kau⁵⁵</i>	<i>ya³³</i>	<i>sai³³</i>
	Elephant	TOP	Jingling	bird	DPM	Trample	kill	AUX	give	PFV

Intended meaning: ‘The elephant trampled and killed the Jingling bird.’

Sentence (44) provides us with another example which reveals the constraint that the malefactive usage of *ya*³³ is restricted to coding an event with three participants. This suggests that it is the number of participants which is crucial and of primary importance for the *ya*³³ malefactive construction, namely three, and not the number of core arguments, which is secondary and corresponds to just two.

- (44) **Shi*³³ *ngai*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *a*³¹*dup*³¹ *ya*³³ *sai*³³.
 3SG 1SG DPM beat give PFV

Intended meaning: ‘He beat me.’

Evidently, this special requirement of three participants in the malefactive construction derives from the fact that *ya*³³ is essentially a valency increaser, as used in the benefactive construction, where *ya*³³ always adds a third argument to the lexical verb. It is natural that this constraint is still kept in the malefactive usage, even if only in terms of participants.

In spite of this, there seem to be counterexamples to the Jinghpo malefactive construction, in which three participants do not appear, but only two, as in (47) and (48).

- (47) *N*³¹*bung*³³ *wan*³¹ *ga*³¹*wut*³¹ *sat*³¹ *kau*⁵⁵ *ya*³³ *sai*³³.
 wind fire Blow kill AUX give PFV

‘The wind blew and put out the fire.’

- (48) *Mu*⁵⁵ *dai*³³ *yong*³¹ *e*³¹ *chye*³³ *kau*⁵⁵ *ya*³³ *sai*³³.
 matter that All AG know AUX give PFV

‘Everyone knew that matter.’

Scrutinizing further the contexts of these sentences reveals, however, that these are not counterexamples. Sentence (47) can only be used in cases of man-made fire for cooking or for lighting. When the fire goes out, it is a bad situation for those concerned. The sentence cannot be used to describe a natural fire in the forest or an accidental fire. Sentence (48) is used in a context where this matter was not supposed to be known by others. When this happens, it is understood as undesirable for the speaker. Thus, in these two sentences, while *ya*³³ is unable to mark an agent already marked by *e*³¹, as in (48), it still licenses a covert third party as the maleficiary, that is, one previously mentioned in the discourse and representing old information.

Note that very often with the malefactive usage, the agent can be omitted when it is recoverable from the context or when it is not salient for discourse and pragmatic reasons, leaving the possessive NP as the only overt argument. This is exemplified by (49) and (50). Note that although the agent is omitted, the patient NP still requires a full possessive noun phrase with two participants, including a noun referring to a part of the body, a kin relationship or some other inalienable category.

- (49) *Sa*³¹*myin*³³ (...) *a*²³¹ *n*³¹*gup*³¹ *bai*⁵⁵ *ma*³¹*tep*⁵⁵ *a*³¹*pyet*³¹

flat-mouth-fish POSS mouth again nip cause-flat

*dat*³¹ *ya*³³ *ai*³³

AUX give PFV

‘(The brothers) again nipped the mouth flat of the flatmouth fish.’ (*Story of how people begin to make a living*: 121)

(50) *Jing*³¹*ling*⁵⁵ *u*³¹ *a*²³¹ *ga*³¹*sha*³¹ *ni*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *ga*³¹*bye*²³¹
 Jingling bird POSS child PL DPM Trample

*sat*³¹ *kau*⁵⁵ *ya*³³ *sai*³³.

kill AUX give PFV

‘(Somebody) trampled the Jingling bird’s children to death.’

The two sentences above appear to resemble passive constructions: they could also be translated as ‘The mouth of the flatmouth fish was nipped flat’ or ‘The Jingling bird’s children were trampled to death’. But these sentences are merely the malefactive construction with an omitted agent. We elaborate on the difference between the malefactive construction and the passive construction in section 6.

5. Evidence for transitional reanalysis of *ya*³³ as an auxiliary verb

The benefactive valency increaser has often been reported to constitute an intermediary stage in grammaticalization chains, either from verbs to adpositions and case markers, or from verbs to verb affixes (Creissels 2007:18). In this section, we will argue that *ya*³³ is grammaticalizing into an auxiliary verb, given its function as a valency increaser in benefactive constructions.

Before we discuss grammaticalization into an auxiliary, it is important to point out that although the lexical verb and *ya*³³ are contiguous in a nuclear serialization, there is sufficient evidence to show that valency increaser *ya*³³ constitutes a separate word. Examples (51) and (52) from the same set of colloquial materials provide a relevant comparison where the identical lexical verb *woi*³³ ‘take care of’ can be either followed immediately by *ya*³³ or be separated by an auxiliary word, such as *kau*⁵⁵, the perfective aspect marker. The productivity of the construction in combination with the existence of such minimal pairs presents clear evidence against analyzing V-*ya*³³ combinations as compound verbs.

(51) *Hkon*³¹ *Toi*³³ ... *yong*³¹ *ga*³¹*htong*³¹ *ting*³¹ *a*²³¹ *ma*³¹
 Hkon Toi... All village whole POSS child

*chyu*³³ *woi*³³ *ya*³³ *re*⁵¹

alone take care of give Is

‘Hkon Toi takes care of all the children in the village by herself.’ (*Dialogue 2: 33*)

(52) *Dai*³³ *ma*³¹ *woi*³³ *kau*⁵⁵ *ya*³³ *n*³¹*na*⁵⁵
 that child take care of AUX give then

*dai*³³ *ga*³¹*lo*³³ *mu*²³¹
 that Do 2PLAG;IMP

‘(I will) take care of the child for you, and you do that!’ (*Dialogue 2: 317*)

Hence, we claim that it is not yet plausible to analyze *ya*³³ as having developed into an auxiliary verb.

In fact, *ya*³³ can still be used as a full verb in Jinghpo, as example (9) clearly illustrates, since it retains the ability to head a monoverbal clause precisely with the same invariable form when used in nuclear serialization structures. The identical case applies to the main causative verb, *sha*³¹*ngun*⁵⁵ ‘to make’ which preserves its verbal status in this function while increasing the valency of the first verb in the series. This exhibits a clear contrast with the aspectual auxiliary verb *kau*⁵⁵ ‘perfective’, or modal auxiliary verb *lu*³¹ ‘able’, in Jinghpo, which are used after the main verb but have lost their ability to be full verbs in their own right.

In spite of this, a high degree of polyfunctionality is not uncommon in languages of the East and Southeast Asian area, synchronically entailing the use of grammaticalized particles side-by-side with their source verbs or nouns. Such is the case of the verb *hây* ‘give’ in Thai, which co-exists with an even larger number of grammatical functions than does *ya*³³ (Jenny 2010: 387), not to mention the case of many coverbs in Southeast Asian languages surveyed in Bisang (1992) and *say* verbs in Sinitic languages which develop complementizer, irrealis and clause-final discourse marker usages (Chappell 2008). Next we discuss the issue of syntactic bondedness which provides a criterion for judging the degree of grammaticalization, specifically, the degree of syntactic reanalysis of *ya*³³ as an auxiliary verb.

In the corpus of Jinghpo colloquial materials just stated above, equivalent to about 5 hours of recording, there is a total of 59 tokens of *ya*³³.¹⁸ Of these, the figures in Table 1 below show that in only 14 cases does it have the full verb function, while there are 45 where it is used as a valency increaser with either a benefactive or malefactive meaning.

<i>Function of ya</i> ³³	<i>Syntactic configuration</i>	<i>Number of cases</i>		
Full verb	(i) NP ₁ (NP ₂ ...) – V _[ya33] – Clause marker ¹⁹	14		
Valency increaser	(ii) NP ₁ (NP ₂ ...) – V ₁ – V _{2[ya33]} – Clause marker	24	45	59
	(iii) NP ₁ (NP ₂ ...) – V ₁ – Aux – V _{2[ya33]} – Clause marker	17		
	(iv) NP ₁ (NP ₂ ...) – V ₁ – V _{2[ya33]} – Aux – Clause marker	4		

Table 1: Classification of the uses of *ya*³³ in Jinghpo texts

An example of each construction type in which ya^{33} is used as a benefactive valency increaser is presented below:

(53) NP₁(NP₂...)-V₁-V₂[ya^{33}]-Clause marker

*Hkon*³¹ *Toi*³³, *nang*³³ *byen*³³ *ya*³³ *u*³¹!

Hkon Toi, 2SG translate **give** 2SGAG;IMP

‘Hkon Toi, you translate (for me)!’ (*Dialogue 2: 25*)

(54) NP₁(NP₂...)-V₁-**Aux**-V₂[ya^{33}]-Clause marker

*Dui*³¹ *no*⁵⁵ *tsan*³³ *kau*⁵⁵ *ya*³³ *de*³¹.

grandmother first **pick** **AUX** **give** IMP

‘Let grandmother pick out (the good ones) for (you) first!’ (*Dialogue 2: 378*)

(55) NP₁(NP₂...)-V₁-V₂[ya^{33}] **Aux**-Clause marker

*Shi*³³ *no*⁵⁵ *nga*³¹ *yang*³¹, *dut*³¹ *ya*³³ *kau*⁵⁵ *sai*³³

3SG still Live when **sell** **give** **AUX** PFV

‘He sold it (to those people in Mangshi) when he was still alive.’ (*Dialogue 1: 207*)

As a valency increaser, ya^{33} occurs in the majority of cases (28/45) directly after V₁, as if to form a syntactic unit with it (V₁-V₂[ya^{33}]), and to a lesser extent is separated from V₁ by one of the aspect auxiliaries: there are 17/45 cases of V₁-**Aux**-V₂[ya^{33}]. In fact, in only 4/21 examples with aspect markers did the aspect auxiliary follow the V₁-V₂ unit: V₁-V₂[ya^{33}] **Aux**. Although the data is suggestive rather than conclusive (given the small numbers), these would appear to indicate that ya^{33} is somewhere in the middle of the grammaticalization pathway between full verb and auxiliary, reinforcing our standpoint. In the corpus data, this intermediate nature is revealed by the existence of two main structures with Structure I being more grammatically developed than Structure II (Note that we have conflated the two similar structures (ii) and (iv) in Table 1 above):

- I. NP (NP...) V₁-V₂[ya^{33}] - (AUX) - Clause marker (28/45) and
- II. NP (NP...) V₁ -AUX - V₂[ya^{33}] - Clause marker (17/45)

Hence, while the valency increaser ya^{33} is not yet found to exclusively occur in Structure I, where it may gradually develop into a new verb complex, forming a syntactic unit with V₁, there is nonetheless clearcut evidence for the dessemanticization of ya^{33} ‘give’ in that it is able to co-occur with its antonym ‘take’ in malefactive function (see example (16) above).

By way of contrast, Structure II is syntactically freer in that aspectual auxiliaries such as ton^{31} can be inserted between V₁ and V₂ (ya^{33}). Even though ya^{33} can still be interpreted as a valency increaser ‘for’ in this structure, it retains a stronger trace of its original lexical meaning of ‘give’. Recalling that the aspect auxiliary ton^{31} codes the result state associated with the verb it modifies, for examples (56) and (57) below, native speakers describe each situation as purposive ones involving the two sequential

actions of buying a book then giving it to someone, (56), or of preparing food to give to Ma Ko, (57). At the same time, the person who will receive the book or the food is viewed as a beneficiary, marked by the use of valency increaser *ya*³³.

(56) *Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *lai*³¹*ka*³³ *mi*³³ *ma*³¹*ri*³³ *ton*³¹ *ya*³³ *sai*³³.
 1SG 3SG DPM book one buy AUX give PFV
 ‘I’ve bought a book for him (to give to him).’

(57) *Shi*³³ *Ma Ko* *hpe*²⁵⁵ *lu*²³¹*sha*⁵⁵ *ga*³¹*lo*³³ *ton*³¹ *ya*³³ *sai*³³.
 3SG Ma Ko DPM food Make AUX give PFV
 ‘She’s made food for Ma Ko (to give to Ma Ko).’

This again underlines the less grammatically developed status of Structure II, V_1 -Aux- $V_{2[ya33]}$ as opposed to the syntactically tighter form of Structure I, V_1 - $V_{2[ya33]}$ - (Aux). Recall that the sequential interpretation of two events or actions is largely unfeasible with Structure I with V_1 - $V_{2[ya33]}$ - (AUX), as illustrated by examples such as (55) with ‘sell’ and the preceding ones, where verbs in series combined with *ya*³³ together code a single event viewed holistically.

Hence, our conclusion is that *ya*³³ is still in a transitional phase of grammaticalization as far as its syntactic category is concerned. It is specifically undergoing the process of syntactic reanalysis to an auxiliary verb, which sees its bondedness increasing to form a syntactic unit with the preceding verb. In this role, it has the function of a valency increaser in adding a benefactive, or malefactive argument/participant to transitive predicates. Despite these reservations with respect to its syntactic status, more importantly, the use of *ya*³³ has been conventionalized, since it is obligatorily required in dative/benefactive and malefactive constructions.

6. Different grammaticalization routes for ‘give’ verbs in Mandarin and in Jinghpo

In this section we will argue for the theoretical implication that nuclear serialization and the OV word order in Jinghpo determine the grammaticalization route of *ya*³³ into an auxiliary, while in an SVO language, such as standard Chinese which makes use of core serialization, preverbal *gěi* ‘give’ is grammaticalized into a preposition or a passive marker.

6.1 Benefactive *gěi* ‘give’ constructions in Mandarin Chinese

In Mandarin Chinese, an SVO language, the ‘give’ verb *gěi* in postverbal position assigns the recipient role to the NP that follows it, whereas *gěi* in preverbal position assigns a beneficiary role (see Chappell and Peyraube 2006 *inter alia*), as illustrated in (58a) and (58b) respectively. The diachronic explanation for this freedom of word order is that *gěi* ‘give’ first grammaticalized into a preposition in the postverbal position and its PP constituent is then moved to the preverbal position to mark the beneficiary as a result of alignment with the typical position for prepositional phrases which most often precede the verb in Sinitic languages.

(58)a *Wǒ* *mǎi* *Le* *yī* *běn* *shū* *gěi* *tā*.

1SG buy ASP one CLF book give 3SG
 ‘I bought a book and gave it to him.’

b *Wǒ gěi tā. mǎi le yī běn Shū*
 1SG give 3SG buy ASP one CLF Book
 ‘I bought a book for him.’

As earlier observed in §4.1, this contrasts with the case for valency increaser *ya*³³, which is blocked from grammaticalizing into a postposition and must always occur after at least one other verb as in (59).

(59) *Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *hpe*²⁵⁵ *lai*³¹*ka*³³ *la*⁵⁵*ngai*³³ *ma*³¹*ri*³³ *ya*³³ *n*³³*ngai*³³
 1SG 3SG DPM book one buy give 1SGAG;IPFV
 ‘I buy a book to give him’ ; ‘I buy a book instead of/for him.’

The reason, that *ya*³³ cannot undergo a process of grammaticalization from verb to postposition or case marker, is strongly related to the fact that the position of *ya*³³ after the lexical verb does not accord with the typical preverbal placement reserved for postpositions in this SOV language. In Jinghpo, postpositional phrases, for example, those containing *hku*³³ ‘in’ precede the clause-final verb or verb complex, as shown in sentence (60).

(60) *Nan*⁵⁵*hte*³³ *Jing*³¹*hpo*²³¹ *ga*³¹ *hku*³³ *tsun*³³ *mu*²³¹.
 2PL Jinghpo language in speak 2PLAG;IMP
 ‘You speak in Jinghpo!’ (*Dialogue 3: 11*)

Consequently, given the rigid order of verbs in nuclear serialization, it is not possible for *ya*³³ in (59) to be separated from the lexical verb and be moved into a preverbal position to follow and mark the beneficiary or recipient NP..

6.2 Causative to passive development in Mandarin Chinese

It has been reported that certain unrelated languages of the Asian region make use of the same source morpheme ‘give’ to express the passive and the benefactive. This is attested not only in the majority of Chinese dialects, including Min, Hakka, Cantonese, Wu, Hui and many Mandarin dialects, but also in Manchu-Tungusic and non-standard Malay (Hashimoto 1976; Chappell & Peyraube 2006; Yap & Iwasaki 2007). This superficial resemblance is reinforced by the fact that many of these passives also code adversity as part of their constructional semantics, specifically, that the undergoer is negatively affected by the event (Clark 1974).

This might suggest a prima facie case for analyzing *ya*³³ as a passive marker rather than a malefactive. Hence, in this section we will use Mandarin as an example to distinguish the malefactive use of *ya*³³ ‘give’ in Jinghpo from the passive use of *gěi* ‘give’ in Mandarin. We first compare *ya*³³ ‘give’ with the *gěi* passive with an overt agent. The Mandarin examples are illustrated in (61), in which verb

gěi ‘give’ specifies an overt agent in a structure with the syntactic configuration of NP_(patient)–*gěi* – NP_(agent)–VP. An example of malefactive *ya*³³ is repeated in (62).

Adversative passive construction with an agent phrase in Mandarin:

- (61)a *Wǒ gěi Tāmen piàn le.*
 I give Them deceive ASP
 ‘I was deceived by them.’ (Yap & Iwasaki 2003:422)

- b *Fángzi gěi Tūfěi shāo le.*
 house give Hooligan burn ASP
 ‘The house was burned down by the hooligans.’ (Yap & Iwasaki 2003:422)

(62) Malefactive construction in Jinghpo

<i>Ka</i> ³³ <i>gyin</i> ³³	<i>e</i> ³¹	<i>ma</i> ³¹ <i>khkyu</i> ³¹	<i>wa</i> ³³	<i>a</i> ^{ʔ31}	<i>la</i> ³¹ <i>go</i> ³³
ant	AG	hunter	man	POSS	foot
<i>ga</i> ³¹ <i>wa</i> ⁵⁵	<i>ton</i> ³¹	<i>ya</i> ³³	<i>u</i> ^{ʔ31} <i>ai</i> ³³		
bite	AUX	Give	3SGAG;3P;IPFV		

‘The ant bites the hunter’s foot (and he is negatively affected by it).’

The difference between the passive construction and the malefactive construction lies in the following aspects. First, in the malefactive construction (62), *ya*³³ is found in postverbal position. Its function is not to license the agent but to license the possessor as the maleficiary. In contrast, the passive marker *gěi* in Mandarin is a preposition that has evolved out of a verb in a serial verb construction. It is used to mark and introduce the agent in (61) in preverbal position.

Second, as discussed in sections 3 and 4, the malefactive usage of *ya*³³ is an extension of the benefactive usage. Thus, the crucial requirement for using malefactive *ya*³³ is the existence of three participants. When this requirement is not met, even if the event is adversative, it is inappropriate to use the malefactive *ya*³³. Real passive constructions, on the other hand, do not have this constraint, as shown clearly in (61), which contains only two arguments and, consequently, two participants. This distinction comes exactly from the fact that the malefactive *ya*³³ is a valency increaser adding a third maleficiary participant, while the passive marker *gěi* does not license any additional participant, but merely marks the agent.

In Mandarin, *gěi* can also be used in an agentless passive construction, as in (63). This looks like the malefactive example with an omitted agent, as shown in (64). However, the difference between them is evident: According to our claim, the malefactive construction requires overt mention of a possessor, the maleficiary licensed by *ya*³³, as in (64). In contrast to this, *gěi* in (63) can be viewed rather as a

valency decreaser, resulting in omission of the agent argument. Such usage is impossible for *ya*³³, as indicated by (65).

(63) Agentless passive constructions in Mandarin:

Fángzi *gěi* *Shāo* *Le*
house give Burn ASP

‘The house was burned down.’ (Yap & Iwasaki 2003:422)

(64) Malefactive constructions with an omitted agent in Jinghpo:

*Sa*³¹*myin*³³ (...) *a*²³¹ *n*³¹*gup*³¹ *bai*⁵⁵ *ma*³¹*tep*⁵⁵ *a*³¹*pyet*³¹
Flat-mouth-fish POSS mouth again nip cause-flat

*dat*³¹ *ya*³³ *ai*³³
AUX give PFV

‘(The brothers) again nipped flat the mouth of the flat-mouth-fish.’

(*Story of how people begin to make a living*: 121)

(65) **Ngai*³³ *a*³¹*dup*³¹ *ya*³³ *sa*³³*ngai*³³.
1SG beat give 1SGAG, PFV

Intended meaning: ‘I was beaten.’

Therefore, based on this empirical evidence, we can conclude that examples in Jinghpo such as (62) and (64) cannot be considered as passive constructions, but rather as the malefactive usage of *ya*³³, an extension in usage from the benefactive construction.

Furthermore, from the overall perspective of grammaticalization, it is not plausible to analyze the malefactive use of *ya*³³ in Jinghpo as a passive one. Chappell & Peyraube (2006) proposed that all passive markers which have their source in verbs of giving are not directly derived from these verbs of giving, but come from an intermediate stage of causative verbs, derived themselves from verbs of giving. Yap and Iwasaki (2003, 2007) provide a similar analysis, namely, that passives emerge when causative verbs grammaticalize and become semantically extended, such that they can take non-agentive subject arguments. This development is generally mediated via permissive causative and reflexive environments. The permissive causative use and the reflexive passive use of *gěi* in Mandarin are shown in (66) and (67) respectively.

(66) *Wǒ* *Gěi* *Nǐ* *cāi* *ge* *míyǔ*.
I Give You guess CL riddle

‘I will let you guess a riddle.’ (Yap & Iwasaki 2003:421)

(67) *Lìsì Gěi Zhāng Sān kànjiàn le.*
 Lisi Give Zhang San see ASP

‘Lisi was seen by Zhang San(or more literally: ‘Lisi let Zhangsan see himself’).’ (Yap & Iwasaki 2003:422)

In Jinghpo, *ya*³³ is only used as a valency increaser. This proceeds along the particular grammaticalization pathway that begins with the dative/benefactive constructions expressing recipient, beneficiary or deputative senses, then extends to the malefactive. It has not fully embarked on the particular grammaticalization pathway that leads to the expression of causative semantics, a separate pathway according to Chappell & Peyraube (2006) who suggest that there are at least two grammaticalization chains associated with verbs of giving in Sinitic languages :²⁰

V [+give] > dative marker

V [+give] > causative verb > passive marker

We propose the following chain of grammaticalization for *ya*³³ in Jinghpo:

(68) Stage I > Stage II > Stage III

V [+give] > dative marker (recipient) / benefactive > malefactive

The syntactic configurations for each stage, despite a basic similarity, show important differences reflecting the semantic transformations involved in the grammaticalization process:

Stage I : Verb of giving : NP_{1(AGENT)} – NP_{2(RECIPIENT)} – NP_{3(PATIENT)} – V₁ = *ya*³³

Stage II: Derived ditransitive construction with dative/benefactive : NP_{1(AGENT)} – NP_{2(BENEFICIARY)} – NP_{3(PATIENT)} – V₁ V₂ = *ya*³

Stage III: Malefactive construction: NP_{1(AGENT)} – [N_{2(MALEFICIARY)} – GEN – N₃]NP_{2(PATIENT)} – V₁ V₂ = *ya*³
 OR: NP_{1(AGENT)} – NP_{2(MALEFICIARY PATIENT)} – NP_{3(LOC)} – V₁ V₂ = *ya*³

There are in fact a few examples in which *ya*³³ is interpreted with a kind of weak and covert causative semantics. This feature is illustrated by (69) and (70).

(69) *Ngai*³³ *n*³³ *kam*³³ *hkon*⁵⁵ *ya*³³ *n*³³*ngai*³³.
 1SG not Want sing give 1SGAG; IPFV
 ‘I do not want to have to sing.’

(70) *Ma*³¹*Ko*³³ *shi*³³ *a*³¹ *ga*³¹ *n*³³ *kam*³³ *ma*³¹*dat*³¹ *ya*³³ *ai*³³.
 Ma Ko 3SG POSS words not want listen give IPFV
 ‘Ma Ko doesn’t want to have to listen to his words.’

These two sentences usually indicate that a third party asks the agent to perform an activity, such as ‘singing a song’ or ‘listening to the elder’s advice’, but the agent is not willing to do the activity described. This implied causer can never be realized overtly in the sentence. Therefore, the function of *ya*³³ here is completely different from the causative usage of *gěi* in Mandarin in (66), in which *gěi* is a permissive–causative complementizer connecting the causer and the causee. In addition, such a usage of *ya*³³ is very limited. The two examples above represent all the cases we have been able to find. Consequently, at present it does not seem that *ya*³³ in Jinghpo will take this path of development into a causative verb and finally into a passive marker in the same way as *gěi* in Mandarin does, or similar verbs in other Sinitic languages.

Before we close our discussion on the malefactive and the passive, we would like to present just one passive example from Jinghpo. Jinghpo makes use of a passive marker *hkrum*⁵⁵ grammaticalized from the lexical verb ‘meet’, ‘be in contact with’ which, interestingly, is not one of the documented sources given in Heine and Kuteva (2002).²¹ It has both agent and agentless forms. The agentless type is illustrated in (67a) and has the syntactic configuration NP_{patient} – Verb – *hkrum*⁵⁵ (passive marker) – Clause markers. The agentless type is illustrated in (67b) and has the configuration NP_{patient}–NP_{agent}–*e*³¹–Verb–NMLZ–*hkrum*⁵⁵–Clause markers.

(67)a *Ngai*³³ *ga*³¹*yai*³³ *hkrum*⁵⁵ *sai*³³.

1SG beat contact PFV

‘I was beaten.’/ ‘I met with a beating.’

b *Ngai*³³ *shi*³³ *e*³¹ *ga*³¹*yai*³³ *ai*³³ *hkrum*⁵⁵ *sai*³³.

1SG 3SG AG beat NMLZ contact PFV

‘I was beaten by him.’

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we have discussed a constellation of Jinghpo *ya*³³ constructions involving nuclear serialization from various angles. It has been shown that these constructions formed by *ya*³³ all present clear cases of valency-increasing. *Ya*³³, following the lexical verb in serialization, adds an additional recipient or beneficiary argument to the subcategorization of its preceding lexical verb. It already shows signs of increasing syntactic bondedness with V₁ in its evolution towards auxiliary status. As an obligatory or conventionalized component in nuclear serialization of an SOV language, *ya*³³ is thus used to derive ditransitive verb complexes and is effectively the sole strategy in Jinghpo to fulfil this function. Furthermore, as a quasi-auxiliary verb, it is not easy for *ya*³³ to be separated from its preceding lexical verb to move into a preverbal position where it might evolve into a postpositional marker of the benefactive in Jinghpo. Consequently, the typological profile of Jinghpo blocks *ya*³³ from grammaticalizing into an adposition in any way similar to SVO languages with core serialization, such as Mandarin.

We also proposed that the benefactive usage is extended to express malefactive semantics in a separate, derived construction, containing a possessive relation licensed by *ya*³³ which expresses that a possessor is harmed by virtue of their possession being negatively affected. We furthermore observe that the existence of two separate constructions conforms to Radetzky & Smith’s claim (2010: 99, 116) that distinct benefactive and malefactive constructions are an areal feature of the Indian subcontinent, Southeast and East Asia.

Though the semantics embodied by the malefactive usage is similar to the adversative passive construction found in many other East and Southeast Asian languages, *ya*³³ was shown to be completely distinct from agent markers in passives which also act as valency decreasing markers in certain languages, including Mandarin. Finally, we argued that it is above all the nuclear serialization feature of Jinghpo which determines the lack of likelihood for *ya*³³ to evolve along a separate grammaticalization pathway into a causative-permissive complementizer and then into a passive marker as the ‘give’ verbs of core serialization structures in many Sinitic and Southeast Asian languages are able to do.

Acknowledgements

We are greatly indebted to Professor Balthasar Bickel and the three anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper, which helped us to revise this paper substantially. Some parts of this paper have been presented in quite different versions at the 16th Annual Conference of the International Association of Chinese Linguistics (IACL-16) held in Beijing in June, 2008, at the 21^{ème} Journées de Linguistique de l’Asie Orientale held in Paris (2008) and at the 41st International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics (ICSTLL-41) held in London (2008) by the first author, Peng Guozhen. We would like to thank the audience at these conferences for their many comments on the earlier versions, which greatly contributed to clarifying various concepts and improving the analysis. Our gratitude also extends to Professor Dai Qingxia, the author of *Jinghpoyu yufa* (A grammar of the Jinghpo language), who kindly checked through all the Jinghpo examples for us.

For this project, the first author conducted two fieldwork trips to the Dehong Dai and Jinghpo Autonomous Prefecture of Yunnan Province, funded by a grant from the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), France during a two-year period as a CNRS postdoctoral fellow at the Centre de recherches linguistiques sur l’Asie orientale, Paris: the first fieldwork trip was conducted in Luxi county during the period April 16 – May 26, 2008; the second one was carried out in Luxi county, Da Zhai village and Xiao Zhai village in the town of Tongbiguan in Yingjiang county during the period October 25 – December 13, 2008. We are very grateful to Ms Dong Masang, Ms Shi Ruifang, Mr Paocheng Meihela, Mr Li Chengrong, Ms Yue Xueqiu, Mr Sha Xiaodong, Mr Zhao Min, Mr Li Mingxue, Mr Dao Xiuhua and Miss Sha Baomai for their assistance during this fieldwork.

The second author, Hilary Chappell, would also like to acknowledge that research leading to these results has received partial funding from the European Research Council under the European Community’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013): ERC Advanced Grant agreement No. 230388: ‘The hybrid syntactic typology of Sinitic languages’ (2009-2012). This particularly regards the components of the project on clause structure from an Asian areal perspective.

List of abbreviations

1: first person; 2: second person; 3: third person; ACC: accusative; ADV: adverbial phrase marker; AG: agent marker; AUX: auxiliary verb ; ASP: aspect; CLF: classifier; DAT: dative; DO: direct object; DB: deputative beneficiary; DPM: differential patient marker; EXCL: exclamatory mood; GEN: genitive; IO: indirect object ; IRR: irrealis ;IPFV: imperfective; IMP: imperative; LOC: locative; NP: Noun phrase; NMLZ: Nominalizer; P: patient; PB: plain beneficiary; PL: plural ; PROG: progressive ; PFV: perfective; Q: question; R: recipient; RB: recipient beneficiary; SG: singular; T: theme; TOP: topic; V: verb

Notes

¹ ‘Sinopheric zone’ is a term coined by James Matisoff to refer to languages of Southeast Asia that have been, during one period or another, subjected to the cultural influence of China, for example, Vietnamese. See Matisoff (1991).

² In fact, to our knowledge, no other researchers are using the term ‘nuclear serialization’ to treat this particular phenomenon in SEA languages, though many use Matisoff’s term ‘verb concatenation’, ‘versatile verbs’ (Matisoff 1974), if not, incorporable verbs (Smeall 1975).

³ In China, the ethnic Jinghpo are known by the same name Jingpo (景颇) as opposed to the use of the name, Kachin, in Burma. They include five sub-branches: Jinghpo, Zaiwa, Maru, Lachi, and Bola. All of them share similar culture, religion, traditions etc. The ethnic population in 2007 was registered as 135,421. Though the official nationality of the five sub-branches is Jinghpo, each sub-branch speaks a different language, with Jinghpo and Zaiwa being the most widely used languages for the Jinghpo people. The Jinghpo language differs from the four other languages in grammar and lexicon and belongs to a different sub-branch of the Tibeto-Burman language family. It is generally agreed that Zaiwa, Maru, Lashi and Bola belong to the Lolo-Burmese subgroup while Jinghpo belongs to a separate Jinghpo subgroup (Thurgood 2003: 8; Van Driem 2001 cited in Lustig 2002:4). In Burma, the ethnic Jinghpo are called Kachin, and include two more branches, namely Lisu and Nu, in addition to those included in China. The population is approximately 900,000 (Lewis 2009: 344). In India, the population of the ethnic Jinghpo is only 2,500. The language they use is Singhpo, which is claimed to have fifty percent lexical similarity with Jinghpo in Burma (Lewis 2009: 403). The writing system for Jinghpo was devised at the end of the 19th century, with small differences between the ones used in China and Burma. For example, the [-aw -] used in the Burmese orthography is always spelled as [-o -] in the Chinese romanization. In this paper, we follow Dai and Diehl (2003) in using ‘Jinghpo’.

⁴ As for the classification of the Jinghpo sub-branch, there are different opinions: Burling (1983:1-32) proposes to classify Jinghpo into the SAL languages which share lexical items meaning ‘sun’; Thurgood (2003:11) and Lewis (2009: 479) classify Jinghpo under the Bodo-Konyak-Jinghpo subgroup; Van Driem (2001) cited in Lustig (2002:4) classifies it as a Nungish-Jinghpo subgroup; the proposals of Bradley (1997) and Dryer (2008) are similar to Thurgood in grouping Jinghpo together with Bodo-Garo and Konyak as belonging to the northeastern Indian (SAL) subgroup.

⁵ Some Tibeto-Burman languages have a very complex verbal morphology. Whether or not this verb agreement system should be reconstructed for Proto-Tibeto-Burman has been a controversial topic. There exist two contrasting opinions. Bauman (1974) and Delancy (1989) argue in favor of reconstructing a verb agreement system for Proto-Tibeto-Burman. In contrast, LaPolla (1992:311-312) proposes the opposite: that there is not enough evidence to assert a case of shared retention in those languages that exhibit it and that it was lost in those languages that do not exhibit it. The Tibeto-Burman taxon began as a morphologically simple ‘role-dominated’ language, in his view.

⁶ As one of the anonymous reviewers points out, terms like ‘subject’ and ‘object’ are misleading, if such grammatical relations cannot be established on the basis of syntactic pivots. It is true that the marking of the agent or the patient in Jinghpo is primarily animacy-based and is not fully grammaticalized to mark every grammatical subject or patient. Thus, it is hard to justify such grammatical terms as subject or object. Matthias (2008:325) also points out that ‘one specific subtype of DOM, namely Ambiguity-Driven Differential Object Marking, always makes it difficult to properly define grammatical relations.’

⁷ Thus for the examples in this paper, if *sai*³³ or *ai*³³ is used for first or second person subject, we only gloss them with perfective or imperfective aspect.

⁸ Note also that all the examples come from the first author’s database of Jinghpo materials collected during two fieldwork trips of about three and half months’ duration, unless otherwise stated. There are a total of four parts to the recording materials: Part I (Dialogue 1) and Part II (Dialogue 2) are recordings

of conversations of three or four Jinghpo native speakers without any interruptions by the researcher. Part III (Dialogue 3) is a recording of a discussion and a narration by three speakers while watching a special video program. Part IV comes from a recording of a story named *Shing³¹ gyim³³ ma³¹ sha³¹ nga³¹ pra³³ sa³³ wa³¹ ai³³ lam³³* ‘The story of how people begin to make a living’ told by an old Jinghpo speaker. The rest of the Jinghpo examples are elicited from six native speakers.

⁹ However, there are cases which happen to involve an animate theme. In this case, there is a need to distinguish among these three semantic roles. Interestingly, in this situation, it is not the recipient that takes the *hpe²⁵⁵* marking, but the theme, whereas the recipient is marked by a postposition.

¹⁰ We do not distinguish between the term ‘serial verb construction’ and ‘verb serialization’, using these two terms interchangeably in this article.

¹¹ *Ya³³* here has the lexical meaning of placing, when used in combination with the verb *bang³³* ‘put’.

¹² These originally V_2 position verbs have also been depicted as ‘aspectivizers’ or ‘vector verbs’ in the relevant literature on Tibeto-Burman (see, for example, Peterson 2007).

¹³ There is however decategorialization – inability to be modified by aspect markers etc.

¹⁴ Note that depending on the contextual clues and the judgement of the speaker, this malefactive construction could also be interpreted as a benefactive: ‘I killed Ma Ko’s chicken for his benefit.’ We suggest that it is precisely such examples which furnish the bridging context enabling the expansion from benefactive domains to the malefactive ones (see Heine 2002 on this concept). We would thus expect for the newer two-argument construction, that is, the malefactive, there would still be some instantiations ambiguous between benefactive and malefactive readings (since the benefactive is the base construction, out of which the malefactive developed) but not so for the benefactive, the older construction from a diachronic point of view. Suffice it to say that the three-argument benefactive structure excludes the malefactive interpretation. This area needs much further research on our part but does not alter the main findings of the paper.

¹⁵ Though the order of agent and recipient can be switched around freely, the recipient tends to precede the theme. This is consistent with the fact that the recipient is generally human and often definite and thus tends to be more topical than the theme (see Thompson 1995 on information flow and secondary topics).

¹⁶ Various terms are used in the literature for labeling such forms in other languages. In this paper, we use ‘benefactive valency increaser’.

¹⁷ *Ya³³* is obligatory in (67), while it can be deleted in (68). But, without *ya³³*, sentence (68) no longer expresses malefactive semantics. It is merely an objective description of the event of the ant biting the hunter’s foot.

¹⁸ There were also two further cases of *ya³³* in clause-final position whose status is unclear at this stage of research.

¹⁹ Clause markers include clause-final inflection words, imperative markers, conjunctions, irrealis markers, etc.

²⁰ Note also that the syntactic configuration for the datives is different from that for the passive and causative constructions: the dative markers always follow the main verb in Sinitic languages, whereas the causative and passive exponents precede it.

²¹ We note in passing that verbs which mean ‘meet’ or ‘make contact with’ are, however, a common source in Sinitic languages for agentful passive markers, as in the verb *zhuó* 着 (see Li Lan 2006) and can also be found in other Southeast Asian languages such as Khmer (see Thach and Paillard 2009), Thai and Lao.

References:

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. *Serial verb constructions: a cross-linguistic typology*. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), 1-68. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Bauman J. 1974. Pronominal verb morphology in Tibeto-Burman. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 1.1: 108-155.
- Bisang, Walter. 1992. *Das Verb im Chinesischen, Hmong, Vietnamesischen, Thai und Khmer (Vergleichende Grammatik im Rahmen der Verbserialisierung, der Grammatikalisierung und der Attraktorpositionen)*. Tübingen: Narr
- Bradley, David. 1997. Tibeto-Burman languages and classification. *Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics No. 14: Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayas*, David Bradley (ed.), 1-72. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Bresnan, Joan & Lioba Moshi. 1990. Object asymmetries in comparative Bantu syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 147-185.
- Bril, Isabelle. 2007. Nexus and juncture types of complex predicates in Oceanic languages: Functions and semantics. *Language and linguistics* 8(1): 267-310.
- Burling, Robbins 1983. The SAL languages. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 7.2: 1–32.
- Chappell, Hilary. 2008. Variation in the grammaticalization of complementizers from *verba dicendi* in Sinitic languages. *Linguistic Typology* 12.1: 45-98.
- Chappell, Hilary & William McGregor. 1996. Prolegomena to a theory of inalienability. In *The grammar of inalienability. A typological perspective on body part terms and the part-whole relation*. H. Chappell & W. McGregor (eds.), 3-30. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chappell, Hilary and Alain Peyraube. 2006. The diachronic syntax of causative structures in Early Modern Southern Min. *Linguistic studies in Chinese and neighboring languages*, Dah-an Ho, H. Samuel Cheung, Wuyun Pan & Fuxiang Wu (eds.), 973-1011. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Clark, Marybeth. 1974. Submissive verbs as adversatives in some Asian languages. In *South-East Asian Linguistic Studies*, Nguyen Dang Liem (ed.), (Pacific Linguistics C-31, Vol. 1), 89-110. Canberra: RSPacS, Australian National University.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

-
- Creissels Denis. Benefactive applicative periphrases: a typological approach, In *Benefactives and malefactives: typological perspectives and case studies*, Zúñiga, F. & S. Kittilä (eds.), 29-69. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Crowley Terry. 2002. *Serial Verbs in Oceanic: A Descriptive Typology*. Oxford University Press.
- Dai, Qingxia & Xu Xijian. 1992. *Jinghpoyu yufa* (A grammar of the Jinghpo language). Beijing: Zhongyang Minzu Chubanshe.
- Dai, Qingxia & Lon Diehl. 2003. Jinghpo. *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*, Graham Thurgood & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), 401-426. London/New York: Routledge.
- Dryer, Matthew. 2008. Word order in Tibeto-Burman languages. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 31.1: 1 - 83.
- DeLancey, Scott 1989. Verb agreement in Proto-Tibeto-Burman, *BSOAS*, LII, 2: 315–33.
- van Driem, George. 1993. “Einige Bemerkungen zum Aspect im Limbu”, *Linguistische Berichte*. 148: 483-489.
- Foley, William A and Robert D. Van Valin Jr. 1984. *Functional syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd. 2002. On the role of context in grammaticalization. In Ilse Wischer & Gabriele Diewald (eds.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, 83-101. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heine Bernd & Kuteva Tania. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2007. *The genesis of grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hermann, Karen. 1979. Coping with complex polysemy: a comparison of dative/benefactive constructions in Mandarin and Thai. *BLS* 5:106-113.
- Jeong, Youngmi. 2007. *Applicatives: structure and interpretation from a minimalist perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jiang, Lansheng. 1999. Shiyi yu beidong jianyong tanyuan (Exploring the origins of the syncretism of the causative and the passive). In *Honor of Mei Tsu-Lin: Studies on Chinese Historical Syntax and Morphology*, Alain Peyraube & Chaofen Sun (eds.), 57-72. Paris: Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales.
- Kittilä Seppo. 2006. Object-, animacy- and role-based strategies. *Studies in Language* 30:1-32.
- Kiyosawa Kaoru & Donna B. Gerds . 2010. Benefactive and malefactive uses of Salish applicatives. In *Benefactives and malefactives: typological perspectives and case studies*, Zúñiga, F. & S. Kittilä (eds.), 147-183. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1992a. ‘Anti-ergative’ marking in Tibeto-Burman. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 15.1: 1-9.

-
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1992b. On the dating and nature of verb agreement in Tibeto- Burman. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. 55.2: 298-315.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1994. Parallel grammaticalizations in Tibeto-Burman languages: Evidence of Sapir's 'drift'. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 17.1: 61-80.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 2003. An overview of Sino-Tibetan morphosyntax. *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*, Graham Thurgood & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), 22-42. London & New York: Routledge.
- Lewis, Paul (ed.). 2009. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. Sixteenth edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International.
- Li Lan. 2006. *Zhuo zi shi beidongju de gongshi fenbu yu leixing chayi*. (The synchronic distribution and typological differences for passive sentences formed with *zhuo* (着) in Chinese dialects). *Zhongguo Fangyan Xuebao* 1:194-205.
- Lord Carol. 1933. *Historical change in serial verb constructions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia:John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lustig, Anton. 2002. *Zaiwa grammar*. Ph.D. dissertation. Leiden University.
- Malchukov, Andrej. 2008. Animacy and asymmetries in differential case marking. *Lingua* 118:203-221.
- Malchukov, Andrej, Martin Haspelmath & Comrie Bernard (eds.). 2010. *Studies in ditransitive constructions: a comparative handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matisoff, James A. 1979. Verb concatenation in Kachin. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 1.186-206.
- Matisoff, James A. 1991. Areal and universal dimensions of grammaticalization in Lahu. *Approaches to grammaticalization*, Vol. 1: Focus on theoretical and methodological issues, Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.), 383-453. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Matisoff, James A. 2001. Genetic vs. contact relationship: prosodic diffusibility in South-East Asian languages. *Areal Diffusion and genetic inheritance: Problems in comparative linguistics*, Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), 291-327. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matthews, Stephen. 2006. On serial verb constructions in Cantonese. Alexandra Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.) *Serial verb constructions*, 69- 87. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Matthias Gerner. 2008. Ambiguity-driven differential object marking in Yongren Lolo. *Lingua* 118:296-331.
- Peterson, D. A. 2007. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-
- Radetzky Paula & Tomoko Smith. 2010. Study of benefactive and malefactive constructions. In *Benefactives and malefactives: typological perspectives and case studies*, Zúñiga, F. & S. Kittilä (eds.), 97-120. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Smeall, Christopher. 1975. Grammaticalized verbs in LoLo-Burmese. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 2.2:273:87.
- Solnit, David B. 2006. Verb serialization in Eastern Kayah Li. *Serial verb constructions: a cross-linguistic typology*, Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), 144-159. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thach, Joseph Deth & Denis Paillard. 2009 Description de tr◌◌ en Khmer contemporain. *Cahiers de linguistique Asie Orientale* 38.1. 71-124.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 1995. The iconicity of ‘Dative Shift’ in English: Considerations from information flow in discourse. *Syntactic iconicity and freezes: The human dimension*, Marge E. Landsberg, (ed.), 155-175. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Thurgood Graham. 2003. A subgrouping of the Sino-Tibetan languages: the interaction between language contact, change, and inheritance, *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*, Graham Thurgood & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), 3-21. London/New York: Routledge.
- Van Valin, Robert & Randy LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yap, Foong Ha & Shoichi Iwasaki. 2003. From causative to passive: A passage in some East and Southeast Asian languages. *Cognitive linguistics and non-Indo-European languages* [Cognitive Linguistics Research 18]. Eugene Casad & Gary Palmer (eds.), 419-446. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yap, Foong Ha & Iwasaki Shoichi. 2007. The emergence of ‘give’ passives in East and Southeast Asian languages. *SEALS VIII. Papers from the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistic Society*, (1998), Mark Alves, Paul Sidwell & David Gil (eds.), 193-208. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Zhang, Min. 2003. Lishi leixingxue yu hanyu lishi yufa de xin keti (New topics in diachronic typology and Chinese historical linguistics). Paper presented at the International Symposium ‘Looking back and looking ahead at research on Chinese historical linguistics’ (*Hanyushi yanjiu de huigu yu zhanwang*).
- Zhu, Dexi. 1979. Yu dongci gei xiangguan de jufa wenti (Syntactic problems concerning the verb ‘give’). *Fangyan* 2: 81-87.
- Zúñiga, F. & S. Kittilä. 2010. Benefaction and malefaction: from a cross-linguistic perspective. In *Benefactives and malefactives: typological perspectives and case studies*, Zúñiga, F. & S. Kittilä (eds.), 1-28. Amsterdam: Benjamins.