

Arcodia, Giorgio Francesco (2017), On Sinitic influence on Macanese: focus on indirect causation, “Language Ecology”, 1(2), pp. 158-184.

<https://doi.org/10.1075/le.1.2.03arc>

**Please note that this article is under copyright and that the publisher should be contacted for permission to re-use or reprint the material in any form.**

### **On Sinitic influence on Macanese: focus on indirect causation\***

Giorgio Francesco Arcodia

University of Milano-Bicocca

#### **Abstract**

Macanese, the near-extinct Portuguese creole of Macao, is an understudied contact language with strong Malayo-Portuguese features. It is also characterised by Sinitic influence, which however has sometimes been downplayed in the literature (see Ansaldo and Matthews 2004). In this paper, I argue that a distinctive element of Macanese *vis-à-vis* other Asian Portuguese Creoles is the stronger role of Sinitic in its “typological matrix” (Ansaldo 2004, 2009). Sinitic influence on Macanese has already been invoked to account e.g. for reduplication (Ansaldo and Matthews 2004); however, little research on multi-verb constructions has been conducted so far. The main object of my study are constructions expressing indirect causation, and I focus on the *chomá* [call] - NP - VP pattern. I argue that, whereas in other Asian Portuguese

---

\* I would like to thank, first and foremost, Mário Pinharanda Nunes for granting me access to his corpus of data of spoken Macanese. It is not an exaggeration to say that, without his generosity, the research contained in this article could never be conducted. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the 20th conference of the European Association for Chinese Studies (Braga, July 2014) and at the 2015 joint meeting of the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics and the *Associação de Crioulos de Base Lexical Portuguesa e Espanhola* (Graz, July 2015). The author would like to thank the participants in the discussion, as well as two anonymous reviewers, for their insightful comments. I would also like to thank Alan N. Baxter, Ana R. Luís and Ana Krajnović-Rodrigues for their help with the analysis of language data and for pointing out useful references. Traditional characters have been used as a default for Chinese. For the Macanese data, we shall use the orthography devised by José dos Santos Ferreira as a default. For Mandarin Chinese, we use the *Pinyin* romanisation system; for Cantonese, we use the *Yale* romanisation; for Hokkien, we use the *Taiwanese Romanization System* (臺羅拼音 *Tâi-lô Phing-im*). For all other varieties, we use the transcriptions as provided by the sources. The glosses follow the general guidelines of the *Leipzig Glossing Rules*. List of abbreviations: Chin. = Mandarin Chinese; Mac. = Macanese; Port. = Portuguese.

Creoles the syntax of indirect causatives appears to be modelled mainly on Malay or on Indian substrate languages, for Macanese the model is clearly Sinitic.

**Keywords:** multi-verb constructions, Macanese, indirect causation, feature pool, typological matrix, contact-induced grammaticalisation, Asian Portuguese creoles

## 1. Introduction

Macanese, also known as Macao Creole Portuguese, *maquista/makista*, *patuá*, *papiá cristám di Macau* (Chin. 澳門土語 *Àomén tǔyǔ* or 澳葡土生土語 *Ào-Pú tǔshēng tǔyǔ*), is the near-extinct Portuguese creole of Macao. While the term ‘Macanese’ (Port. *Macaense*, Mac. *Maquista*) primarily defines the Macanese ethnicity, i.e. the people of mixed Portuguese and Asian descent whose ‘roots’ are in Macao (Pinharanda Nunes 2012a), it is also applied to the language, which however goes mostly by the name *patuá* among locals (Ansaldò and Matthews 2004, *inter alios*).

*Maquista* is classified as ‘nearly extinct’ by the Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons and Fennig 2016) and as ‘critically endangered’ by the Endangered Languages Project.<sup>1</sup> It was a language of the Macanese community roughly until the first half of the XX century; then, the progressive diffusion of education in Standard Portuguese (from the beginning of the XX century), together with emigration, brought about decreolisation of this variety and, eventually, its disappearance from normal use. Nowadays, *Maquista* is spoken fluently probably only by a handful of elderly people in Macao, although there is a somewhat larger number (in the region of 50?) of semi-speakers and younger passive learners, possibly also among members of the Macanese diaspora in North America, Portugal, Brazil and Australia (Pinharanda Nunes 2012a-b, p.c. 2016). Cultural activities aimed at preservation (rather than revitalisation) of the language have been going on at least since the late eighties (Pinharanda Nunes 2012a: 21), notably by the *Dóci Papiaçám di Macau* (‘sweet language of Macau’) theatre group; they stage plays and produce comedy videos in Macanese.<sup>2</sup> However, despite being an important symbol of Macanese identity, it is extremely unlikely that the language will be used again in everyday life.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.endangeredlanguages.com/lang/mzs> (last access: 29/11/2016).

<sup>2</sup> Their clips are freely available from the *Dóci Papiaçám di Macau* Youtube channel: [www.youtube.com/channel/UCxRaAKi5QGPIfGi3Vbr8Ngg](http://www.youtube.com/channel/UCxRaAKi5QGPIfGi3Vbr8Ngg) (last access: 11/10/2016).

The Macanese language shares many features with other Asian Portuguese (or Luso-Asian) Creoles (Pinharanda Nunes and Baxter 2004, Ansaldo and Cardoso 2009), as e.g. the postnominal genitive marker *-sa* (with Kristang and Tugu), and the typical preverbal TAM markers *já* ‘PFV’ (< Port. *já* ‘already’), *tá* ‘PROG/HAB’ (< *estar* ‘be, stay’) and *lôgo / lô* ‘FUT/IRR’ (< *logo* ‘soon’). It has especially close ties with Malaccan *papia kristang*, which had a particular strong influence in the formation of Macanese. Having developed in a Sinitic-speaking territory, Macanese is also characterised by Sinitic influence, mostly in syntax (Batalha 2000 [1953]); however, this has sometimes been downplayed in the literature (see Tomás 1988, Cardoso 2012), due to the sociohistorical circumstances in which this creole developed, as we shall see below (§2).

In this paper, I shall argue that a distinctive element of Macanese *vis-à-vis* other Asian Portuguese Creoles is the stronger role of Sinitic (specifically, Hokkien and/or Cantonese) in its “typological matrix” (Ansaldo 2004, 2009). Sinitic influence on Macanese has already been invoked to account for patterns of reduplication (Ansaldo and Matthews 2004), demonstratives (Pinharanda Nunes 2008), the use of the copula (Baxter 2009b) and the TAM system (Pinharanda Nunes 2011); however, little research concerning the origin of patterns of multi-verb constructions specifically focussed on Macanese has been conducted (see Baxter 1996, 2009a). The main object of my study are constructions expressing indirect causation, and I shall focus on the *chomá* [call] - NP - VP pattern:

(1) *Vôs chomá iou tomá amuichái vêm casa?*

2SG call 1SG take maidservant come home

‘And you (call >) want me to bring a maidservant home?’

(Ferreira 1967, *Má-lingu co má-lingu*)

(2) *pa agora têm que fazé video pa chomá mais gente vai olá ilôtro*

at now have to make clip to call more people go watch 3SG.PL

‘Now, they have to make video clips to attract more audience (lit.: to call more people go watch them)’<sup>3</sup>

This use of a verb meaning ‘to call’ as a marker of indirect causation is not very common, cross-linguistically; common sources of causative markers are verbs as DO, GIVE and TAKE

<sup>3</sup> This example comes from a clip by the theatre group *Dóci Papiaçám di Macau* (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YVy2Z0IHd6c>; last access: 28/11/2016).

(Heine and Kuteva 2002). A grammaticalisation path from ‘reported speech’ (SAY or DO) to causativity is common in Papua New Guinea and Africa, and it exists to some extent in Australia (Stef Spronck p.c. 2013, 2015); however, the only languages which make use of CALL as a marker of (indirect) causation I could find are Early Old English (*hātan*) and, to a lesser extent, Gothic (*haitan*; Cloutier 2013); this use did not survive in any modern Germanic language. This seemingly rare development is, however, extremely common in Sinitic languages, as e.g. Taiwanese Hokkien:

(3) 校長叫伊去校長室

*Hāu-tiúnn kiò i khi hāu-tiúnn-sik*

school-head call 3SG go school-head-room

‘the headmaster ordered(/made) her/him to go to her/his office’<sup>4</sup>

In Cantonese, a similar construction is possible both with the verb 叫 *giu* ‘to call’, but also with 嗌 *aai* ‘to yell’ (Cheung 2007: 89):

(4) 佢嗌阿黃去

*kéuih aai A-Wóng heui*

3SG yell old-Wong go

‘he (yelled >) asked/made old Wong go’

The verb *chamar* ‘to call’ is also used in Modern Portuguese in a parallel (but, crucially, not identical) construction, attested at least since the 17th century. As we shall see below, there are also parallel constructions in other Asian Portuguese (and Spanish) Creoles, using not only *chomá*, but also *gitá* ‘to yell’ and *mandá* ‘to send’, but these constructions typically involve adjacent verbs and/or case-marking of the (human) patient (Baxter 2009a). Hence, we argue that, whereas in other Asian Portuguese Creoles the syntax of indirect causatives appears to be modelled mainly on Malay or on Indian substrate languages, for Macanese the syntactic model is clearly Sinitic.

The main data for this research come from three sources: (a) the *Ta-Ssi-Yang-Kuo*, a XIXth century Portuguese magazine on the Far East, containing texts in (a form of) Macanese; (b) the prose works by José dos Santos Ferreira (Adé), the most prolific writer in the Macanese

<sup>4</sup> Ex. from [http://twblg.dict.edu.tw/holodict\\_new/index.html](http://twblg.dict.edu.tw/holodict_new/index.html) (last access: 2/3/2017).

language; and (c) a corpus of contemporary spoken Macanese collected by Mário Pinharanda Nunes (see below, §3).

The paper is organised as follows. Firstly, we will provide a brief sketch of the history of Macanese, paying special attention to the ecology in which this variety developed (§2). Secondly, we will present the data on the *chomá* construction, providing also some background information for our sources of language data (§3). Then, we will discuss the possible origins for the construction at issue, focussing on the typological matrix of Macanese (§4).

## 2. A short history of Macanese and of its ecology

Macao was set up as a trading port in 1557 by the Portuguese, although it was recognised as a city by the Viceroy of Portuguese India only in 1586; Goa and Malacca had been occupied almost fifty years before Macao, and by then the Portuguese had already started developing a trade network in Southern China (Ansaldo 2009). The linguistic landscape of the Portuguese settlements in Asia at that time arguably included contact varieties of Portuguese spoken in India and in Malacca (Pinharanda Nunes 2012b); moreover, a form of pidginised Portuguese developed in the so-called “China trade”, i.e. the trade between China and (some) Western countries between the 16th and the early 20th century. The main ports involved in the early period of the China trade were Macao and Canton, and the first speakers of this pidgin probably were Chinese traders who developed this variety in contact with speakers of Portuguese<sup>5</sup> and/or Macanese (Baxter 2009b; Li and Matthews 2016). The Sinitic language native to the area surrounding Macao was Zhongshan, a Yue dialect; however, Hokkien-speaking traders were soon attracted to the city (Baxter 2009b).

One aspect of the Portuguese settlement in Macao which set it apart from Malacca is the segregation which was imposed on “foreigners”. In the early days of Macao, only very few Chinese traders were allowed in the settlement, and they had to leave the inner city (i.e. the city within the walls) at nightfall; control on the relations between the foreigners and the Chinese was relaxed in the 19th century, especially after China’s defeat in the Opium Wars

---

<sup>5</sup> Here we use “Portuguese” in a loose sense: it is very likely that, at this stage, what was actually spoken with the locals was some restructured (possibly, pidginised) Portuguese vernacular (see Clancy Clements 2000, 2009; Ansaldo 2009). Moreover, due to space constraints, here we shall not discuss the issue of a possible African origin for features of Asian Portuguese Creoles; the reader is referred to Holm (2009) for an overview of this *vexata quaestio*.

(Ansaldo 2009). As to the Chinese population, by the mid-17th century Chinese Christians were already a significant presence in Macao, whereas non-Christians Chinese would still live outside the Christian area of the city; however, the integration of the ethnic Chinese in the Portuguese community was slow, and apparently did not happen on a large scale, at least before the 19th century (Pinharanda Nunes 2012b).

On the other hand, intermarriage was common within the Portuguese communities, and “Indo-Portuguese” (i.e. *Asian Portuguese*) families were far from rare; as pointed out by Pinharanda Nunes (2012b: 314), “[t]his would mean that, in the 16th century, the population under Portuguese jurisdiction comprised a good number of linguistic imports, many of which [...] would have spoken Malay”. It was usual practice for Portuguese men in Macao to marry “creole” women, i.e. Eurasian women from Malacca, and Malay women, “brought as servants or slaves” (Tomás 2009: 56). Indeed, the people usually referred to as “Portuguese” in this context mostly moved to Macao from the Asian settlements, especially Goa and Malacca, rather than from Europe. After the fall of Malacca to the Dutch in 1641, large numbers of residents moved to Macao (Tomás 2009); generally speaking, the influx of immigrants from Malacca, Batavia and other ports in the Malay archipelago continued well into the 19th century (Pinharanda Nunes 2012b). As pointed out by Tomás (2009: 50), the Portuguese presence in Asia “was based on a network system rather than on the control of a territory for the production of goods”, which led to “cross-pollination” of cultural and linguistic elements among the settlements (see also Ansaldo 2009: 75). To give but one example, the presence of a Malayo-Portuguese feature as pluralising noun reduplication in Indo-Portuguese varieties attests to the (likely) spread of linguistic traits among the Asian settlements (Holm 2009).

In the beginning, however, intermarriage did not involve Chinese wives; as Pinharanda Nunes (2012b: 316) puts it, “[t]he Chinese ascendancy of Macanese families throughout the centuries was, to a large extent, the result of the presence of the *muitsai* [maidservants] within the Portuguese and Eurasian households in Macau”. Since the *muitsai* moved in their new homes at a very young age, they should not have contributed much to the Macanese “feature pool” (Mufwene 2001), according to Pinharanda Nunes (2012b). We will get back to this below.

Hence, in this scenario Sinitic varieties may be expected to have had a limited impact on the early development of Macanese, if compared to other Portuguese-based Asian creoles(/pidgins), (restructured) Malay and other languages of South and Southeast Asia. In particular, as mentioned in the introduction, the strong influence of *papia kristang* in the

formation of Macanese has been stressed time and again in the literature (see Baxter 1996; Ansaldo 2009; Tomás 2009; Cardoso 2012; Pinharanda Nunes 2012a-b). However, Malaccan *kristang* itself is not immune from Sinitic influence: specifically, a number of features of *kristang* (e.g. the use of possessive *sa* as a marker of relativisation), may be seen as deriving from contact with Hokkien, often with the mediation of Bazaar Malay or Baba Malay (Baxter 1988: 99; see also Pinharanda Nunes 2011); crucially, this is true also for some serial verb constructions (we shall get back to this in §4).

While Sinitic languages are not expected to have had a strong direct influence on Macanese in its early stages, following the consolidation of Macanese families in the settlement and the diffusion of intermarriage with ethnic Chinese, Cantonese did have an influence on Macanese, visible e.g., as mentioned in the introduction, in the TAM system, or in the use of the copula *sã* (< Port. *são*), absent in *kristang*, under the likely influence of Cantonese 係 *haih* (Baxter 2009b: 286-287), *inter alia*. Interestingly, another construction of likely Sinitic origin in Macanese, i.e. the incorporation of the numeral *unga* ‘one’ in the demonstratives (e.g. *acunga* ‘that’; compare *kristang aké*), became the ordinary form of the demonstratives in the 20th century, but still appeared to be optional until the 19th, pointing towards a development in the later phase of language contact with Cantonese (Pinharanda Nunes 2008; Baxter 2009b). We must then distinguish between an early phase, dominated by Malayo-Portuguese and Malay varieties, and a later phase, starting in the 19th century, in which Macao’s “melting pot” included a significant number of Sinitic speakers, with Cantonese as an adstrate of *Maquista* (Pinharanda Nunes 2008, 2011; Ansaldo 2009). One should not forget that the Chinese population in Macao soared from about 7000 people in 1662 to between 60000 and 85000 towards the end of the 19th century; at that time, the “Portuguese” population was between 4000 and 6000 (Baxter 2009b: 278). In fact, as pointed out by Ansaldo (2009: 159), following the Manchu invasion of Canton (1652) there had been waves of mass migration of Cantonese and Hokkien speakers to Macao continuing well into the 19th century. Also, the Macanese gained the role of “power brokers” between China and the West precisely because of their knowledge of Chinese customs and of their bilingualism in Portuguese/Macanese and Cantonese (Ansaldo 2009: 154).

Moreover, the segregation between foreigners and ethnic Chinese in the early period of the Macao settlement was probably not as rigid as is usually assumed. Ansaldo and Matthews (2004: 2) point out that a small group of Hokkien-speaking Chinese traders were allowed to live in the settlement from very early on, and hence they were “in a position to influence the

emerging Portuguese creole from the outset, before the relaxation of controls and migration allowed Chinese to enter on a large scale”. Also, one should not underestimate the role of ethnic Chinese concubines (derogatorily referred to as *bichas* – ‘worms’), and their illegitimate offspring, in Macanese families. In fact, concubinage, and the presence of “many Chinese girls in the household” was even regarded as a peculiarity of Macao (vs. the rest of the Portuguese empire; Ansaldo 2009: 77). Whereas, as said above, Pinharanda Nunes (2012b) believes that Chinese women in Macanese households could not have contributed much in linguistic terms, Ansaldo and Matthews (2004: 4), suggest that “[a]s mothers and nannies, these Chinese women must have played a significant role in the development of Macanese from an early stage”.<sup>6</sup>

In sum, there is no doubt that Yue dialects, particularly Cantonese, have actually been important adstrates in the later development of Macanese. As to the early phase of development of the Creole, the Malayo-Portuguese blueprint and restructured Malay varieties were obviously dominant; however, there is reason to believe that Hokkien may also have played a role.

The third phase in the history of Macanese begins in the mid 19th century, as mentioned in the introduction, when schooling in European Portuguese for the Macanese population became more common, and Macanese went through a process of decreolisation (i.e. convergence towards the standard); in particular, access to education for girls, which had been hitherto very important agents for intergenerational transmission of the creole, dealt a fatal blow to *Maquista*. However, at least until the first half of the century, Macanese was well preserved in the immigrant community in Hong Kong, as only a minority of well-educated Macanese would use standard Portuguese; ordinary people, on the other hand, were usually bilingual in Macanese and Cantonese. This appears to be true also for the members of the Macanese diaspora in Shanghai (Baxter 2009b; Pinharanda Nunes 2011, 2012a), and arguably elsewhere; in point of fact, as we shall see in the next section, Pinharanda Nunes collected his corpus of 21st century Macanese in the expatriate community of Vancouver and

---

<sup>6</sup> In this connection, it might be interesting to report the description of the linguistic ecology of the Macanese community of Hong Kong in the late twenties made by an informant born in 1926 (from Pinharanda Nunes’s corpus, 2007; my translation):

We “children of Macao” in Hong Kong, (...) the first language we learned was [Cantonese] Chinese. When I was one to three I could speak only Chinese. Chinese before English, before Portuguese, before Macanese, it’s Chinese. Why? Because when we were born, our mothers hired a Chinese *ama* [woman servant] to look after us. Mom went to drink tea, play *mahjong*, while the Chinese *ama* looked after us.

Although we are dealing with a later period, and a different setting (Hong Kong), this shows a possible scenario for an influence in the early linguistic development of Macanese children by Chinese house servants.

San Francisco exactly because he wanted speakers with little exposure to Standard Portuguese (Pinharanda Nunes 2011). Moreover, generally speaking, the influence of European Portuguese was relatively slow even in Macao, as the most evident signs of convergence (e.g. in verbal inflection) seem to be visible in the second half of the 20th century (Pinharanda Nunes 2011). In fact, Arana-Ward (1977) refers to pre-WWII Macanese as the “old dialect”, in order to distinguish it from the more decreolised variety spoken after the War.

Lastly, in order to have a complete picture of the linguistic ecology of Macao, we must mention the observations made at the end of the 19th century by Pereira (1899: 55, my translation; see also Cabreros 2003), according to which there were three distinct varieties (sociolects?) of Macanese:

- a. *macaista cerrado / puro*, ‘pure Macanese’, “spoken by the lower classes”
- b. *macaista fallado pelos chins* ‘Macanese as spoken by the Chinese’<sup>7</sup>
- c. *macaista* “modified to approximate standard (Metropolitan) Portuguese”

These observations are important to us, firstly, because they prove that Macanese was spoken also by the ethnic Chinese, and thus would be subject to ‘double’ language contact – in the speech of the bilinguals of Eurasian ancestry, and in the speech of the bilinguals whose dominant language was a Sinitic variety; secondly, because they show us that the pool of variants did not include only *one* Macanese and Standard Portuguese, but, probably, a *continuum* of varieties.

To conclude, in Table 1 we summarise the evolution of the linguistic ecology in the history of the Macanese community.

Table 1. The linguistic ecology of Macanese

	<b>16th-18th century</b>	<b>19th century</b>	<b>20th century</b>
<b>Main events</b>	Establishment of the settlement; migration from Malacca increased after 1641; migration from the Canton region	Expansion of the Canton trade; defeat of China in the Opium Wars; steady growth of the Chinese population; beginning of	Diffusion of instruction in Portuguese in Macao; migration towards Hong

<sup>7</sup> According to Li and Matthews (2016), this Macanese spoken by the Chinese might actually be a variety of pidgin Portuguese, somewhat distinct from Macanese. Since the issue is not directly relevant to our discussion, we shall not deal with it any further.

	after 1652	schooling in Portuguese for the masses	Kong, Shanghai and the West; diffusion of English
<b>Main languages</b>	Malayo-Portuguese, pidgin Portuguese, vehicular Malay varieties, Hokkien (?)	Macanese, Cantonese, Standard Portuguese	Macanese, Cantonese, Standard Portuguese, English
<b>Sociolinguistic characteristics</b>	Limited contacts between the Macanese and the Chinese, no intermarriage, but concubinage and illegitimate offspring	Increased contact between the Portuguese and the Chinese, bilingualism in Macanese and Cantonese, different varieties/registers of Macanese	Decreolisation and shift towards Standard Portuguese and Cantonese; preservation of Macanese among elderly expats; disappearance of Macanese from daily use

What clearly emerges from our discussion is that, whereas the extent of Sinitic influence in the formation phase of Macanese may have been limited, there is little doubt that Chinese languages, particularly Cantonese, later became strong players in the typological matrix of *Maquista*. In the next section, we shall present our corpus and data.

### 3. Multi-verb constructions and the *chomá* - NP – VP pattern

As mentioned in the introduction, the *chomá* – NP – VP pattern of Macanese evolved, in our opinion, into a construction expressing indirect causation. Specifically, we believe that, just as is the case for Sinitic, this construction evolved into a so-called “pivotal construction”, i.e. a construction in which there are a verb (here, *chomá*), an NP and another verb, and the object of the first verb is the subject of the second verb (see e.g. Chao 1968; Li and Thompson 1981; Cheung 2007, *inter alios*). Compare the Macanese example in (5) and the Cantonese example in (6):

- (5) *Chomá Fred vê m dentro*  
 call Fred come inside  
 ‘(call >) ask Fred to come inside’ (Ferreira 1973, *Padrinho*)

(6) 我叫佢走

*ngóh giu kéuih jáu*

1SG call 3SG leave

‘I told him to leave’ (Matthews 2006: 74)

Aikhenvald (2006: 14), in her typological study of serial verb constructions (SVCs), includes pivotal construction into the set of “switch-function SVCs”. However, as noted e.g. by Matthews (2006: 74), pivotal constructions are not necessarily also SVCs, at least per Aikhenvald’s (2006) definition. This is because in her (widely adopted) definition of SVCs, an essential trait of this class of constructions is monoclausality, i.e. the verbs must “act together as a single predicate” (2006: 1; see also Aikhenvald 2011). On the other hand, in examples as (5) and (6) the second VPs seem to have independent illocutionary force (Matthews 2006). Also, if we choose to follow Ameka’s (2003) definition of SVC, the mere fact that the first and the second verb in the construction have different subjects already disqualifies them as SVCs.

In point of fact, the very notion of indirect causation (also known as “directive” causation) does not fit well into the “classical” definitions of SVC. In indirect causation, differently from direct causation, both the causer and the causee are agentive entities, and the causing and caused event enjoy some degree of autonomy; because of this, the caused event (Shibatani and Pardeshi 2002: 89)

may have its own spatial and temporal profiles distinct from those of the causing event. This separability of the caused event from the causing event, captured by the term ‘distant causation’, resists integration of the two, disallowing the construal of the whole causative situation as a single event.

Hence, I believe it is more correct to use the looser label “multi-verb constructions”, as defined by Ameka (2003: 2-3):

I assume, as a working definition, that a multi-verb construction is a sequence of verbs or verb phrases and their complements

- without any marker of syntactic dependency

- typically, at least one argument is common to all the verbs in a sequence (...)
- the VPs in the sequence are seen as related
- the individual verbs can function as independent verbs in simple clauses (in the same form)

Ameka (2003) also convincingly argues that even by adopting stricter criteria for the definition of SVCs, one ends up having SVCs with different features according to the typological profile of the language (also, for a criticism of the notion of SVC as applied to Sinitic and West African languages, see also Paul 2008). What is crucial for the phenomenon at issue, in our opinion, is the fact that the verbs in the *chomá* construction share one argument, and have no marker of syntactic dependency.

A parallel biclausal construction,<sup>8</sup> based on the verb *chamar* ‘to call’, has been attested in Portuguese at least since the 17th century:

- (7) *Cham-ou para escrev-er seu testamento a Dom Agostinho Manuel*  
 call-PRET.3SG to write-INF his will OBJ Don Agostinho Manuel  
 ‘He summoned/called Don Agostinho Manuel to write his will’  
 (Francisco Manuel de Melo, *Tácito Portugues*, 1995[1650])

Here we are obviously not dealing with a multi-verb construction, as the marker of dependency *para* and the use of a non-finite verb form in the second clause clearly demonstrate. In contemporary Portuguese, differential marking of the object is generally no longer used, and the (typical) order of the constituents is closer to that of Macanese:

- (8) *chamei João para ir comigo na casa de Rafael (...)*  
 call-PRET.1SG João for go-INF with.me to.DEF house of Rafael  
 ‘(I) called João to go with me to Rafael’s house (...)’ (web example)<sup>9</sup>

In both examples, however, the literal meaning of CALL is still dominant, we believe: there still is a physical act of ‘calling’ associated with these sentences. It would be far-fetched to propose that we are dealing with indirect causation. The same objections might apply to

---

<sup>8</sup> Note that not all scholars regard biclausal constructions as ‘true’ causatives. However, as suggested by Kulikov (2001: 887), the distinction between monoclausal and biclausal causative constructions “is by no means clear-cut”; according to him, the two types stand on a *continuum*, rather than being discrete categories.

<sup>9</sup> <https://spiritfanfics.com/historia/sede-de-vinganca-o-despertar-das-furias-2346373/capitulo15> (last access: 2/3/2017).

Macanese examples as (5), *supra*; however, we believe that examples as (1) and (2), repeated here for the sake of convenience, do represent unequivocal instances of indirect causation:

(1) *Vôs chomá iou tomá amuichái vêm casa?*

2SG call 1SG take maidservant come home

‘And you (call >) want me to bring a maidservant home?’

(2) *pa agora têm que fazé video pa chomá mais gente vai olá ilôtro*

at now have to make clip to call more people go watch 3SG.PL

‘Now, they have to make video clips to attract more audience (lit.: to call more people go watch them)’

In (1) and (2), there clearly is no physical act of calling involved. As to (1), extracted from a short (comedy) story, a woman suggests that the utterer of (1) hire a maidservant; later on, however, she tells her about a maidservant causing trouble in the home she was working for. (1) is the reaction to this piece of news: you know that this danger exists, and you still want me to bring a maidservant home? Obviously, no calling is involved. The same goes for (2): making videoclips is a way to attract more audience to theatre plays, but, surely, it cannot be construed as an act of ‘calling’. It is clearly a form of indirect causation, possibly of the “curative” subtype (“ask someone to bring about”), which is expressed morphologically e.g. in some Uralic languages, as Mansi (Kulikov 2001: 892, quoting Rombandeeva 1973):

(9) *ūnt(u)- > ūnt-t(u)- > ūnt-t-u-pt(a)-*

‘sit down’

‘seat’

‘ask to sit down’

Also, from the structural point of view, the *chomá* construction seems to be very rigid (i.e. conventionalised). Not only there is no marker of syntactic dependency but also, crucially, there is never overt marking of the patient (with *pa*); this is however possible when *chomá* is used to mean ‘to call’ or ‘to be called/named’, as in the following examples:

(10) *quim ta chomá pa iou?*

who PROG call OBJ 1SG

‘who’s calling me?’ (Ferreira 1967, *Má-lingu co Má-lingu*)

- (11) *Tudo gente na Macau assi chomá pa iou*  
 all people in Macao so call OBJ 1SG  
 ‘All the people in Macao call me this’ (Ferreira 1967, *Merenda Ai*)
- (12) *Cháchá chomá iou?*  
 grandma call 1SG  
 ‘is grandma calling me?’ (Ferreira 1967, *Mui-Mui sua neto*)
- (13) *vôs ja chomá puliça*  
 2SG PFV call police  
 ‘You already called the police’ (Ferreira 1973, *Padrinho*)

In the lexical uses of *chomá*, *pa* can be used, although it is not obligatory. It is however never attested with the *chomá* construction in my corpus.

In order to analyse the use of the *chomá* construction in the history of Macanese, we extracted all the instances of this construction in a corpus consisting of three main bodies of data, as hinted at in the introduction. Below we illustrate them in chronological order (from older to most recent).

The first main body of data comes from the *Ta-Ssi-Yang-Kuo* (Chin. 大西洋國 *Dàxīyáng Guó*, ‘The Atlantic Country’, i.e. Portugal). It is a Portuguese language magazine on the Portuguese Far East, for which the issues from 1899 to 1901 were available. The magazine is written in Standard Portuguese, but it contains also texts written in (some form of) Macanese, presented as “aids for the study of the creole dialects of the Far East” (*subsídios para o estudo dos dialectos crioulos do Extremo Oriente*). The whole available series contains 8 *subsídios* on Macanese, which include three poems, five letters from the readers (two from the same sender, one *Maria Varè-Rua* ‘Maria who wanders in the streets’), two *descomposturas* (‘quarrels’), two collections of riddles and two songs. This body of data is especially valuable because notes and commentaries are provided by the author, as an aid in the interpretation of creole structures; moreover, differences can be spot among the different texts, i.e. the language is not homogeneous.

The second, and by far larger set of data comes from the *œuvre* of José dos Santos Ferreira, known by his nickname “Adé” (‘duck’; 1919-1993), by far the most prolific writer in the Macanese language. He belonged to the last generation of fluent speakers of Macanese, and

his work represents a conscious attempt to record the language before it disappeared (Ansaldo and Matthews 2004). There are at least 5 plays, 8 short stories and 17 poems available; it is very likely that there are more, which we have not been able to track down. Some of his works are translations (or, better, adaptations) from Standard Portuguese and English (e.g. Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, Mario Puzo's *The Godfather*; see below, Fn. 11), and he offers translations into Portuguese for some of his works, which are obviously important for the correct understanding of the Macanese texts. However, we must remark that the language he uses represents his own ideas about Macanese; hence, we cannot know how much it reflects the usage of his contemporaries, especially since there was probably much interspeaker variation (see above, §2). Following Ansaldo and Matthews (2004), we chose to take into consideration only his prose works, as poetry, again, may not always be representative of the spoken language.

The third body of data comes from a corpus of contemporary spoken Macanese collected by Mário Pinharanda Nunes. While the full corpus ranges from 1984 to 2007, we could access only his transcriptions of the interviews conducted in 2007 in the Macanese community in Vancouver and San Francisco.<sup>10</sup> To the best of our knowledge, these constitute the most recent linguistic corpus of spontaneous spoken Macanese, and are of the utmost importance to assess diachronic change in this creole, being representatives of the 'decreolised' variety. The 2007 recordings involve seven women and men aged between 78 and 85 at the time of the interview, all born in the Twenties in Hong Kong (except for one informant who was born in Macao, but moved to Hong Kong at the age of 21); also, they had all been in their new countries for at least forty years then. The data were collected through semi-guided interviews, eliciting conversations about their family, their childhood, World War II, the past and present of Macao, friends and spouses, and their life as immigrants.

Note that there are also grammatical sketches of Macanese available: notably, the one by José dos Santos Ferreira (1978), and a somewhat longer description of post-WWII Macanese as spoken in Hong Kong by Arana-Ward (1977), besides other shorter descriptions (e.g. Batalha 2000 [1953]). While these have been useful as supporting material for the analysis of language data, they contain no mention of the *chomá* construction, and hence have not been used as primary sources.

The results of our survey are summarised in Table 2, where we listed all the occurrences of the *chomá* construction which we found in each source.

---

<sup>10</sup> Currently, there are plans to make the whole corpus freely available (Mário Pinharanda Nunes, p.c. 2016).

Table 2. Instances of the *chomá* construction in our sample

Name of text	Type of text	Source	Occurrences
<i>Ajuste de casamentu de Nhi Pancha cô Nhum Vicente</i>	Poem	<i>Ta-Ssi-Yang-Kuo</i> (1899)	2
<i>Em 23 de dezembro</i>	Poem	<i>Ta-Ssi-Yang-Kuo</i> (1899)	1
<i>Sium Lopes co su Nhonha</i>	Short story	Ferreira (1973)	1
<i>Panela di Quartêl</i>	Short story	Ferreira (1973)	2
<i>Livro di fôlia vérde</i>	Short story	Ferreira (1973)	1
<i>História de unga príncipe</i>	Short story	Ferreira (1973)	1
<i>Padrinho</i>	Short story	Ferreira (1973)	10 <sup>11</sup>
<i>Chico vai escola</i>	Short story	Ferreira (1973)	3
<i>Qui-nova, Chencho</i>	Comedy	Ferreira (1973)	2
<i>Mui-Mui sua neto</i>	Comedy	Ferreira (1967)	2
<i>Má-lingu co Má-lingu</i>	Short story	Ferreira (1967)	4
Informant SM16	Spoken conversation	Pinharanda Nunes (2007)	2
Informant SM17	Spoken conversation	Pinharanda Nunes (2007)	4

For ease of presentation, we did not mention the texts in which there was no occurrence of this construction.

The total number of occurrences of the *chomá* construction in our corpus is 35, a significant number if one considers the very limited data we had; however, not all of these are equally representative, from the semantic point of view. For instance, while an example as (1) does not involve any physical act of calling, as said above, many examples in our corpus are less clear. Compare:

(14) *chomá Bonasera intrá*

<sup>11</sup> An anonymous reviewer pointed out that the number of occurrences of the *chomá* construction is significantly higher in *Padrinho* than in the other sources. I suggest that this may be explained, firstly, by the fact that *Padrinho* is significantly longer (11 pages) than almost all of the other texts considered (mostly between 1 and 4 pages). Also, *Padrinho*, an adaptation of Mario Puzo's novel *The Godfather*, is a rather dense narrative, in which the main character, the *Padrinho*/Godfather, often gives orders to his henchmen: this is exactly the context in which an indirect causative construction is expected.

call Bonasera enter

‘(call >) ask Bonasera to come inside’ (Ferreira 1973, *Padrinho*)

(15) *Fred chomá iou falá...já dá um-cento dóla pa iou falá...*

Fred call 1SG talk PFV give one-hundred dollar for 1sg talk

‘Fred (call >) asked me to talk...he gave me one hundred dollars to make me talk’

(Ferreira 1973, *Padrinho*)

Example (14) is still directly connected with the lexical meaning of the verb *chomá*. In (15), however, the connection with the physical act of calling is much less direct; here the utterer is trying to excuse himself for lying, and says that he has been given a sum of money to do so. We believe that these may be seen as instances of “bridging contexts”, i.e. a phase in the semantic evolution of an item “from meaning A to B” in which “meaning B is only contextually implicated but not yet lexicalized as a distinct sense” (Evans and Wilkins 2000: 549-550); this happens not only in lexical polysemy, but also in grammaticalisation. Incidentally, this type of ambiguity is attested also in the history of Chinese 叫 *jiào* as well: as pointed out by Ōta (1987: 224), up until the Ming Dynasty (1368-1644) there are indeed relatively few examples of pivotal constructions in which the original meaning of 叫 *jiào*, i.e. ‘call’, is completely blurred. Below is an example from the “Yongle Encyclopedia” (永樂大典 *Yǒnglè Dàdiǎn*), an early 15th century document (Chappell and Peyraube 2006):

(16) 叫妹妹出來拜辭哥哥

*jiào mèimèi chū lái bài cí gēgē*

call Miss exit come say farewell Mister

‘Tell Mademoiselle to go out and say farewell to the gentleman’

Although this is cited as an early example of the CALL causative construction, here the lexical meaning of 叫 *jiào* may still be present. In point of fact, Chen (2009) highlights that in the Contemporary Hokkien 叫 *kiò* causative construction the causer must still be animate and volitional, and suggests that this is explained by the fact that it retains some of its original meaning of calling, an act which requires a volitional causer. We will get back to this below. Hence, it appears that the instances of the *chomá* construction may be arranged on a scale, ranging from less to more grammaticalised; in the more grammaticalised instances, the

lexical meaning of *chomá* is more “bleached” and “abstract”, fundamental correlates of grammaticalisation (Lehmann 1995 [1982]; Hopper and Traugott 2003). In other words, CAUSE is a more abstract concept than CALL, in that it does not “yield mental images” (Lehmann 1995 [1982]: 127); however, there is a metaphorical connection between the two, in that a physical act of ‘calling’ is reinterpreted as a generic action of persuasion, of indirect causation (on metaphor in grammaticalisation, see Heine, Claudi and Hünnemeyer 1991). While (15) may be interpreted as a more grammaticalised instance than (14), (1) or (2) are clearly further down the cline of meaning abstraction.

In some Sinitic languages, the CALL construction went another step down the cline. In Mandarin, 叫 *jiào* may be used as a marker of causation for stative verbs, even with non-volitional subjects (Chen 2009: 50; my glosses and translation):

- (17) 每天總是陰沉沉的，叫人心裡很煩悶  
*měi-tiān zǒngshì yīnchénchén de jiào rén xīn-li hěn fánmèn*  
 every-day always heavily.cloudy NMLZ call people heart-in very depressed  
 ‘Every day it is very cloudy, it makes people feel depressed’

In this case, meaning abstraction goes further, as the caused event is stative in nature, i.e. it is a psychological state, and hence the act of causation is even more indirect; moreover, here the causer of the event is clearly non-volitional (on the semantic evolution from intentional causation to non-intentional causation, see Chang 2006; Chappell and Peyraube 2006).

We found no occurrences of the *chomá* construction with stative predicates in our corpus; however, this usage for CALL is neither found in Hokkien, except for negative imperatives and rhetorical questions (Chen 2009), or in Cantonese,<sup>12</sup> the adstrates of Macanese. Interestingly, as hinted at above, both languages generally also do not allow inanimate and/or nonvolitional causers in the CALL causative construction, just as Macanese, but differently from Mandarin. Hence, the lack of stative causation for the *chomá* construction, and the requirement that the causer be animate and volitional, is consistent with our hypothesis of an origin of the construction in Hokkien and/or Cantonese.

In this connection, one last example worth discussing is the following:

- (18) *Quelê-môdo lôgo chomá sodado-sodado de batalham anôte-anôte* *entrá*

<sup>12</sup> I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out to me.

how            IRR   call   soldiers            of battle            in.the.middle.of.the.night enter  
*na iou sa casa?*

in 1SG POSS house

‘How could I let soldiers enter my house in the middle of the night?’

(Ferreira 1973, *Mui-Mui sua neto*)

In the passage from which (18) has been extracted, an old woman is narrating an incident in which she tripped on a hole, fell to the ground, and two handsome soldiers helped her and escorted her home. Another woman in the story asks her if the soldiers entered her home; she answers that, as an honourable married woman (*siara virtuosa*), she could not possibly let them in. We suggest that this may be interpreted as a sign of a possible evolution of the *chomá* construction from causative to permissive, a development which e.g. in Mandarin led to the grammaticalisation of 叫 *jiào* into a passive marker (see Xu 2003; Chang 2006). Note, again, that the use of CALL as a permissive (or passive) marker is not attested either in Hokkien (Chen 2009) or in Cantonese;<sup>13</sup> hence, in this respect the Macanese *chomá* construction could be argued to be further down the cline of grammaticalisation, if compared to its Sinitic adstrates. However, this is the only example of this type which we found in our corpus; hence, its significance is limited.

To sum up, in this section we have tried to show that the *chomá* construction is a conventionalised construction expressing indirect causation, with a stable form distinguishing it from the other uses of the lexical verb *chomá*; however, the degree of grammaticalisation of causative meaning varies among the different instances of the construction. Also, in our corpus we could not find instances of the *chomá* construction used with a stative verb and/or with a non-volitional causer, which is consistent with the CALL construction in Hokkien and Cantonese. We interpret this as a sign of the fact that, just as in its Sinitic adstrates, the *chomá* construction of Macanese still has a fairly strong connection with the lexical meaning CALL, which prevents its usage with non-volitional causers and stative predicates (differently e.g. from Mandarin); on the other hand, there is (very) limited evidence for an evolution of the *chomá* construction towards a permissive reading, which is apparently not attested in its adstrates. In the next section, we will probe into the origins of the *chomá* construction, taking into account the ecology of Macanese as discussed in § 2.

---

<sup>13</sup> I would like to thank (once again) an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out to me.

#### 4. Language contact, grammaticalisation and the typological matrix of Macanese

In an ecological approach to language evolution, contact languages may be seen as evolving out of a “feature pool” (Mufwene 2001), i.e. a pool of variants resulting from the contact of the languages involved. The output language or languages, thus, select particular features, or combination of features, from the pool of variants available. A parallel concept is that of the “typological matrix”, i.e. “a ‘matrix’ consisting of a number of interacting varieties, derived from careful socio-historical as well as typological observations” (Ansaldo 2004: 128); the typological matrix represents the “internal ecology” of a language, i.e. “system-internal considerations”, a complement to its “external ecology”, i.e. “the socio-cultural and historical dimensions of language” (Ansaldo 2009: 112). In a nutshell, the key concept behind the idea of a typological matrix for language evolution is that type and token frequency are expected to play a key role in the selection of features (Ansaldo 2009: 117):

token-frequency can be interpreted as discourse frequency: linguistic items that are frequent in discourse may be those that are grammatically obligatory, semantically salient, or pragmatically more relevant (...). Type-frequency can be interpreted in terms of congruence: constructions that are more common, for example, because of typological congruence, are more likely to dominate the T[ypological]M[atrix].

In this view, for instance, Sri Lanka Malay developed a case marking system, despite the fact that Malay varieties have none, because case marking is an important feature of two adstrates in its typological matrix, Sinhala and Tamil, leading to high type-frequency (congruence) of this feature in the matrix. Crucially, this applies also to alleged cases of “simplification”: for instance, the absence of the copula in adjectival predication for Singlish can be seen as a selection of a feature which clearly dominates the matrix, being characteristic of all the Sinitic and Malay adstrates of this language, rather than as simplification of English, the lexifier language (Ansaldo 2009: 117).

As to Macanese, we suggest that its typological matrix may be represented as such (compare Ansaldo 2004: 132):

- a. Lexifier: varieties of Asian Portuguese
- b. Substrate: (restructured) Malay varieties
- c. Early substrates/adstrates: Hokkien varieties

d. Later adstrates: Yue dialects (Cantonese, Zhongshan)

As said above, there is little doubt that Standard Portuguese had a very limited role in the matrix until recently. However, to err on the side of caution, in our discussion we will also mention it as a possible model.

We already showed above how the verb *chamar* was used in 17th century and Modern Portuguese in biclausal constructions. Also, a parallel construction is found in Cape Verdean Creole:<sup>14</sup>

(19) *Komu el ka sabeba skrebe, e txoma si fidju pa skrebe-l kel kárta*

as 3SG NEG know.ANT write 3SG call 3SG.POSS son for write-3SG DEM.SG letter

‘Since he couldn’t write, he called his son, so that he would write the letter for him’

Here there is little doubt that the construction is still comparable to the Standard Portuguese one, both because of the function word *pa* introducing the second sentence and for the lexical meaning that the verb *txoma* bears here. However, we believe that it is worth mentioning this structure in a Portuguese-based Creole, as it proves that it could be available in a contact environment, and hence probably attested also in colonial vernaculars.

Also, since *papia kristang* seems to have provided the blueprint for Macanese, it is important to mention that a multi-verb construction based on *chomah* is attested in this language too:<sup>15</sup>

(20) *Eli ja chomah ku yo bai kaza*

3SG PFV call OBJ 1SG go home

‘he already asked me to go home’

The first structural difference with the Macanese construction is marking of the ([+human]) object, which is required in *kristang*. Also, this construction is attested also with the *chomá*-VP-NP order, pointing to a lower degree of conventionalisation:

---

<sup>14</sup> Example of the Santiago variety, drawn from the *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures Online* (last access: 29/11/2016).

<sup>15</sup> Examples (20) and (21) courtesy of Alan Norman Baxter.

- (21) *Eli ja chomah bai kaza ku yo*  
 3SG PFV call go home OBJ 1SG

As to the semantic side of the issue, unfortunately we have no access to a corpus of *kristang* data, and hence we cannot know whether it grammaticalised to the same degree of the Macanese construction. Also, according to Baxter (2009a: 71), *kristang* allows verbs as *chomá*, *gitá* ‘to yell’ and even *falá* ‘to say’ as markers of *direct* causation; since he provides no examples for the pattern, we are not in a position to assess its relationship with *chomá* as a marker of indirect causation. Note, however, that the direct causative construction involves adjacent verbs, overt marking of the ([+human]) patient and an intransitive second verb (valency-increasing), and hence it is a very different construction from the one marking indirect causation.

We have, however, a detailed study of constructions marking indirect causation in Asian Ibero-Romance creoles (Baxter 2009a). See the following examples (Baxter 2009a: 72, 80):

- (22) *eli ja dá sabé ku yo John teng nakí*  
 3SG PFV give know DAT 1SG John be here  
 ‘He informed me that John was here’ (*papia kristang*)

- (23) *Per sinhor grande mandá fallá (...)*  
 DAT man big send say  
 ‘Have the squire informed that (...)’ (Sri Lanka Creole Portuguese)

- (24) *rainh mandô chamá par hortelão*  
 queen order.PST call OBJ gardener  
 ‘The queen had the gardener summoned’ (Daman Creole Portuguese)

The type of causation exemplified in (22) is termed by Baxter “facilitative causation”, and involves the serialisation of a transitive verb, which is turned into a ditransitive predicate; the construction is thus valency-increasing, and the reading is “facilitative” or “permissive” (Baxter 2009a: 73). While a parallel construction, based on the verb 予 *hōo* ‘to give’ is attested in Hokkien, in this language the verbs involved are not adjacent, whereas they appear in the same order as *kristang* in colloquial vehicular Malay; also, Malay has optional marking

of the recipient, while Hokkien has none. Hence, Baxter (2009a) suggests that Malay provides the best match, and is hence the most likely source for this construction. As to examples (23) and (24), from two Indo-Portuguese varieties, here again we are dealing with a causative construction involving adjacent verbs and marking of the patient; moreover, what is actually marked is the *object* of the second verb, whereas its agent is (mostly) non-specific. Also, the Portuguese creoles of Diu and Daman possess the same facilitative construction based on GIVE as *kristang*, again with adjacent verbs and overt marking of the patient; here, the model for the construction possibly also comes from substrate Indian languages, which have analogous constructions based on a GIVE verb as well (Baxter 2009a: 78-79).

The discussion of these causative structures have important consequences for our understanding of the genesis of the *chomá* construction in Macanese. As proposed by Baxter (2009a: 86),

(...) the presence of dative/accusative case marking of [+HUMAN] ‘objects’ in both causation SVC types [i.e. direct and facilitative] in all Asian C[reole]P[ortuguese]s, could have important genetic implications for the eastern Asian CPs. (...) We posit that the notable structural parallels in the SVCs in Asian CPs would have been present as variants present in the contact environments in earlier stages in these communities on the Portuguese Asian trade networks, originating in the interaction of superstrate, foreigner-talk and early contact varieties based on Portuguese that functioned in the Indo-Portuguese context. Subsequently, with the development of the Portuguese trade network in an easterly direction, and with creolization and stabilization of these contact varieties in different multilingual settings, the SVCs that had parallels in the various local substrates, received reinforcement. Further reinforcement would have come from the partial reciprocal transfusion between Portuguese creole communities on the trade network (...)

What is being claimed here is that causative constructions in Asian Portuguese Creoles have been modelled mainly on vehicular Malay varieties and, for some features, Indian languages, obviously with antecedents in (varieties of) Portuguese. However, in the case of the *chomá* construction of Macanese, we believe that the syntactic model is clearly Sinitic (Hokkien and/or Cantonese). In point of fact, while a possible source construction may be found in Portuguese, as shown above, Hokkien and Cantonese are clearly a best match, both from the semantic and from the structural point of view (see above, exx. 3-4, 6). In order to illustrate our point, in Table 3. we plot four key characteristics of the possible source constructions and

of the Macanese *chomá* construction, namely the presence of a complementiser (*para*), overt marking of the object, non-adjacent verbs and adjacent verbs:

Table 3. The CALL construction in the lexifier, substrates/adstrates and in Macanese

	Complementiser	Object marking	VP-NP-VP	VP-VP-NP
17th century Portuguese	Y	Y	Y?	Y
Contemporary Portuguese	Y	N	Y	Y
<i>papia kristang</i>	N	Y	Y	Y
Hokkien	N	N	Y	N
Cantonese	N	N	Y	N
Macanese	N	N	Y	N

Going back to the notion of typological matrix(/ feature pool), we believe that it clearly appears that, whereas the “Portuguese” adstrates all differ among themselves, Hokkien and Cantonese are perfectly congruent, and Macanese behaves exactly like them according to all the parameters considered. As suggested in Aboh and Ansaldo (2007: 45), congruent/converging features in a pool tend to “reinforce each other” and “become more regular/frequent”, thus becoming more competitive, and hence more likely to be selected. The position of the causee between the verbs, and the absence of patient marking, which is however used in other constructions in Macanese, as discussed above (including the facilitative causative construction based on *dá* ‘give’), clearly differentiate this construction from parallel constructions found in other Asian Portuguese Creoles (and, specifically, *kristang*), and show how Macanese is closer to Sinitic in this respect. To this, we may add that the semantic requirements for the *chomá* construction, namely having an animate and volitional causer and rejecting stative predicates, appear to be consistent with its Sinitic adstrates, as pointed out in the preceding section.

One last point requiring clarification is the timing for the influence of Sinitic on *Maquista*. We argued above that Hokkien, rather than Cantonese, would have had a stronger (albeit limited) role in the early development of the creole. The causative structure based on CALL would have been there, since it is attested in Hokkien at least since the early 17th century (Chappell and Peyraube 2006), if not earlier. On the other hand, bilingualism in Macanese and Cantonese became more common later. We suggest that early Hokkien influence and

later Cantonese influence, in this case, complement, rather than excluding each other; this explains their (possible) mutual reinforcement of the model.

## 5. Summary and conclusions

In this paper, we sought to offer our contribution to the understanding of the role of Sinitic in the development of Macanese. While we do not wish to challenge the received idea that Malayo-Portuguese and even Malay varieties did have a stronger role in the early ecology of Macao, we argued that in one aspect in which other Asian Portuguese Creoles seem to converge, namely constructions expressing indirect causation, Macanese stands out as having a construction which fits perfectly with its Sinitic adstrate languages.

The syntax of the *chomá* construction should thus be added, in our opinion, to the list of features of clear (or, at least, very likely) Sinitic origin in Macanese, most of which have been mentioned earlier in this paper. Ansaldo and Matthews (2004: 16), in their discussion of Macanese patterns of reduplication, argue that “[t]hrough the sources for these patterns are varied, what is most distinctive about Macanese is the Sinitic adstrate”; we believe that this remark can (and, perhaps, *should*) be extended to other aspects of the language, in which the difference between Macanese and other Asian Portuguese creoles lies in the stronger role of Sinitic varieties in the typological matrix of the creole of Macao, if compared to the former. This is the product, we believe, of an ecology in which the role of Sinitic languages was arguably stronger than often assumed in other works, in which much emphasis has been given to the formation period of the Macanese creole (see above, § 2). Also, whereas some phenomena seem to be the product of later Chinese influence, as argued above for demonstratives, there is no reason to exclude *a priori* that they may be attributed also to earlier influence, possibly through the presence of bilingual house servants in Macanese homes; in the case of the *chomá* construction, since Hokkien and Cantonese are largely congruent in this respect, it might have been the case that the syntactic model was mutually reinforced.

Lastly, we suggest as a possible further avenue for research the assessment of indirect Sinitic influence on Macanese through the mediation of *kristang* (or, even, through the mediation of vehicular Malay varieties). The presence of constructions of Sinitic origin both in *kristang* and in Macanese would attest to the common influence of Hokkien, reinforced and expanded

in Macao through later contact with Cantonese. In this scenario, arguing that a feature of *maquista* comes from *kristang* does not exclude a Sinitic origin. To give but one example, this could be the case for the multi-verb construction based on *sentá* ‘to sit’, a means of transportation and *vai* ‘to go’, in which *sentá* acts as a coverb modifying *vai* (e.g. *sentá caréta corê vai chomá puliça* ‘go by car to call the police’; Ferreira 1967, *Má-lingu co má-lingu*); this is attested both in *kristang* and in Macanese, and has a clear semantic and structural parallel in Sinitic. We leave this for further research.

### Primary sources

Ferreira, José Dos Santos (1967), *Macau Sã Assi. Versos e prosas no dialecto macaense e breve vocabulario*, Macau, Tipografia da Missão do Padroado.

Ferreira, José Dos Santos (1973), *Qui-nova, Chencho: obra no dialecto macaense - prosa e poesia - com breve vocabulário*, Macau, Tipografia da Missão do Padroado.

Melo, Francisco Manuel. 1995[1650]. *Tácito Português: Vida, Morte, Dittos e Feitos de el Rey Dom João IV de Portugal*. Lisbon: Livraria Sá da Costa Editora.

Pereira, José F. M. (1899-1901), *Ta-Ssi-Yang-Kuo. Archivos e Annaes do Extremo-Oriente Portuguez*, Lisbon, Bertrand.

Pinharanda Nunes, Mário Ruí Lima (2007). *Corpus of Spoken Macanese*. Macao: University of Macau.

### References

Aboh, Enoch and Umberto Ansaldo. 2007. The role of typology in language creation: A descriptive take. In Umberto Ansaldo, Stephen Matthews and Lisa Lim, eds. *Deconstructing Creole*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 39-66.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and Robert M.W. Dixon, eds. *Serial Verb Constructions. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-68.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2011. Multi-verb constructions: setting the scene. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and Peter Muysken, eds. *Multi-Verb Constructions. A View from the Americas*. Leiden: Brill. 1-26.

- Ameka, Felix. 2003. The multiverb constructions in a West-African areal typological perspective. In *Proceedings of TROSS 03*. Available online at [http://www.ling.hf.ntnu.no/tross/ameka\\_TROSS03\\_paper.pdf](http://www.ling.hf.ntnu.no/tross/ameka_TROSS03_paper.pdf).
- Ansaldo, Umberto and Hugo Cardoso. 2009. Introduction. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 8(2): 3-10.
- Ansaldo, Umberto and Stephen Matthews. 2004. The origins of Macanese reduplication. In Geneviève Escure and Armin Schwegler, eds. *Creoles, Contact and Language Change. Linguistic and social implications*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1-20.
- Ansaldo, Umberto. 2004. The evolution of Singapore English: Finding the matrix. In Lisa Lim, ed. *Singapore English: A Grammatical Description*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 127-149.
- Ansaldo, Umberto. 2009. *Contact Languages. Ecology and Evolution in Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arana-Ward, Marie. 1977. *A Synchronic and Diachronic Investigation of Macanese*. MA dissertation. University of Hong Kong.
- Batalha, Graciete. 2000[1953]. Aspectos da sintaxe macaense. *Mosaico* 39-40: 125-131.
- Baxter, Alan Norman. 1988. *A Grammar of Kristang (Malacca Creole Portuguese)*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Baxter, Alan Norman. 1996. Portuguese and Creole Portuguese in the Pacific and Western Pacific Rim. In Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler and Darrell T. Tryon, eds. *Atlas of Languages of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas* (vol. 1). Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 299-338.
- Baxter, Alan Norman. 2009a. Causative and facilitative serial verbs in Asian Ibero-Romance creoles – a convergence of substrate and superstrate systems? *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 8(2): 65-90.
- Baxter, Alan Norman. 2009b. O português em Macau: contacto e assimilação. In Ana M. Carvalho, ed. *Português em Contato*. Frankfurt-Madrid: Vervuert/Iberoamericana. 277-312.
- Cabreros, Peter. 2003. Macao Patois words in English. *Review of Culture* 5: 126-151.
- Cardoso, Hugo. 2012. Luso-Asian comparatives in comparison. In Hugo Cardoso, Alan Norman Baxter and Mário Pinharanda Nunes, eds. *Ibero-Asian Creoles: Comparative Perspectives*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 82-123.
- Chang, Li-li. 2006. 漢語使役句表被動的語義發展. *Language and Linguistics* 7(1): 139-174.

- Chao, Yuen Ren. 1968. *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chappell, Hilary and Alain Peyraube. 2006. The diachronic syntax of causative structures in Early Modern Southern Min. In Dah-An Ho, ed.. *Festschrift for Ting Pang-Hsin*. Taipei: Academia Sinica. 973-1011.
- Chen, I-Hsuen. 2009. *Causative Variants and Related Passives in Southern Min: A Case Study of Grammaticalization*. MA dissertation. National Tsing Hua University.
- Cheung, Samuel H. 2007. *香港粵語語法的研究*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Clancy Clements, Joseph. 2000. Evidência para a existência dum pidgin português asiático. In Ernesto D'Andrade, Dulce Pereira and Maria Antónia Mota, eds. *Actas do Colóquio sobre Crioulos de Base Lexical Portuguesa*. Braga: Associação Portuguesa de Linguística. 185–200.
- Clancy Clements, Joseph. 2009. *The Linguistic Legacy of Spanish and Portuguese: Colonial Expansion and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cloutier, Robert A. 2013. \*haitan in Gothic and Old English. In Gabriele Diewald, Leena Kahlas-Tarkka and Ilse Wischer, eds. *Comparative Studies in Early Germanic Languages: with a Focus on Verbal Categories*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 17-40.
- Evans, Nicholas and David Wilkins. 2000. In the mind's ear: The semantic extensions of perception verbs in Australian languages. *Language* 76(3): 546-592.
- Ferreira, José Dos Santos. 1978. *Papiá Cristám di Macau*. Macau: Tipografia da Missão do Padroado.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi and Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Holm, John. 1989. *Pidgins and Creoles: A Reference Survey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holm, John. 2009. Atlantic features in Asian varieties of Creole Portuguese. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 8(2): 11-22.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization (second edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2001. Causatives. In Martin Haspelmath *et al.*, eds. *Language Typology and Language Universals* (vol. 2). Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 886-898.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995 [1982]. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

- Li, Charles N. and Sandra Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese. A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Li, Michelle and Stephen Matthews. 2016. An outline of Macau Pidgin Portuguese. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 31(1): 141-183.
- Matthews, Stephen. 2006. On Serial Verb Constructions in Cantonese. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and Robert M.W. Dixon, eds. *Serial Verb Constructions. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 69-87.
- Mufwene, Salikoko. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ōta, Tatsuo. 1987. *中国语历史文法*. Beijing, Beijing Daxue Chubanshe.
- Paul, Waltraud. 2008. The serial verb construction in Chinese: A tenacious myth and a Gordian knot. *The Linguistic Review* 25(3-4): 367-411.
- Pinharanda Nunes, Mário Ruí Lima and Alan N. Baxter. 2004. Os marcadores pré-verbais no crioulo de base lexical portuguesa de Macau. *Papia* 13: 31 - 46.
- Pinharanda Nunes, Mário Ruí Lima. 2008. Os demonstrativos em Maquista: uma análise morfosintáctica contrastiva. *Papia* 18: 7-21.
- Pinharanda Nunes, Mário Ruí Lima. 2011. *Estudo da Expressão Morfo-sintáctica das Categorias de Tempo, Modo e aspecto em Maquista*. PhD dissertation. University of Macau.
- Pinharanda Nunes, Mário Ruí Lima. 2012a. Herança cultural e linguística dos macaenses: considerações em torno das suas origens, evolução e continuidade. *Fragmentum* 35(1): 16-25.
- Pinharanda Nunes, Mário Ruí Lima. 2012b. Traces of superstate verb inflection in Makista and other Asian Portuguese Creoles. In Hugo Cardoso, Alan Norman Baxter and Mário Pinharanda Nunes, eds. *Ibero-Asian Creoles: Comparative Perspectives*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 289-326.
- Rombandaeva, Evdokija I. 1973. *Mansijskij (vogul'skij) jazyk*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Santos, Carlo Pinto and Orlando Neves. 1996. *De Longe à China: Macau na Historiografia e na Literatura Portuguesas*. Macao: Instituto Cultural de Macau.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi and Prashant Pardeshi. 2002. The causative continuum. In Masayoshi Shibatani, ed. *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 85-126.
- Spronck, Marie-Stephan. 2015. *Reported Speech in Ungarinyin. Grammar and Social Cognition in a Language of the Kimberley Region, Western Australia*. PhD dissertation. Australian National University.

Tomás, Maria Isabel. 1988. Makista Creole. *Review of Culture* 15: 33-46.

Tomás, Maria Isabel. 2009. The role of women in the cross-pollination process in the Asian-Portuguese varieties. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 8(2): 49-64.

Xu, Dan. 2003. 汉语使字句的演变 — 兼谈使字的语法化. In Fuxiang Wu and Bo Hong, eds. *语法化与语法研究*. Beijing: The Commercial Press. 224-238.