

STUDIES IN BURMESE BY JAPANESE SCHOLARS SINCE 1985*

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to introduce major works on the Burmese (Myanmar) language by Japanese scholars from 1985 to the present (August 2020). Yabu [1985] introduces works on Burmese by Japanese scholars up to 1984. Thus, in the present article, works since 1985 will be considered. For works before then, refer to Yabu [1985] because they will not be considered here, except when a work in question needs to be referred to. The works considered here will be limited to those that are open to the public and available to every student.

Many of the works that will be introduced in the present article are written in Japanese. Papers written in Japanese are not often read by foreign scholars, probably because of the complex writing system of Japanese. However, these days, Japanese texts can be understood with certain preciseness through automatic translation from Japanese to English. Thus, just giving an overview of a paper written in Japanese would be meaningful because foreign students who are interested in the paper would possibly go on to read it.

I have been asked many times why Japanese scholars do not write papers in English. This question is quite reasonable. However, imagine how difficult it would be to express complicated ideas in a foreign language.¹ Moreover, most Japanese scholars who study Burmese spend a large por-

tion of their lives learning Burmese (in some cases, languages of ethnic minorities as well) in time-consuming processes, including studying abroad for years in Myanmar. Thus, sparing time for learning to write or speak precise English is not an easy task.

In Japan, two national universities teach Burmese as a major subject: Osaka University (Ōsaka Daigaku 大阪大学) and the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku 東京外国語大学). Osaka University started teaching Burmese in April 1945 (the school was then the Osaka College of Foreign Affairs (Ōsaka Gaiji Senmon Gakkō 大阪外事専門学校), which later became Osaka University of Foreign Studies (Ōsaka Gaikokugo Daigaku 大阪外国語大学) and long afterward merged with Osaka University) and the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies in April 1981. Partly because of this, the level of research on Burmese is by no means low. Therefore, I believe that introducing works on Burmese by Japanese scholars in English is of great significance.

In the following, information on works on Burmese by Japanese scholars since 1985 will be shared under the rubrics of 1. Historical and comparative linguistics; 2. Morphosyntax, semantics, and pragmatics; 3. Phonology; 4. Grammatology; 5. Introductory textbooks; 6. Dictionaries; 7. Dialectology; and 8. Others. The order of papers listed in each section is chronological, except for cases in which papers of the same author are closely related. In the present article, Burmese forms are shown with the phonemic transcription used in Kato [2013, 2015b, 2018a, 2018b, 2019].

1. HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS

Since Nishi [1999b] is a book that is well known to foreign scholars, there is no need to write an introduction to it here. This book contains Nishi's four papers [Nishi 1976, 1998a, 1998b, 1999a], all of which are works on the historical phonology of Burmese. However, these original papers are all written in English. There are also important works of Nishi among those papers which are written in Japanese. Nishi [2016] and Nishi [2017], which were published through the efforts of Nathan W. Hill, are English translations of Nishi [1974] and Nishi [1975]. As has been mentioned, since papers written in Japanese are not often read by foreign scholars, it is pleasing to see that such translations have been published.

Yabu [2004] provides an excellent overview of the Myazedi Inscription (also known as the Yazakumar Inscription or Gubyaukgyi Inscription), on which four languages, i.e., Burmese, Mon, Pali, and Pyu, are engraved. The paper begins with the discovery of the Myazedi Inscription, and it goes on

to explore its research history, the date of its creation, and its value as a research resource. Then, it discusses the correspondence of spellings between the inscription and Written Burmese, and it gives a list of grammatical morphemes that appear in the inscription. Furthermore, after discussing the vocabulary that has become obsolete in modern Burmese, it discusses the stylistic nature of the Burmese face in the inscriptions. Yabu says that when the Burmese face on the inscription is compared with the Mon and Pali faces, the Mon and Pali texts seem to be somewhat more elaborate and sophisticated. Thus, he states that he cannot subscribe to the idea that the Mon face is a translation of the Burmese face.

Ohno [2005] describes the structure of Burmese in the Pagan period. He draws on the wealth of his knowledge gained by reading a large number of Burmese inscriptions to describe many aspects of Burmese in the Pagan period, including its phonology, word classes, sentence types, syntactic structures of clauses, and functional morphemes.

Yabu [2006] provides a small discussion of the Hpun language spoken in northern Burma, one of the Burmish languages. He discusses Hpun words that have common etymologies with Burmese.

2. MORPHOSYNTAX, SEMANTICS, AND PRAGMATICS

Sawada [1988] semantically and syntactically discusses in detail the verb alignment, consisting of two categories—that is, serialized verbs and compounded verbs. He first classifies the structure V1–V2, i.e., a series of two verbs, into two groups based on two formal criteria: (1) the possibility of the negative marker *mǎ-* occurring before V2 and (2) the possibility of complement modifiers (*lé* ‘also’, *tǎ* ‘contrastively’, *tàun* ‘even’, etc.) occurring after V1. For serialized verbs, (1) and (2) are applicable; however, neither is applicable to compounded verbs. Serialized verbs can be classified into Types (a), (b), (c), and (d), according to whether or not the paraphrases using the two subordinate clause markers = *pí* ‘after V-ing’ and = *lô* ‘with V-ing’ following V1 are possible: Type (a) can be paraphrased with both = *pí* and = *lô*; Type (b) can be paraphrased only with = *pí*; Type (c) can be paraphrased only with = *lô*; and Type (d) can be paraphrased with neither of them. An example of Type (a) is *che? sá* (cook / eat) ‘to cook and eat’; Type (b), *sá pyí* (begin / speak) ‘to begin to speak’; Type (c), *sínzá nè* (consider / live) ‘(I) am thinking’; and Type (d), *sá cí* (eat / look) ‘try to eat’. These serialized verbs generally exhibit the following argument governing properties: (1) the entire serialized verbs must take one subject argument; and (2) there must not be two non-subject arguments with the same se-

semantic role. He further classifies compounded verbs into Type (e) and Type (f), according to whether the paraphrase using (*ʔā*)*phô* ‘to (do)’ following V1 is allowed. Type (e) cannot be paraphrased, although Type (f) can. An example of Type (e) is *shìN-tù* ‘resemble’, and that of Type (f) is *phaʔ-íN* ‘should read’.

Sawada [1992] observes semantic and syntactic features of the clauses introduced by the nominalizing markers = *tà* (realis) and = *hmà* (irrealis) and argues that in many cases these clauses are related to the concept of presupposition. Some of these refer to event participants and others to events. Those that refer to event participants are free relative clauses that denote inanimate entities with the semantic role Theme. Those that refer to events have four subclasses: (1) complement clauses of superordinate clauses, (2) optional complements, (3) presuppositional clauses of pseudo-cleft sentences, and (4) clauses used as independent sentences. In (1), not only in the case of factive verbs but also in the case of predicates such as *yòUN* ‘believe’, where factiveness is not specified, the proposition denoted by clauses with = *tà* or = *hmà* is assumed to be true by the speaker, even when the verb is denied. For example, in the sentence *ʔāmè = hà màUNmàUN wùNjí phyiʔ = tà = gò mǎ-yòUN = bú* (mother = TOP / Maung.Maung / minister / become = TA = KO / NEG-believe-NEG) ‘His mother does not believe the fact that Maung Maung became a minister’, the proposition that Maung Maung became a minister is always true; however, in the sentence *ʔāmè = hà màUNmàUN wùNjí phyiʔ = tè = lô mǎ-yòUN = bú* (mother = TOP / Maung.Maung / minister / become = RLS = QUOT / NEG-believe-NEG) ‘His mother does not believe that Maung Maung became a minister’, it can be false. In discussing (2), Sawada shows that adverbial clauses may be introduced by = *tà* or = *hmà*, as can be seen in *pyó-zǎyà éi = dà pyó = bà* (speak-SAYA / be = TA / speak = POL) ‘If (you) have something to say, then say (it)’.

Yabu [1994] is a descriptive, partly historical, study of case particles in Burmese. His survey of old literature shows that the particles that are used most frequently as a “nominative case particle” are, in chronological order, *kaa* (Pagan Period, 12th–13th centuries CE), *sañ* (Ava Period, 16th century CE), *lañ*: (late Konbaung Period, 19th century CE), and *sañ* (Modern Written Burmese, 20th century CE). What attracts our attention is that the particle *lañ*: ‘also’ is frequently used like a nominative case particle in *Mhannan: Mahaa Raajawantókrii*: (1829 CE). In Modern Burmese, the meaning of the particles = *kā* ‘from’ and = *kò* ‘to’, which have the meaning of directionality, has been extended to indicate time, as seen in *mǎnê = gā* ‘yesterday’ and *neʔphyiN = gò* ‘tomorrow’.

Sawada [1995] is a relatively well-known paper by foreign researchers.

The purpose of this paper is to describe the usage of the particles =*kò* and =*kâ* when they are attached to a nominal complement of the verb. The core usage of =*kò* and =*kâ* is to indicate Goal and Source of a movement, respectively. He shows that depending on the type of movement that the verb denotes, the importance of Goal and Source varies as follows: the case in which Source is more important, the case in which Goal is more important, and the case in which both are equally important. An important aspect of this paper is that it attempts to clearly define the “subject” of Burmese, which many studies have avoided. Sawada says that the typical subject in Burmese has the following characteristics: (i) it can occur with no marking in free positions preceding the verbal predicate; (ii) topic marker =*hà* can be attached to it; (iii) in the environment of Causative with =*sè*, =*kò* is attached to it; (iv) it can be the antecedent for reflexive expressions; (v) some verb modifiers, e.g., =*nàin* ‘may, can’, =*chìn* ‘want to’, =*yâ* ‘must, can’, and =*èà* ‘pitifully’, are used to add further information about nothing but them. He then argues that in Burmese, there are good reasons to establish a subject, but there are not good reasons to establish an object. Furthermore, he emphasizes the fact that form X can be attached to a subject does not always mean that form X marks a subject, and claims that = \emptyset should be regarded as the marker of the subject and that =*kâ* attached to subjects has a different function. As for =*kò*, he states that =*kò*, which is attached to a non-subject theme, has the function to disambiguate a non-subject from the subject.

Kato [1996] compares the particles =*hà* and =*kâ*, both of which are used to mark a subject. He argues, based on a statistical study, that N =*hà* has the following characteristics when compared to N =*kâ*: (1) it occurs at the beginning of a sentence more frequently; (2) it occurs inside a subordinate clause less often; and (3) it more often makes a subject-predicate relationship, with a subordinate clause between the subject and predicate. For (1), he shows that this characteristic, i.e., occurring near the beginning of a sentence, is highly noticeable when the position of the “object” is taken into consideration; N =*kâ* can appear in both SO (subject - object) and OS (object - subject) word order, but N =*hà* usually appears in SO word order and very rarely in OS word order. Finally, he suggests, from these characteristics of =*hà*, that it is related to topicality.

Okano [2000] divides elements that modify a noun into demonstrative, nouns with particles (= *yê* ‘POSS’, = *kâ* ‘from’, = *nê* ‘with’, etc.), and clauses, and describes the grammatical features of each.

Okano [2002] is a study of the verb *pé* ‘give’ functioning as a causative marker.² After describing the grammatical behavior of *pé*, he points out the difference in grammatical acceptability between speakers from Yangon and

Mon State—that is, speakers from Mon State allow causative *pé* in wider grammatical contexts. He further implies that this usage was first developed in the Mawlamyine (Moulmein) dialect, which has been influenced by the Mon language, and that it then entered Standard Burmese. Okano [2005] is a developed version of this paper.

Okano [2003a] describes in detail the principles of the use of the Burmese motion verbs *ṭwá* ‘go’ and *là* ‘come’, mainly from a pragmatic perspective. He discusses not only cases in which they are used alone but also cases in which they appear as V1 or V2 in the serialized verbs.

Kato [2004] can be seen as a sequel to Kato [1996]. Kato [1996] surveyed the characteristics of nouns marked by =*hà*, a particle mainly attached to the subject, and suggested that =*hà* is related to topicality; however, =*hà* is rarely used in daily speech, although it appears highly frequently in texts written in the colloquial style. Thus, this paper discusses the markings of subjects with high topicality in daily speech. Based on his research using a tape drama, he concludes that subjects with high topicality basically appear with a zero marking.

Okano [2006] establishes groups of elements that modify nouns—that is, plural expressions, quantifying expressions, possessive expressions, demonstrative expressions, nominal expressions, and verbal expressions, and discusses them in detail. This paper is a major expansion of Okano [2000]. In his discussion, he points out that the difference between *sàṭou? ṭá-thù* (book / A-thick) ‘a thick book’ and *sàṭou? thù-dù* (book / thick-thick) ‘a thick book’ is that the former contrastively implies the existence of a thin book, while the latter does not. He also points out that the expressions *sàṭou? ṭá-khe?* (book / A-difficult) ‘a difficult book’, *sàṭou? kheṭ-khe?* (book / difficult-difficult) ‘a difficult book’, and *sàṭou? khe?* (book-difficult) ‘a difficult book’, are less acceptable and that they must be changed into *khe? = té sàṭou?* (difficult = AN / book) ‘a difficult book’. He suggests that the low acceptability of the first three has to do with the fact that “being difficult” is a state that cannot be grasped instantly. Okano further describes the order and co-occurrence restrictions of the groups of noun-modifying elements.

Okano [2010a] provides an exhaustive overview of the Burmese case particles, i.e., = \emptyset ‘zero marking’, =*ká* ‘KA’, =*kò* ‘KO’, =*hmà* ‘LOC’, =*né* ‘INS; COM’, and =*yé* ‘POSS’, and relational nouns, e.g., *ṭátwe?* ‘for’, *ṭáthí* ‘until’, *ṭásá* ‘instead of’, *lau?* ‘about’, and *lò* ‘like’.

Okano [2010b] is an essay on Burmese verbs. He points out some interesting phenomena, including the case in which the English loanword *ìntàbyú* ‘to interview’ is reinterpreted as a NV(noun + verb)-type verb, as in *ìntà ṭwá byú = mè* (inter / go / view = IRR) ‘to go to an interview’, and

the case in which a speaker asked the question *ḡáḡáun lá* (fifty.thousand / Q) ‘Is it fifty thousand (Kyats)?’ replies using the noun *ḡáun* ‘ten thousand’ as a verb, as in *má-ḡáun = b̂ = bú*, *ḡáḡáun = b̂* (NEG-ten.thousand = POL = NEG / five.thousand = POL) ‘It is not fifty thousand. It is five thousand’.

Hongyo [2010] describes the use of the particle *=khê*, which occurs after the verb. According to her, *=khê* has two usages—that is, the spatial usage and temporal usage. In the spatial usage, there are two additional usages: (A) the usage of denoting a movement toward the deictic center and (B) that of denoting a movement away from the deictic center. Moreover, usage (A) can be grouped into four cases (A1) to (A4): in (A1), the movement of the subject (precisely, the referent of the subject) occurs after the action denoted by the verb, e.g., *ḡáhmaiḡ kauḡ khê = m̂* (trash / pick.up / *khê* = IRR) ‘(I) will pick up the trash and come back’; in (A2), the movement of the subject occurs with the result of the action denoted by the verb, e.g., *ḡínḡi wuḡ khê = m̂* (shirt / wear / *khê* = IRR) ‘(I) will come with a shirt’; in (A3), the movement of the subject occurs simultaneously with the action denoted by the verb, e.g., *pyé ḡé = m̂* (run / *khê* = IRR) ‘(I) will come running’; and in (A4), *khê* indicates certainty of the cislocative motion, e.g., *là ḡé = m̂* (come / *khê* = IRR) ‘(I) will certainly come’. Usage (B) can be grouped into two cases (B1) and (B2): in (B1), the movement of the subject occurs after the action denoted by the verb, e.g., *pyiḡsí thá = ḡé = m̂* (luggage / put / *khê* = IRR) ‘(I) will leave my luggage behind’; and in (B2), the movement of an entity other than the referent of the subject occurs, e.g., *d̂i = hm̂à n̂é = ḡé = m̂* (here = LOC / stay = *khê* = IRR) ‘(I) will stay here (though you are leaving)’. On the basis of which of these six cases a verb with *=khê* can represent, Burmese verbs can be classified into seven classes.

Okano [2011a] deals with the usage of the nominalizers *=tà* and *=hm̂à*. After mentioning the two uses of these nominalizers, i.e., one is the use of denoting an object and the other is that of denoting an event, he lists the peculiar constructions in which nominalized clauses with these nominalizers are used, including the *noda*-sentence, pseudo-cleft sentence, and the case in which the nominalized clause functions like an adverbial clause that explains the situation surrounding the event of the main clause.

Okano [2011b] gives an overview of Burmese demonstratives. In his discussion, he describes the behavior of the extended forms of *d̂i* ‘this’ and *hò* ‘that’, i.e., *ĥóḡd̂i*, *ĥóḡhò*, *ḡéḡd̂i*, and *ḡéḡhò*, and also that of *ĥó* ‘over there’.

Kato [2013] is a description of the mermaid construction in Burmese. Mermaid construction, a term coined by Tsunoda Tasaku 角田太作, is a construction like the Japanese *asu iku yotei da* (tomorrow / go / plan /

to.be) ‘I plan to go tomorrow’ (Literally: ‘I am the plan to go tomorrow’). What is important about this construction is that *asu iku*, which appears to be an adnominal clause modifying the noun *yotei* ‘plan, schedule’, can actually be characterized as a main clause rather than a subordinate clause. Similar phenomena also exist in Burmese. The sentence *tù là = dè pòun = bé* (3SG / come = AN / shape = EMPH) ‘It seems that s/he came’ is an example (Literally: ‘S/he is the shape that s/he came’). As a result of a survey, Kato found that a total of 19 Burmese nominals, which can be classified into four groups, have a similar function of *yotei* ‘plan’ in the Japanese sentence above. In this paper, sample sentences with these nominals are checked with various syntactic tests. As a result, it was found that the part that appears to be a subordinate clause, just as in the Japanese mermaid construction, actually has the characteristics of a main clause. Kato [2020] is a developed version of this paper.

Kurabe [2013] provides a detailed syntactic and semantic description of the Burmese “passive construction” *ǎ-V khàn = yâ = dè* (A-V / receive = must = RLS) ‘be V-ed’. Semantically, this construction is often used to indicate damage, but it may also be used for beneficial actions, as in *ǎ-chíchú khàn = yâ = dè* (A-praise / receive = must = RLS) ‘(Someone) was praised’. When the agent is referred to in the passive construction, the noun denoting it appears before *ǎ-V*, and the noun assumes at least one of the three forms: the genitive form with *=yê*, the form with the falling tone (i.e., induced creaky tone), or the nominative form (a form with no case marking or no falling tone). In the case of an inanimate noun, only the nominative form is allowed. In the case of an animal noun, the genitive form is used, and when the noun is referential, the nominative form may appear. In the case of a human noun, all forms can appear. Furthermore, Kurabe also examines sentences in which the possessed object is the patient, as in *ṇà gáun yai? khàn = yâ = dè* (1SG / head / hit / receive = must = RLS) ‘I was hit on the head’, and points out that the acceptability of this kind of sentence is higher when the possessed object is an important thing for the possessor, as is the case for a body part, and it also undergoes a state change.

Okano [2013a] is one of the chapters of Tōnan Ajia Shogengo Kenkyūkai [2013], which compares the pattern of appearance of nouns in various verb phrases in six languages of mainland Southeast Asia, i.e., Vietnamese, Khmer, Thai, Lao, Burmese, and Lhaovo. This book examines marking of nouns in many verb sentences of each language by utilizing a questionnaire that contains a total of about 450 Japanese example sentences made with about 250 verbs. Okano is in charge of researching Burmese in this volume. His chapter seems to be of great use as a source for case

marking in Burmese.

Okano [2013b] classifies Burmese sentences in terms of criteria such as mood, verb predicate vs. non-verb predicate, and declarative vs. interrogative, and describes the behavior of each class.

Kato [2015a] discusses the phenomenon of “event cancellation” in Burmese. In Burmese, a series of consecutive sentences, such as $t̄t̄ = gò$ $t̄taʔ = t̄è$ (3SG = KO / kill = RLS) ‘(I) killed him’ $dà = b̄m̄ê$ $t̄t̄ m̄ã-t̄t̄ = b̄u$ (this = although / 3SG / NEG-die = NEG) ‘But he didn’t die’, is fine without any contradiction. This phenomenon is called “event cancellation” because the second sentence seems as if it canceled a statement of the first sentence. Kato describes various cases in which event cancellation is possible and argues in conclusion that reaching the end of an event can be negated in the case of volitional verbs. In Burmese, the action itself is sometimes interpreted as the end of the event, and the equivalent of the two sentences ‘I stood. But I couldn’t stand’ is allowed.

Okano [2017] gives an overview of Burmese serialized verbs. He first divides Burmese serialized verbs into four classes: (1) those in which any verb retains its lexical meaning; (2) those in which the lexical meaning of the second verb is bleaching; (3) those in which the lexical meaning of the first verb is bleaching; and (4) those containing the causative *pé* ‘give’ as the first verb, and then he describes semantic and syntactic features of each class.

Kato [2018a] is a contrastive study of Burmese and Japanese about event cancellation, which was discussed in Kato’s [2015a] paper on Burmese. In one of the previous studies on Japanese event cancellation, Tsujimura [2003] proposes that lexical causative verbs in Japanese are underspecified for telicity and that a telic interpretation results from conversational implicature because Japanese speakers allow event cancellation. In fact, however, event cancellation in Japanese is not so freely accepted, as compared to Burmese, in which it is widely accepted. Considering this fact, he argues that this explanation can be thought to apply, not to Japanese, but to Burmese.

Kato [2018b] examines possible combinations of adverbial and main clauses. He treats 7 causal adverbial clauses, 3 conditional adverbial clauses, and 3 concessive adverbial clauses, and he discusses what kind of main clauses they can be combined with. For example, $V = t̄à = n̄ê$ ($V = TA =$ with) ‘because (something/someone) Vs’ and $V = l̄ô$ ($V =$ because) ‘because (something/someone) Vs’ are both causal adverbial clauses, but there is a difference. $V = l̄ô$ can co-occur with an imperative main clause, as can be seen in $mó ywà = n̄è = l̄ô$ $ʔăpyìn m̄ã-thwεʔ = n̄ê$ (rain / fall = PROG = because / outside / NEG-go. out = PROH) ‘Don’t go out because the rain is falling’;

however, $V = t\grave{a} = n\acute{e}$ cannot co-occur with an imperative main clause, which can be seen from the unacceptability of $*m\acute{o} yw\grave{a} = n\grave{e} = d\grave{a} = n\acute{e}$ $\text{?}\acute{a}py\grave{i}n m\grave{a}-thw\acute{e}?\text{?} = n\acute{e}$ (rain / fall = PROG = TA = with / outside / NEG-go. out = PROH).

Okano [2019] discusses an algorithm that is necessary for translating Japanese and Burmese personal referents into each other's language in an automatic translation system. For example, he proposes the following flow-chart for translating the Burmese word $\mu\grave{i}$ 'younger brother' into Japanese: i-1 address word or not? [yes→ii-1, no→ii-2], ii-1 first person or not? [yes→ 'watashi', no→ 'anata/kimi'], ii-2 relative or not? [yes→ 'otōto', no→ 'otō-tosan'].

Okano [2020] is a discussion on the Burmese morpheme $h\acute{o}$ 'that; over there'. It seems to be a demonstrative, considering a sentence such as $h\acute{o} = hm\grave{a} \text{?}\grave{e}in \acute{e}i = d\grave{e}$ (over.there = LOC / house / to.be = RLS) 'There is a house over there'. However, $h\acute{o}$ has different characteristics from the genuine demonstratives such as $d\grave{i}$ 'this' and $h\grave{o}$ 'that'. For example, it never co-occurs with non-locational nouns, as in the ungrammatical phrase $*h\acute{o} l\grave{u}$ ($h\acute{o}$ / person), compared with $h\grave{o} l\grave{u}$ (that / person) 'that person'. The phrase $*h\acute{o} h\grave{a}$ ($h\acute{o}$ / thing) is also ungrammatical, compared with $h\grave{o} h\grave{a}$ (that / thing) 'that one'. Moreover, it cannot co-occur with case particles to the exclusion of $=hm\grave{a}$ 'LOC', although $d\grave{i}$ 'this' and $h\grave{o}$ 'that' can co-occur with much more case particles. Thus, he concludes that $h\acute{o}$ is not a demonstrative.

Kurabe [forthcoming] classifies animal names in Burmese, and describes them in terms of phonology, morphology, and semantics. This paper is not yet published, but I think it is worth mentioning because it treats phenomena not often discussed in previous studies.

3. PHONOLOGY

Kato [2006] is a study on the pronunciation of syllables ending with a glottal stop (called "checked syllables") in Burmese. Checked syllables are generally pronounced high. However, checked syllables are frequently pronounced low in the case of loanwords from English. This paper is perhaps the first to point out this fact. This paper explores the phonological conditions under which these "low checked syllables" appear, and it also provides a phonological interpretation of the high and low pitches that appear in checked syllables. In conclusion, Kato points out that low checked syllables never appear in three environments—that is, at the end of a word, just before a high checked syllable, and just before a falling tone (= creaky

tone). He further argues that phonologically, the pitch of ordinary high checked syllables can be interpreted the same as the falling tone in open syllables, and the pitch of low checked syllables can be interpreted the same as the low-level tone in open syllables.

Kurabe [2016] is not a study of the Burmese language itself; rather, it is a study of the phonology of Jinghpaw words that have a Burmese origin, but it would be worth mentioning here. Despite the fact that the contact relationship between Burmese and Jinghpaw seems recent, a large portion of Burmese loans retain several phonological properties of Written Burmese that have been lost in the modern language. This fact can be explained in terms of borrowing chains that can be represented as “Burmese → Shan → Jinghpaw”—that is, many of the loanwords of Burmese origin in Jinghpaw were introduced via Shan.

4. GRAMMATOLOGY

Yabu [2001a] is a detailed overview of the Burmese script, written as an entry in the *Sanseido Encyclopaedia of Linguistics*.³ After explaining the name, distribution, origin, lineage, and history of the Burmese script, he explains the system of the script with examples.

Yabu [2001b], also written as an entry in the *Sanseido Encyclopaedia of Linguistics*, is a detailed commentary on the Burmese script of Myazedi Inscription. Reading this article together with Yabu [2004] will provide the reader with essential knowledge about the Myazedi Inscription.

Sawada [2003] is a study of tonal notation in Indic scripts in mainland Southeast Asia. He first compares the Thai script and the Burmese script to bring out the characteristics of tonal notation in each language. The Thai tonal notation is systematic, while that of Burmese has complex relationships with the tones. In his discussion of the Burmese script, Sawada shows how the tonal notation in the Burmese script changed over the course of history.

Okano [2003b] is a study of the history of “ligature”, i.e., combined consonant letters, in the Burmese script. In the Pagan period, there were three different uses of ligature: (1) representing consonant clusters; (2) representing polysyllables containing an atonic vowel; and (3) representing homorganic consonant sequences. Of these three types, (2) and (3) fell into disuse later. After pointing out this fact, he discusses the reasons for the demise of (2) and (3).

Okano [2007b] places the shapes of the Burmese script observed in the *Miandianguan Yiyu* 緬甸館譯語 (15th century) in the history of shape

changes of the Burmese script.

5. INTRODUCTORY TEXTBOOKS

Ohno [1986] is an introduction to colloquial Burmese, with an emphasis on training in reading Burmese alphabets and texts.

Kato [1998] is also an introduction to colloquial Burmese with 20 lessons for beginners to master the Burmese sounds, writing system, and basics of grammar. It covers the minimum requirements for speaking Burmese. Kato [2015b] is an entirely revised version of this, and Kato [2019] is a revised version of Kato [2015b], with the addition of greeting expressions and readings.

Sawada [1999a] and Sawada [1999b] are textbooks on grammar of colloquial Burmese written for a course in Burmese grammar at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. Sawada [1999a] for the first grade consists of 15 lessons, and Sawada [1999b] for the second grade consists of 13 lessons. Based on grammatical categories that are set up according to Sawada's elaborate thought on the Burmese grammar, these textbooks explain the grammatical behavior of various forms of each category. Abundant example sentences are given, and they are useful in practical conversation as well. Written as textbooks for classroom use, however, they also have the character of reference grammar.

Okano [2007a] is an expository book on Burmese grammar, consisting of 21 chapters. It is based on a handout designed for a Burmese grammar class at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. Its preface states that the book will cover beginning to intermediate levels; however, it includes advanced content as well. Grammatical categories established in this book generally follows Sawada [1999a] and Sawada [1999b].

6. DICTIONARIES

Ohno [1995] is a Japanese-Burmese dictionary with 623 pages. In each entry, the Japanese word is written in roman letters and is accompanied by a few Burmese words semantically corresponding to the Japanese word. This is a dictionary for Japanese learners of the Burmese language rather than for Myanmar learners of Japanese.

Ohno [2000] is a large Burmese-Japanese dictionary with 925 pages. This dictionary is a necessity for Japanese learners of the Burmese language. The exact number of items is unknown, as it is not stated, but it is

probably between 45,000 and 50,000. Notable features of this dictionary include the following: (1) accurate Japanese translations are given; (2) many example sentences are given; (3) it has comprehensive coverage of grammatical forms (including particles and affixes) in both literary and colloquial styles; (4) a wide range of modern words are given; (5) a wide range of botanical and animal names are given; and (6) a large number of proverbs are given. Since the translations of grammatical forms are accurate and many example sentences with them are given, Japanese beginners at Burmese may be able to read a text written in Burmese with this dictionary once they have learned how to read the Burmese script.

7. DIALECTOLOGY

Yabu [1993] is an overview of the Marma language, written as an entry in the *Sanseido Encyclopaedia of Linguistics* (see Note 3). Marma is a dialect of Burmese spoken in eastern Bangladesh. It is closely related to the Rakhine (Arakan) dialect.

Huziwara [2003] describes the sounds of Marma in good detail. He considers what phonemes can be set up for consonants, vowels, and tones, and he provides a phonetic explanation for each. Regarding the Marma tones, he points out the important fact that the Marma tone corresponding to the falling tone (= creaky tone) of Standard Burmese is a rising tone. For example, Standard Burmese /sâ/ ‘begin’ with the falling tone corresponds to Marma /că/ ‘begin’ with the rising tone. Furthermore, he shows the correspondences between the phonemes of Marma and Written Burmese. At the end of the paper, basic vocabulary of Marma consisting of 1,000 entries is shown.

Huziwara [2011] is a grammatical description of the morpheme = *ca* in Marma. The morpheme = *ca* has following four functions: (1) nominalization of non-future clauses; (2) relativization of non-future events; (3) topicalization of noun phrases; and (4) sentential nominalization of non-future events. He describes these functions and compares them to those of similar grammatical devices in Marma. Moreover, the origin of this morpheme is also discussed.

Huziwara [2017] is conversational material in Marma; it is a translation into Marma of the dialogues of all 20 lessons contained in Kato [2015b].⁴ Each word of the sentence is glossed in English, and each sentence is accompanied by a Japanese translation. Useful notes on grammar and vocabulary are also provided throughout the dialogues.

Kato and Khin Pale [2012] describe the Myeik dialect, the southern-

most dialect of Burmese. After presenting the phonological system of this dialect and phonetic descriptions of individual phonemes, they present conversational texts with grammatical annotations (a translation of Kato's [1998] dialogues into the Myeik dialect) and basic vocabulary consisting of about 900 items. The important facts pointed out in this paper are that the Myeik tone corresponding to the falling tone (= creaky tone) of Standard Burmese is a rising tone and that this dialect is a rare Tibetan-Burman language that has both pharyngealization and laryngealization.

Otsuka [2014] is a study of the Palaw dialect, which is a dialect spoken in Tanintharyi, like the Myeik dialect treated by Kato and Khin Pale [2012]. After presenting the phonological system and giving a phonetic description of each phoneme, he shows correspondences between the phonemes of the Palaw dialect and Standard Burmese. In this dialect, the tone corresponding to the falling tone (= creaky tone) of Standard Burmese is a rising tone, as is the same case for Marma of Huziwara [2003] and Myeik of Kato and Khin Pale [2012]. At the end of the paper, basic vocabulary of the Palaw dialect consisting of about 850 entries is given.

8. OTHERS

Yabu [1992] is a detailed overview of Burmese, written as an entry in the *Sanseido Encyclopaedia of Linguistics* (see Note 3). This article consists of the following sections: shiin 子音 (consonants), boin 母音 (vowels), seichō 声調 (tones), onsetsu kōzō 音節構造 (syllable structure), heijobun 平叙文 (declarative sentences), gimonbun 疑問文 (interrogative sentences), hiteibun 否定文 (negative sentences), jutsugo dōshiku 述語動詞句 (predicate verb phrases), hojo dōshi to jodōshi 補助動詞と助動詞 (subsidiary verbs and auxiliary verbs), sōnyū dōshi 挿入動詞 (parenthetical verbs; equivalents of Okell's pre-verbs [Okell 1969: 31]), shūjoshi 終助詞 (final particles), seiku dōshi 成句動詞 (idiomatic verbs), jidōkei to shiekikei 自動形と使役形 (intransitive forms and causative forms), kankeiku 関係句 (relative phrases), meishibun no shurui to hō 名詞文の種類と法 (types of noun-sentences and mood), meishi no gokōsei 名詞の語構成 (constructions of nouns), meishika to meishikaku 名詞化と名詞化句 (nominalization and nominalized phrases), jikū meishi to keishiki meishi 時空名詞と形式名詞 (space-time nouns and relational nouns), daimeishi 代名詞 (pronouns), gimonshi 疑問詞 (interrogatives), sūshi 数詞 (numerals), josūshi 助数詞 (numeral classifiers), kantōshi 間投詞 (interjections), kakujoishi 格助詞 (case particles), fukujoshi 副助詞 (adverbial particles; equivalents of Okell's sentence-medial postpositions [Okell 1969: 122]), setsuzoku joshi 接続助詞

(conjunctive particles), *meishi hasei* 名詞派生 (noun derivation), *keigo* 敬語 (honorifics), *shakuyōgo* 借用語 (loanwords), *kōgo to bungo* 口語と文語 (colloquial and literary styles), *hōgen* 方言 (dialects), *goshi* 語史 (history of the language), *kenkyūshi* 研究史 (research history), *shakaiteki jōkyō* 社会的状況 (social situations), *gengo no meishō* 言語の名称 (name of the language), *jisho* 辞書 (dictionaries), and *sankō bunken* 参考文献 (references). This article provides a bird's-eye view of Burmese studies in the world before 1992. To this day, this is the article to be referred to first by every Japanese researcher who wishes to work on Burmese.

Otsuka [forthcoming] is an article describing the characteristics of the Burmese community in Japan, especially in terms of language. Because the author of this paper has had a close relationship with people from Myanmar, and as a researcher of the Kuki-Chin language, he has in-depth knowledge of the ethnic minorities, this article provides credible information about the Burmese community in Japan.

NOTES

- * My special thanks are due to Sawada Hideo 澤田英夫 and Okano Kenji 岡野賢二 for their assistance in collecting the papers treated in this article. In addition, I am indebted to Sawada for sending me abstracts of his papers, which he newly wrote to assist me. Of course, I am solely responsible for any errors.
- 1 There are several reasons that the Japanese are not good at writing and speaking in English. One of the reasons for this is that English education in Japanese has placed an emphasis on grammar and reading comprehension and has not focused on conversation and composition. Another reason would be that the linguistic types of English and Japanese are very different; in particular, the definiteness, plurality, and countability of English nouns are very difficult for Japanese speakers to understand. For these reasons, even researchers may be reluctant to write a paper in English. When a Japanese researcher writes a paper in English, they must have it checked by an English speaker at the final stage of the writing process, and this often takes a lot of money; this is another major obstacle. In my case, I feel that it takes me over 10 times longer to write a paper in English than it does in Japanese, if the time required to check my English is included.
- 2 In Kato [1998: 145], I showed the sentence $t\dot{u} = g\dot{o} p\acute{e} w\grave{i}n = d\grave{e}$ (3SG = KO / give / enter = RLS) 'I let him go in', to point out the causative use of *pé* 'give', which is placed before the verb. I thought this was the first to point out the causative use of *pé*, but later, I noticed that Harada and Ohno's [1979: 262] Burmese-Japanese dictionary had the entry of *pé yai?* (give /

hit) ‘to allow to hit (someone)’, which is evidently an example of the causative use of *pé*. They annotate this entry with the comment ‘Mōrumen hōgen, Mon-jin no hyōgen’ モールメン方言、モン人の表現 (Moulmein dialect; an expression of Mon). Furthermore, they show three more examples of causative *pé*—that is, *pé pha?* (give / read) ‘yomu koto o mitomeru’ 読む事を認める (to allow to read), *pé lou?* (give / do) ‘suru koto o mitomeru’ する事を認める (to allow to do), and *pé ci* (give / look) ‘miru koto o mitomeru’ 見る事を認める (to allow to look). It should be noted that since the use of the verb with the meaning of ‘to give’ to express causativity is also found in Karenic languages (cf. Kato [2009]), it is possible that the Karen languages such as Pwo Karen and Sgaw Karen, most of whose speakers live in southern Burma, may also have influenced the spread of the causative use of *pé* in Standard Burmese.

- 3 The *Sanseido Encyclopaedia of Linguistics* (Gengogaku Daijiten 言語学大辞典) is a large encyclopedia of languages and linguistics, published by Sanseidō 三省堂, a publisher in Tokyo. Volume 1 (1988, 1,824p.), Volume 2 (1989, 1,824p.), Volume 3 (1992, 1,216p.), and Volume 4 (1992, 1,232p.) are the Section of the Languages of the World (Sekai gengo-hen 世界言語編), Volume 5 (1993, 1,072p.) is the Section of the Addendum and Index of Languages (Hoi, gengomei sakuin-hen 補遺・言語名索引編), Volume 6 (1996, 1,808p.) is the Section of Linguistic Terms (Jutsugo-hen 述語編), and the Supplementary Volume (Bekkan 別巻, 2001, 1,232p.; also treated as Volume 7) is for the writing systems and is subtitled “Encyclopaedia of Writing Systems of the World” (Sekai moji jiten 世界文字辞典). The Section of the Languages of the World contains articles about 3,500 languages, and the Supplementary Volume contains articles about 300 writing systems.
- 4 The dialogues of Kato [1998] and Kato [2015b] can be used as a questionnaire to collect sentences and grasp basic grammar when researching Burmese dialects and minority languages in Myanmar. I myself have used these in my research on Karen languages and Burmese dialects. The dialogues in Kato [2015b] are a rewrite of those in Kato [1998], and some dialogues are completely different. Either book can be used as a questionnaire.

ABBREVIATIONS

A	the nominalizing prefix <i>ʔǎ-</i>
AN	adnominalizer
COM	comitative
EMPH	emphatic
INS	instrumental
IRR	irrealis
KA	the particle = <i>kâ/ = gâ</i> , which functions like a subject marker

KO	the particle = <i>kò</i> /= <i>gò</i> , which functions like an object marker
LOC	locative
N	noun
NEG	negative
PL	plural
POL	politeness
POSS	possessive
PROG	progressive
PROH	prohibitive
Q	question
QUOT	quotative
RLS	realis
SAYA	the suffix-like morpheme <i>-sàyà</i> / <i>-zàyà</i> , which means ‘thing which has to be V-ed’
SG	singular
TA	the realis nominalizer <i>tà</i>
TOP	topic
V	verb
1	first person
2	second person
3	third person

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Harada Masaharu 原田正春 and Ohno Toru 大野徹. 1979. *Birumago jiten* ビルマ語辞典 (Burmese dictionary). Osaka: Nihon Biruma Bunka Kyōkai 日本ビルマ文化協会.
- Hongyo Saori 本行沙織. 2010. Birumago no joji *khê* no kūkan yōhō, jikan yōhō ビルマ語の助辞 *khê* の空間用法・時間用法 (On spatial and temporal usage of Burmese verbal particle *-khê*). *Ekusu Oriente* えくす・おりえんて (Ex Oriente, Journal of Association for Integrated Studies of Language and Society, Osaka University) 17: 127–156.
- Huziwaru Keisuke 藤原敬介. 2003. Marumago no onsei ni kansuru kōsatsu マルマ語の音声に関する考察 (A phonetic analysis of Marma). *Gengogaku Kenkyū* 言語学研究 (Linguistic Research, Kyoto University) 22: 237–300.
- _____. 2011. Nominalization and related phenomena in Marma. In *North East Indian linguistics*, vol. 3, ed. Gwendolyn Hyslop, Stephen Morey, and Mark W. Post, pp. 105–119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2017. Marumago kaiwabun shiryō マルマ語会話文資料 (Material of conversation in Marma). *Gengo Kijutsu Ronshū* 言語記述論集 9: 65–94.
- Kato Atsuhiko 加藤昌彦. 1996. Birumago no joshi *-ha_* no tokuchō ni tsuite ビルマ語の助詞 *-ha_* の特徴について (On the characteristics of Burmese particle *-ha_*). *Tōkyō Daigaku Gengogaku Ronshū* 東京大学言語学論集 (Tokyo University Linguistics Papers) 15: 167–201.

- _____. 1998. *Ekusupuresu Birumago* エクスプレスビルマ語 (Express: A concise introduction to Burmese). Tokyo: Hakusuisha 白水社. 182p.
- _____. 2004. On the markings of subjects with high topicality in pure colloquial Burmese. In *Shudai no taishō* 主題の対照 (A contrastive study in topic), ed. Masuoka Takashi 益岡隆志, pp. 57–87. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan くろしお出版.
- _____. 2006. Gendai Birumago no shakuyōgo ni mirareru hikui sokuonsetsu 現代ビルマ語の借用語に見られる低い促音節 (Low checked syllables in loanwords of modern Burmese). In *Gengo kenkyū no shatei: Yukawa Yasutoshi sensei kinen ronshū* 言語研究の射程：湯川恭敏先生記念論集 (Scope of language studies: Festschrift for Professor Yukawa Yasutoshi), ed. Kato Shigehiro 加藤重広 and Yoshida Hiromi 吉田浩美, pp. 103–126. Tokyo: Hituzi Shobō ひつじ書房.
- _____. 2009. Valence-changing particles in Pwo Karen. *Linguistics of the Tibe-to-Burman Area* 32-2: 71–102.
- _____. 2013. Mermaid construction in Burmese. In *Adnominal clauses and the 'mermaid construction': Grammaticalization of nouns*, NINJAL collaborative research project reports 13-01, ed. Tsunoda Tasaku, pp. 419–463. Tachikawa, Japan: National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics.
- _____. 2015a. Birumago no jishō kyanseru ビルマ語の事象キャンセル (Event cancellation in Burmese). *Ekusu Oriente* 22: 1–36.
- _____. 2015b. *Nyū Ekusupuresu Birumago* ニューエクスプレスビルマ語 (New Express: A concise introduction to Burmese). Tokyo: Hakusuisha. 166p.
- _____. 2018a. Entailed and intended results in Japanese and Burmese accomplishment verbs. In *Handbook of Japanese contrastive linguistics*, eds. Prashant Pardeshi and Taro Kageyama, pp. 173–192. Boston; Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- _____. 2018b. Burmese. In *Levels in clause linkage: A crosslinguistic survey*, ed. Tasaku Tsunoda, pp. 571–613. Boston; Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- _____. 2019. *Nyū Ekusupuresu Purasu Birumago* ニューエクスプレスプラスビルマ語 (New Express Plus: A concise introduction to Burmese). Tokyo: Hakusuisha. 178p.
- _____. 2020. Burmese. In *Mermaid construction: A compound-predicate construction with biclausal appearance*, ed. Tasaku Tsunoda, pp. 557–604. Boston; Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kato Atsuhiko and Khin Pale. 2012. The Myeik (Beik) dialect of Burmese: Sounds, conversational texts, and basic vocabulary. *Ajia Afurika Gengo Bunka Kenkyū* アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究 (Journal of Asian and African Studies) 83: 117–160.
- Kurabe Keita 倉部慶太. 2013. Birumago no judō kōbun ビルマ語の受動構文 (The passive construction in Burmese). *Chikyūken Gengo Kijutsu Ronshū* 地球研言語記述論集 (RIHN Descriptive Linguistics Series) 5: 27–71.
- _____. 2016. Phonology of Burmese loanwords in Jinghpaw. *Gengogaku Ken-*

- kyū 35: 91–128.
- _____. Forthcoming. Phonology, morphology, and semantics of Burmese animal nomenclature. In *Topics in Middle Mekong linguistics*, ed. Norihiko Hayashi. Kobe: Kobe City University of Foreign Studies.
- Nishi Yoshio 西義郎. 1974. Biruma bungo no *-ac* ni tsuite ビルマ文語の*-ac*について (On *-ac* in Burmese). *Tōyō Gakuhō* 東洋学報 (The Journal of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko) 56-1: 1–43.
- _____. 1975. OB *ry-* ni tsuite (1) OB *ry-*について(1) (On OB *ry-* (1)). *Kagoshima Daigaku Shiroku* 鹿児島大学史録 (Shiroku Kagoshima University) 8: 1–16.
- _____. 1976. Medials in Burmese. In *Genetic relationship, diffusion, and typological similarities of East and Southeast Asian languages*, ed. Mantaro Hashimoto, pp. 15–29. Tokyo: Japan Society for the Promotion of Sciences.
- _____. 1998a. The orthographic standardization of Burmese: Linguistic and sociolinguistic speculations. *Kokuritsu Minzokugaku Hakubutsukan Kenkyū Hōkoku* 国立民族学博物館研究報告 (Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology) 22-4: 975–999.
- _____. 1998b. The development of voicing rules in Standard Burmese. *Kokuritsu Minzokugaku Hakubutsukan Kenkyū Hōkoku* 23-1: 253–260.
- _____. 1999a. Old Burmese: Toward the history of Burmese. *Kokuritsu Minzokugaku Hakubutsukan Kenkyū Hōkoku* 23-3: 659–692.
- _____. 1999b. *Four papers on Burmese: Toward the history of Burmese (the Myanmar language)*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- _____. 2016. Proto-Lolo-Burmese and Old Burmese sources of Written Burmese *-ac*. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 9: 97–129.
- _____. (trans. Nathan W. Hill). 2017. Old Burmese *ry-*: A remark on Proto-Lolo-Burmese resonant initials. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 10-2: i–x.
- Ohno Toru 大野徹. 1986. *Birumago yon-shūkan* ビルマ語四週間 (Four weeks Burmese). Tokyo: Daigaku Shorin 大学書林. 274p.
- _____. 1995. *Nihongo Birumago jiten* 日本語ビルマ語辞典 (Japanese-Burmese dictionary). Tokyo: Daigaku Shorin. 623p.
- _____. 2000. *Biruma (Myanmā) go jiten* ビルマ (ミャンマー) 語辞典 (Burmese (Myanmar) -Japanese dictionary). Tokyo: Daigaku Shorin. 925p.
- _____. 2005. The structure of Pagan period Burmese. In *Studies in Burmese linguistics*, ed. Justin Watkins, pp. 241–305. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Okano Kenji 岡野賢二. 2000. Gendai kōgo Birumago no meishiku gentei kōzō (1) 現代口語ビルマ語の名詞句限定構造 (1) (The description of the noun attributive structures in colloquial Burmese (1)). *Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku Tōnan Ajiagaku* 東京外国語大学東南アジア学 (Southeast Asian Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) 6: 1–18.
- _____. 2002. Gendai kōgo Birumago no dōshi “ataeru” no bunpōka ni tsuite

no oboegaki 現代口語ビルマ語の動詞「与える」の文法化についての覚え書 (A note on grammaticalization of the verb ‘GIVE’ in colloquial Burmese), *Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku Tōnan Ajiagaku* 7: 135–146.

_____. 2003a. Gendai kōgo Birumago no “iku, kuru” 現代口語ビルマ語の「行く・来る」 (“Go” and “come” in colloquial Burmese). In *Tōnan Ajia tairikubu shogengo no “iku, kuru” 東南アジア大陸部諸言語の「行く・来る」* (“Go” and “come” in languages of mainland Southeast Asia), ed. Tōnan Ajia Shogengo Kenkyūkai 東南アジア諸言語研究会 (Research Group on Southeast Asian Languages lead by Mikami Naomitsu 三上直光), pp. 289–336. Tokyo: Keiō Gijuku Daigaku Gengo Bunka Kenkyūjo 慶應義塾大学言語文化研究所 (Keio Institute of Cultural and Linguistic Studies).

_____. 2003b. Standardization of consonant ligature writings in Bagan Burmese. In *Working papers of the International Symposium on Indic Scripts: Past and future*, ed. Peri Bhaskararao, pp. 293–300. Tokyo: Research Institute for the Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

_____. 2005. The verb ‘give’ as a causativizer in colloquial Burmese. In *Studies in Burmese Linguistics*, ed. Justin Watkins, pp. 97–104. Canberra: Australian National University.

_____. 2006. Gendai kōgo Birumago no meisiku no kōzō 現代口語ビルマ語の名詞句の構造 (Noun phrase structure in colloquial Burmese). In *Tōnan Ajia tairikubu shogengo no meisiku kōzō 東南アジア大陸部諸言語の名詞句構造* (Noun phrase structure in languages of mainland Southeast Asia), ed. Tōnan Ajia Shogengo Kenkyūkai, pp. 155–195. Tokyo: Keiō Gijuku Daigaku Gengo Bunka Kenkyūjo.

_____. 2007a. *Gendai Biruma (Myanmā) go bunpō* 現代ビルマ(ミャンマー)語文法 (Colloquial Burmese (Myanmar) grammar). Tokyo: Kokusai Gogakusha 国際語学社. 176p.

_____. 2007b. Mentenkan Yakugo ni kakareta Biruma moji no keijō ni tsuite 緬甸館譯語に書かれたビルマ文字の形状について (The shapes of Burmese Script in Miandianguan Yiyu). *Gogaku Kyōiku Fōramu* 語学教育フォーラム (Contribution towards Research and Education of Language, Daito Bunka University) 13: 47–57.

_____. 2010a. Birumago no kaku hyōji ビルマ語の格標示 (Case marking in colloquial Burmese). In *Chibetto-Birumakei gengo no bunpō genshō 1: Kaku to sono shūhen* チベット=ビルマ系言語の文法現象 I : 格とその周辺 (Grammatical phenomena of Tibeto-Burman languages 1: Case-marking and related matters), ed. Sawada Hideo 澤田英夫, pp. 239–268. Tokyo: Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku Ajia Afurika Gengo Bunka Kenkyūjo 東京外国語大学アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究所 (The Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies).

_____. 2010b. Birumago no dōshi ni tsuite ビルマ語の動詞について (On verbs in Burmese). *Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku Tōnan Ajiagaku* 15: 83–99.

- _____. 2011a. Gendai kōgo Birumago no meishikasetu ni tsuite 現代口語ビルマ語の名詞化節について (On nominalized clauses in colloquial Burmese). *Nihongo Nihongaku Kenkyū* 日本語・日本学研究 (Journal for Japanese Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) 1: 13–31.
- _____. 2011b. Gendai kōgo Birumago no “shijigo” 現代口語ビルマ語の「指示語」 (On “demonstratives” in colloquial Burmese). *Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku Tōnan Ajiagaku* 16: 75–86.
- _____. 2013a. Birumago no dōshiku ビルマ語の動詞句 (Verb phrases in colloquial Burmese). In *Tōnan Ajia tairikubu shogengo no dōshiku* 東南アジア大陸部諸言語の動詞句 (Verb phrases in languages of mainland Southeast Asia), ed. Tōnan Ajia Shogengo Kenkyūkai, pp. 243–293. Tokyo: Keiō Gijuku Daigaku Gengo Bunka Kenkyūjo.
- _____. 2013b. Birumago no bun no kaibunrui ni tsuite ビルマ語の文の下位分類について (On subclassification of sentences in Burmese). In *Chibetto-Birumakei gengo no bunpō genshō 2: Jutsugo to hatsuwa kōi no taipu kara mita bun no kai bunrui* チベット=ビルマ系言語の文法現象 2：述語と発話行為のタイプからみた文の下位分類 (Grammatical phenomena of Tibeto-Burman languages 2: Subclassification of sentences with respect to the types of predicates and speech act), ed. Sawada Hideo, pp. 41–80. Tokyo: Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku Ajia Afurika Gengo Bunka Kenkyūjo.
- _____. 2017. Birumago no dōshirenzoku: Dōshiteki na dōshi o chūshin ni ビルマ語の動詞連続：動作的な動詞を中心に (Verb serialization in Burmese). In *Tōnan Ajia tairikubu shogengo no dōshi renzoku* 東南アジア大陸部諸言語の動詞連続 (Verb serialization in languages of mainland Southeast Asia), ed. Tōnan Ajia Shogengo Kenkyūkai, pp. 130–160. Tokyo: Keiō Gijuku Daigaku Gengo Bunka Kenkyūjo.
- _____. 2019. Nihongo to Birumago no sōgo henkan ni okeru mondaiten: Jinbutsu o shiji suru meishi shūhen no genshō 日本語とビルマ語の相互変換における問題点：人物を指示する名詞周辺の現象 (Some problems on transforming between Japanese and Burmese: “Personal referents” and their relating phenomena). *Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku Tōnan Ajiagaku* 24: 55–79.
- _____. 2020. Gendai kōgo Birumago no ၵ: hó wa shijishi ka? 現代口語ビルマ語の ၵ: hó は指示詞か? (Is the colloquial Burmese ၵ: hó a demonstrative?). *Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku Ronshū* 東京外国語大学論集 (Area and Culture Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies) 100: 163–184.
- Okell, John. 1969. *A reference grammar of colloquial Burmese*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Otsuka Kosei 大塚行誠. 2014. Birumago Parō hōgen kiso goi ビルマ語パロー方言基礎語彙 (A basic vocabulary of the Palaw dialect of Burmese). *Ajia Afurika no Gengo to Gengogaku* アジア・アフリカの言語と言語学 (Asian and African Languages and Linguistics, ILCAA) 8: 163–200.
- _____. Forthcoming. Burmese. In *Languages of Japan: Communities and culture*, ed. John C. Maher. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sawada Hideo 澤田英夫. 1988. Gendai Birumago ni okeru dōshi hairetsu no

- ruikei ni tsuite 現代ビルマ語における動詞配列の類型について (On categorization of verb alignment in modern Burmese). *Gengogaku Kenkyū* 7: 73–110.
- _____. 1992. Gendai kōgo Birumago no meishisetsu hyōshiki *-ta_*, *-hma_* no yōhō, kinō 現代口語ビルマ語の名詞節標識-*ta_*・*-hma_*の用法・機能 (The usages and functions of the nominalizers *-ta_* and *-hma_* in modern colloquial Burmese). *Gengogaku Kenkyū* 11: 25–61.
- _____. 1995. On the usages and functions of particles *-kou_*/*-ka_* in colloquial Burmese. *Senri Ethnological Studies* 41: 153–187.
- _____. 1999a. Birumago bunpō (ichinenji) ビルマ語文法 (1年次) (Burmese grammar: 1st year), ms. 44p. (downloadable from <http://www.aa.tufs.ac.jp/~sawadah/oldtexts-sjis.html>)
- _____. 1999b. Birumago bunpō (ninenji) ビルマ語文法 (2年次) (Burmese grammar: 2nd year), ms. 50p. (downloadable from <http://www.aa.tufs.ac.jp/~sawadah/oldtexts-sjis.html>)
- _____. 2003. Tonal notation of Indic Scripts in mainland Southeast Asia. In *Working papers of the International Symposium on Indic Scripts: Past and future*, ed. Peri Bhaskararao, pp. 318–349. Tokyo: Research Institute for the Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Tōnan Ajia Shogengo Kenkyūkai 東南アジア諸言語研究会 (Research Group on Southeast Asian Languages lead by Mikami Naomitsu 三上直光). 2013. *Tōnan Ajia tairikubu shogengo no dōshiku* 東南アジア大陸部諸言語の動詞句 (Verb phrases in languages of mainland Southeast Asia). Tokyo: Keiō Gijuku Daigaku Gengo Bunka Kenkyūjo. 400p.
- Tsujimura Natsuko. 2003. Event cancellation and telicity. In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, Vol. 12, ed. William McClure, pp. 388–399. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Yabu Shiro 藪司郎. 1985. Gengo 言語 (Language). In *Biruma kankei hōgo bunken no kaidai oyobi mokuroku* ビルマ関係邦語文献の解題及び目録 (Burmese studies in Japan, 1868–1985: Literary guide and bibliography), ed. Biruma Kenkyū Gurūpu ビルマ研究グループ (Burma Research Group), pp. 10–13, pp. 58–63. Tokyo: Tōkyō Gaikokugo Daigaku Indoshinago Gakka Birumago Kenkyūshitsu 東京外国語大学インドシナ語学科ビルマ語研究室 (Burmese Course, Department of Indo-Chinese Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies).
- _____. 1992. Birumago ビルマ語 (Burmese). In *Gengogaku daijiten* 言語学大辞典 (The Sanseido encyclopaedia of linguistics), vol. 3, ed. Kamei Takashi 亀井孝, Kōno Rokurō 河野六郎, and Chino Eiichi 千野栄一, pp. 567–610. Tokyo: Sanseidō 三省堂.
- _____. 1993. Marumago マルマ語 (Marma). In *Gengogaku daijiten*, vol. 5, ed. Kamei Takashi, Kōno Rokurō, and Chino Eiichi, pp. 346–348. Tokyo: Sanseidō.
- _____. 1994. Case particles *-ká* and *-kou* in Burmese. In *Current issues in Sino-Tibetan linguistics*, ed. Kitamura Hajime, Nishida Tatsuo, and Nagano

Yasuhiko, pp. 730–736. Osaka: 26th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics Organizing Committee, National Museum of Ethnology.

_____. 2001a. Biruma moji ビルマ文字 (Burmese script). In *Gengogaku daijiten*, Supplementary Volume, ed. Kōno Rokurō, Chino Eiichi, and Nishida Tatsuo 西田龍雄, pp. 812–822. Tokyo: Sanseidō.

_____. 2001b. Myazedi moji ミヤゼディ文字 (Myazedi script). In *Gengogaku daijiten*, Supplementary Volume, ed. Kōno Rokurō, Chino Eiichi, and Nishida Tatsuo, pp. 1001–1005. Tokyo: Sanseidō.

_____. 2004. Myazedi Hibun ni okeru Ko-Birumago (OB) oboegaki ミヤゼディ碑文における古ビルマ語(OB)覚書 (Notes on Old Burmese in Myazedi Inscription). *Ekusu Oriente* 11: 59–103.

_____. 2006. Hpun words cognate to Burmese. In *Han-Zangyu yanjiu: Di 34 jie guoji Han-Zang yuyan ji yuyanxue huiyi lunwenji* 漢藏語研究：第三十四屆國際漢藏語言暨語言學會議論文集 (The research on the Sino-Tibetan languages and linguistics: Articles on Sino-Tibetan languages and linguistics for the 34th international conference), ed. Zhao Jiawen 趙嘉文, Shi Feng 石鋒, and He Shaoying 和少英, pp. 515–522. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe 民族出版社.

