Two types of causative construction in Pwo Karen (the Eastern dialect)[1]

Atsuhiko Kato

0. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to have a general look at the causative constructions of the Eastern dialect of Pwo Karen which is spoken in Burma. Special attention will be taken to what kinds of verbs[2] can co-occur with the causative elements. It will be shown that 'controllability' of the verbs denoting caused situations and 'humanity' of causees take important roles in the use of the causative constructions of Pwo Karen.

The causative constructions of Pwo Karen can be grouped into two groups. One is the construction where the causative element (hereafter CAUSE) and the verb denoting a caused situation are juxtaposed, and the complex of the juxtaposed elements functions like a single verb, with a noun which denotes the causer preceding it and a noun which denotes the causee following it. This type will be referred to as Type I in this paper.

Type I: CAUSER CAUSE V CAUSEE

See below.

(1) (a) '@we. lI_
3sg go
"He went."

(b) j@- da_ lI_ '@we.
1sg CAUSE go 3sg
"I let him go."

(1b) is a causative sentence of Type I, and (1b) is the corresponding simple active sentence. In (1b), the 'causative verb' *da_* and the verb *lI_* "to go" are justaposed.

Another is the construction where a causative element takes a complement sentence of which subject denotes the causee, and the causer functions as the subject of the matrix sentence. This type will be referred to as Type II in this paper.

Type II: CAUSER CAUSE [CAUSEE V]

See below:

(2) (a) '@we. lI_
3sg go
"He went."

(b) j@- 'an:m@n. '@we. lI_
1sg CAUSE 3sg go
"I ordered him to go."

In (2b) which is an example of Type II , the causee appears as the subject of the complement sentence. The reason that the causee should not be taken as the object of the matrix verb but the subject of the complement sentence is shown later.

Before looking at the characteristics of the Type I and II, it would be necessary to introduce the concept of 'controllability' of a verb, which is essential for discussing the causative constructions of Pwo Karen. The verbs of Pwo Karen can be classified into [+ controllable] verbs and [- controllable] verbs: a [+ controllable] verb is the one which denotes a situation that the subject can intentionally control, and a [- controllable] verb is the one which denotes a situation that the subject cannot intentionally control[3]. In Pwo Karen most verbs are specified about controllability in the lexicon[4]. The tests to see whether a verb is [+ controllable] or [- controllable] are shown below:

(i) If a verb can be an imperative sentence without any assistance of a particle, it is [+ controllable], and if not, it is [- controllable]:

(3) 'an: "Eat!"
(4) * Ti. "Die!"

Thus, in the examples above, *'an:* "to eat" is [+ controllable], and *Ti.* "to die"

is [- controllable][5].

(ii) If a verb can be used in the subordinate clause *be. ... To_* "so as (to do/be)" when the subject of it and the subject of the main clause are coreferential, it is [- controllable], and if not, it is [+ controllable].

(5) * be. j@i- khlain_ phloUn_ To_ , j@i- kly_cy_
SCM 1sg speak Karen SCM 1sg endeavor

(6) be. j@i- TI: To_ , j@i- kly_cy_
SCM 1sg can SCM 1sg endeavor
"I made an effort to be able (to do something)."

Thus, *khlain_* "to speak" is [+ controllable], and *TI:* "can" is [- controllable].

(iii) If a verb can be preceded by one of the causative verbs *ma_* , it is [- controllable], if not, it is [+ controllable].

(7) ma_ lan_thi.pha=
CAUSE tumble
"(I) made (him) tumble."

(8) * ma_ lI_ '@we.
CAUSE go 3sg

Thus, *lan_thi.pha=* is [- controllable], and *lI_* is [+ controllable]. However, since one of the main purpose of this paper is to see the features of verbs which can co-occur with causative verbs themselves, this test cannot be used here.

(iv) If a verb can take an inanimate subject, it is [- controllable].

(9) lai:'aU_ lan_the:
book fall down
"The book fell down."

Thus the verb *lan_the:* is a [- controllable] verb. But in the case of a verb which cannot take an inanimate subject, it may be either [+ controllable] or [- controllable], in other words it cannot be said that a verb is [+ controllable] because it cannot take an inanimate subject. For example, *lan_thi.pha=* "to tumble, to fall down" is a verb which cannot take an inanimate subject, but it is [- controllable].

In the appendix it is shown whether important verbs are [+ controllable] or [- controllable]. Most verbs are specified about controllability in the lexicon, but there are verbs, though few in number, of which controllability is not specified, for example *ni=* "to laugh". They can be used either as a [+ controllable] verb or a [- controllable] verb. For these verbs also, see the appendix.

1. Type I

This is the type where the causative element and the verb denoting a caused situation are juxtaposed. Though it is not yet evident whether the whole of the juxtaposed elements can be considered to be a 'compound verb', it can be said that they are quite tightly tied up because they cannot be interrupted by any other forms. Hereafter, the whole of the juxtaposed elements is refered to as a 'verb complex' for convenience sake.

The Type I causative construction can be defined in that the object[6] of the verb complex and the 'logical subject' of the latter element of the verb complex are coreferential. For example:

(10) j@- da_ lI_ '@we. (=1b)
1sg CAUSE go 3sg
"I let him go."

In (10), *'@we.*, the object of the verb complex *da_ lI_*, is the logical subject of *lI_* which is the latter element of the verb complex[7]. In this respect, (10) is quite different from (11).

(11) j@- ba: jU=khwa= '@we.
1sg must care 3sg
"I must take care of him."

This sentence is not the causative construction because *'@we.* is not the logical subject of *jU=khwa=* which is the latter element of the 'verb complex' *ba: jU=khwa=*.

Type I can be further divided into two types: one is the case where the causative element is a 'causative verb', and another is the case where the causative element is a general verb. Each type will be observed below.

1.1 The case using 'causative verbs'

There are four causative verbs which have so far been found in the author's data: *ma_* , *da_* , *phI:lan.* and *ko_*. Each of them have their origin in a general verb, but they semantically or syntactically differ from their corresponding general verbs. In this sense, it can be said that they are more or less grammaticalized; hence they are called 'causative verbs'. I define a 'causative verb' as a verb which is a more or less grammaticalized verb for the use as the causative element. They can be considered as one kind of 'auxiliaries' (See the note 2; i.e., they are preverb particles).

When a causative verb is used, the causee occurs in the positions described below, which are common to all the causative verbs. First, if the verb denoting a caused situation is one which cannot take an object, namely an intransitive verb, the causee occurs in the object (direct object) position of the verb complex (examples below are sentences with *da_*):

(12) j@- da_ kli: '@we.
1sg CAUSE run 3sg
"I let him run."

Second, if the verb denoting a caused situation is one which can take one object, namely a transitive verb, the causee occurs in the indirect object[8] position of the verb complex:

(13) j@- da_ 'an: '@we. mI_
1sg CAUSE eat 3sg rice
"I let him eat rice"

Finally, if the verb denoting a caused situation is one which can take two objects, namely a ditransitive verb, the causee occurs with the preposition *de=*, which indicates Instrumental or Comitative[9].

(14) j@- da_ phI:lan. '@we. lai:'aU_ de= j@- pha=
1sg CAUSE give 3sg book with my father
"I let my father give a book to him."

The fact that the causee is syntactically demoted as the valence of the verb denoting a caused situation increases conforms to Comrie (1976)'s proposal[10] from the linguistic typological point of view.

1.1.1 ma_

The causative verb *ma_* has the corresponding general verb *ma_* which means "to do" or "to make". The reason why *ma_* should be considered to be a causative verb is shown below:

(15) j@- ma_ pjo_ '@we. mI_
1sg CAUSE vomit 3sg rice
"I made him vomit rice"

In (15), the verb complex *ma_ pjo_* takes two objects. If *ma_* is a general verb, *ma_ pjo_* should be able to take only one object, because as Kato (1998) shows, in verb concatenation of Pwo Karen, the whole of the concatenated verbs takes over the characteristics, including the manner of taking arguments, of one of the concatenated verbs. Of which characteristics are taken over is determined according to whether they are intransitive (Vi) or transitive (Vt). In short, in the concatenations of Vi + Vi, Vi + Vt, and Vt +

Vt, the characteristics of the posterior verb (V2) are taken over, and in the concatenation of Vt + Vi, the characteristics of the anterior verb (V1) are taken over. For details, see Kato (1998). A few examples are below:

(16) j@- paU_ than: jU= l@khon.
1sg open PVP look outside
"I opened (the window) and looked at the outside."

(16')(a) * j@- paU_ than: jU= pai_t@ran.
1sg open PVP look window
(b) * j@- paU_ than: jU= pai_t@ran. l@khon.
1sg open PVP look window outside

(17) j@- dU: Ti. thwi:
1sg hit die dog
"I hit the dog dead."

In (16), an example of Vt + Vt concatenation, the whole of the concatenated verbs *paU_ than: jU=* takes over the manner of taking arguments of the V2 *jU=* (here *paU_ than:* as the whole is treated as the V1), therefore it can take one object. It must be noted that the object is the argument of V2, and the argument of V1, *pai_t@ran.* "window", cannot occur in the sentence, as is shown in (16'a) and (16'b). Next, in (17), an example of Vt + Vi concatenation, the whole of the concatenated verbs takes over the manner of taking arguments of the V1 *dU:*, thus it takes one object, *thwi:* "dog". The V2 *Ti.* "die" is an intransitive verb, and in this case, it does not influence the characteristics of the whole concatenated verbs.

Thus, the whole of concatenated general verbs cannot take two objects as far as either of the verbs is not a ditransitive verb[11]. In (15), if *ma_* is a general verb, the whole of the concatenated verbs, in this case Vt + Vt, should be able to take only one object, since both of the verbs are ones which can take only one object. However, there are two objects in (15), and this is why *ma_* should be considered to be a causative verb, not a general verb.

The causative verb *ma_* is used when the verb denoting a caused situation is [- controllable]. There is no semantic restriction for the causees. Examples are shown below:

(18) j@- ma_ Ti. thwi:
1sg CAUSE dead dog
"I killed the dog."

(19) j@- ma_ Ta_mE: '@we.
1sg CAUSE fear 3sg
"I frightened him."

(20) '@we. ma_ lan_thi.pha= '@- wE=cO_
3sg CAUSE tumble his brother
"He made his brother tumble."

(21) j@- ma_ ga_gon_ '@- gein:
1sg CAUSE break his house
"I broke his house."

(22) j@- ma_ cO: j@- chain.
1sg CAUSE wet his shirt
"I got my shirt wet."

(23) j@- ma_ lan_jwa_ Tein:la:
1sg CAUSE flow leaf
"I made the leaf flow"

If the co-occurring verb is [+ controllable], *ma_* cannot used anymore:

(24) * j@- ma_ lI_ '@we.
1sg CAUSE go 3sg

(25) * j@- ma_ chon.mon: '@we.
1sg CAUSE consider 3sg

(26) * j@- ma_ 'an:phon. '@we. mI_
1sg CAUSE cook 3sg rice

The sentences (24)-(26) become acceptable if *ma_* is replaced by *da_* which will be discussed in the next section.

(24') j@- da_ lI_ '@we.
1sg CAUSE go 3sg "I let him go."

(25') j@- da_ chon.mon: '@we.
1sg CAUSE consider 3sg
"I let him consider (it)."

(26') j@- da_ 'an:phon. '@we. mI_
1sg CAUSE cook 3sg rice
"I let him cook rice."

In fact, there are a few exceptions which do not conform to the generalization above; they are the verbs, *TI:ja.* "to know", *da:* "to see", *na=g@n.* "to hear", and *na:TI:* "to understand", which have meanings concerning perception or cognition. These verbs are considered [- controllable] because they cannot be an imperative sentence and they can occur in the *be. ... To_* clause, but in fact they do not co-occur with *ma_.* They are the only exceptions for the use of *ma_*[12]. See the examples below:

(27) (a) * j@- ma_ TI:ja. '@we.
1sg CAUSE know 3sg
(b) j@- da_ TI:ja. '@we.
1sg CAUSE know 3sg
"I notified him (of that)."

(28) (a) * j@- ma_ na=g@n. '@we.
1sg CAUSE hear 3sg
(b) j@- da_ na=g@n. '@we.
1sg CAUSE hear 3sg
"I made it possible for him to hear (that)."

1.1.2 da_ (daU_)

*da_* can also be pronounced as *daU_*. Considering the phonological correspondence with the Western Pwo Karen dialect (the Western form /d@y'/) or Sgaw Karen (Sgaw Karen form /dy'/), its original form would have been *daU_*, but presently it is more often pronounced as *da_*. It has the correrssponding general verb *daU_* which means "to fight" or "to attack". The reasons why *da_* is considered to be a causative verb, not a general verb are given below:

(29) j@- da_ 'an: '@we. kU:
1sg CAUSE eat 3sg confectionery
"I let him eat a cake."

First, as is shown in (29), *da_* is not used as a verb meaning "to fight". Second, the general verb meaning "to fight" is usually pronouced *daU_*, not *da_*. Third, if *da_* is a general verb, the verb complex in (29) should be able to take only one object, as we saw in 1.1.1. Since the general verb meaning "to fight" and *'an:* "to eat" are both transitive verbs which can take only one object, the concatenated general verbs *da_ 'an:* could take only one object; nevertheless there are two objects in (29). Accordingly, *da_* should be considered a causative verb.

The causative verb *da_* is used when the verb denoting a caused situation is [+ controllable]. Therefore the causee is usually an animate entity, which is due to the fact that the verb is [+ controllable], and there is no need to specify animacy as a selectional restriction of *da_*. Examples of sentences with *da_* are:

(30) j@- da_ lI_ '@we.
1sg CAUSE go 3sg
"I let him go."

(31) j@- da_ 'an: j@- thwi: cha:
1sg CAUSE eat my dog feed
"I feed my dog."

(32) j@- da_ 'an:gu: '@we. ch@_
1sg CAUSE steal 3sg thing
"I let him steal (it)."

If *da_* is replaced by *ma_*, these sentences become unacceptable.

(30') * j@- ma_ lI_ '@we.
(31') * j@- ma_ 'an: '@we. kU:
(32') * j@- ma_ 'an:gu: '@we. ch@_

Generally speaking, if the verb denoting a caused situation is [+ controllable], *ma_* is used as the causative verb, and if [- controllable], *da_* is used as the causative verb. However, with a [-controllable] verb, *da_* is in fact sometimes used as the causative verb.

(33) j@- ma_ ga_gon_ '@- gein:
1sg CAUSE break his house
"I broke his house."

(34) j@- ma_ saU_ '@we.
1sg CAUSE startled 3sg
"I startled him."

In (33) and (34), it is not impossible to replace *ma_* with *da_* as below:

(33') j@- da_ ga_gon_ '@- gein:
(34') j@- da_ saU_ '@we.

In the author's data, it was found that *ma_* can be replaced by *da_* in almost all of the cases. In the all cases, however, using *ma_* is more natural than using *da_* with a [-controllable] verb. According to Kato (1992), Sgaw Karen has the forms *ma=* and *dy'* which are cognage to Pwo Karen *ma_* and *da_* respectively, and there is also a sentence which corresponds to (33'):

(35) j@- dy' ha'gO= '@- hi^ [Sgaw Karen]
1sg CAUSE break his house
"I let his house break of itself."

The sentence (35) implies that "I" let the "collapse of his house" take its course and that "I" was just an "onlooker". Sgaw Karen *dy'* does not usually co-occur with a [- controllable] verb, but if it does, it always yields the "noninterference" meaning as in (35). In Pwo Karen, however, *da_* with a [+ controllable] verb does not involve the meaning like this. Furthermore, in the Western dialect of Pwo Karen, the sentence below corresponding to (33') is an unacceptable sentence:

(36) * j@- d@y' ga'gaun: '@- jein_ [Western Pwo Karen]
1sg CAUSE break his house

Looking at these facts, it would be possible that the new use of *da_* being able to co-occur with [- controllable] verbs without adding a particular meaning has sporadically appeared in the Eastern dialect of Pwo Karen.

1.1.3 phI:lan. (phlan.)

Next, we will see the causative verb *phI:lan.* which involves benefactive meaning. The following is an example:

(37) j@- phI:lan. pO= '@we. lai:'aU_
1sg CAUSE read 3sg book
"I let him read the book (for his sake)."

It has the corresponding general verb *phI:lan.* which means "to give"[13] and which can take two objects. The reasons why *phI:lan.* should be considered to be a causative verb are as follows.

First, as we saw in 1.1.1, in the concatenation of Vt + Vt, the characteristics of V2 are taken over by the whole concatenated verbs. In (37), *pO=* "to read" is a verb which takes only one object, but the whole of the concatenated verbs takes two objects, therefore *phI:lan. pO=* is not an ordinary concatenation. This fact implies that *phI:lan.* is a causative verb. Second, in (37) even if we assume *phI:lan. pO=* is an ordinary concatenation and that the characteristic of taking two objects is determined by the V1 *phI:lan.*, there is a definite difference between *phI:lan.* of here and general *phI:lan.*:

(38) j@- phI:lan. '@we. lai:'aU_
1sg give 3sg book
"I gave him a book."

In (38), a sentence where the general verb *phI:lan.* is used, there is a movement from *j@-* "I" to *'@we.* "he" of the "book". But the sentence (37), with the causative *phI:lan.*, does not involve such a movement of any entity, in other words, in (37) there is not any change of possessors that is ordinarily involved in a sentence with the general verb *phI:lan.*. Therefore we may reasonably say that *phI:lan.* as in (37) should be considered a causative verb.

The causative verb *phI:lan.* can be used without respect to whether the verb denoting a caused situation is [+controllable] or [- controllable]. (39) and (40) below are the examples with [+controllable] verbs, and (41) and (42) are the examples with [- controllable] verbs:

(39) j@- phI:lan. lI_ '@we.
1sg CAUSE go 3sg
"I let him go (for his sake)."

(40) j@- phI:lan. 'an:phon. '@we. mI_
1sg CAUSE cook 3sg rice
"I let him cook rice (for his sake)."

(41) j@- phI:lan. m@n. than: '@we.
1sg CAUSE alive PVP 3sg
"I revived him (for his sake)."

(42) j@- phI:lan. dU: than: '@we.
1sg CAUSE big PVP 3sg
"I brought him up (for his sake)."

The causative verb *phI:lan.* differs from *ma_* or *da_* in that *phI:lan.* adds benefactive meaning to the sentence. As far as the causee is animate, it is to be interpreted as the beneficiary. However, as in the examples below, inanimate entities often appear as a causee, in which case the causee is not coreferential with the beneficiary:

(43) j@- phI:lan. khU= than: thi. '@we. '@gan=
1sg CAUSE hot PVP water 3sg sake
"I boiled the water for him."

(44) j@- phI:lan. phan_ than: daU_ph@n_
1sg CAUSE light PVP inside of the room
"I made the room light (for someone's sake)."

In (43), the causee is *thi.* "water", but the beneficiary is *'@we.* "he", and in (44), the causee is *daU_ph@n_*, but the beneficiary is someone which is not expressed in the sentence. Thus, when the causee is an inanimate entity, it

is not coreferential with the beneficiary.

1.1.4 ko_

A verb complex with the causative *ko_* generally means "call someone in order to make him/her do something".

(45) j@- ko_ 'an: '@we. mI_
1sg CAUSE eat 3sg rice
"I called him to make him eat rice. (I invited him for a meal)."

The causative verb *ko_* has the corresponding general verb which means "to call" or "to invite" and which can take one object:

(46) j@- ko_ '@we.
1sg call 3sg
"I invited him."

In (45), if the verb complex *ko_ 'an:* is a simple example of concatenated general verbs, it could take only one object, since none of the verbs is ditransitive. However, there are two objects in (45), therefore, *ko_* in this case should be considered to be a causative verb, not a general verb.

But, in fact, *ko_* can take two objects when it is used in the meaning of "call someone as ~" as shown in (47):

(47) j@- ko_ '@we. man_cO_
1sg call him uncle
"I call him 'Uncle'"

Through this fact, can it be assumed that the verb complex of (45) takes over the *ko_*'s characteristic of being able to take two objects as in (47)? The answer is 'no'. In (47), the direct object and the indirect object are coreferential, namely *'@we.* equals *man_cO_*, while in (45), the relationship *'@we.* = *mI_* does not hold. Therefore, we may say that *ko_* as in (45) is not

the same as the general verb *ko_*.

In a sentence with the causative *ko_*, the verb denoting a caused situation can be either [+ controllable] or [- controllable]. (48) and (49) below are the examples with [+ controllable] verbs:

(48) j@- ko_ 'an: '@we. mI_ (=45)
1sg CAUSE eat 3sg rice
"I invited him for a meal."

(49) j@- To_ ko_ mi. j@_
my friend CAUSE sleep 1sg
"My friend let me stay one knight at his house."

(50) below is an example with a [- controllable] verb:

(50) j@- ko_ nO: than: '@we.
1sg CAUSE wake PVP 3sg
"I called out to him to wake him up."

One thing to be noted in the use of *ko_* is that the causee must be [+ human]. Therefore, (51) below is appopriate, while (52) with an animal causee is not acceptable:

(51) j@- ko_ gE. than: j@- phU:
1sg CAUSE come PVP my child
"I told my son to come up (onto the house)."

(52) * j@- ko_ gE. than: j@- thwi:
1sg CAUSE come PVP my dog

The general verb *ko_* has the same selectional restriction:

(53) * j@- ko_ j@- thwi:
1sg call 1sg.GEN dog

Perhaps the causative verb *ko_* has succeeded the selectional restriction of the original general verb.

1.2 The case where general verbs are used as the causative element

Here, we will see the cases where a general verb is used as the causative element. These cases are discussed by Kato (1998) in his description of Pwo Karen verb concatenation, where he shows that only if the concatenated verbs are of combination of Vt + Vi, the logical subjects of the V1 and the V2 are not coreferential, and that the logical subject of V2 is coreferential with the object noun of the concatenation. (54) below is an example of such a case, whereas the sentences (55) - (57) are examples of the other combinations where the logical subjects of the V1 and V2 are coreferential.

Vt + Vi

(54) j@- dU: Ti. thwi:
1sg hit dead dog
"I hit the dog dead."

Vi + Vi

(55) j@- chi.nan_ ko_sa_
1sg sit shout
"I shouted while sitting."

Vi + Vt

(56) j@- chi.nan_ pO= lai:'aU_
1sg sit read book
"I read a book while sitting."

Vt + Vt

(57) j@- 'an:phon. 'an: mI_
1sg cook eat meat
"I cooked the rice and ate it."

In a concatenation such as (54), V2 denotes a situation caused by the action denoted by V1, therefore the sentence contains a causative-like meaning[14]. With this combination, a verb used as V1 is often relatively high in transitivity, and the V2 is always [-controllable] (for details see Kato 1998). Examples follow:

(58) j@- che_ Ti. '@we.
1sg stab dead 3sg
"I stabbed him dead."

(59) j@- 'ain: ble_ kU:
1sg bite smash confectionery
"I bit the bisket into pieces."

(60) ch@phU:xa= 'an: ga_gon_ bu:
insect eat break paddy
"The insects did harm to the paddy."

(61) j@- dU: kain: le:
1sg hit bend stick
"I hit the stick to bent it."

(62) j@- 'O:ke: su: lan_ thi_khlan.
1sg put cool PVP tea
"I put the tea to cool it."

Generally speaking, in sentences of this type, the object noun of the concatenated verbs refers to the undergoer of the V1, but it is not always the

case. See the example below (see Kato 1998 also).

(63) j@- kh@Un: lan_b@n_ phloUn_cU:
1sg dig sink corpse
"I dug (the ground) and buried the body."

2. Type II

In this section we will see the Type II , where the word order is CAUSER CAUSE [CAUSEE V]. The causee occurs in the position of the subject of the complement sentence. In this type, the possible causative elements which have so far been found in my data are the verbs *'an:m@n.* "to order", *plE_tO_* "to allow", and *phI:lan.* "to give". Unlike the causative verbs which were seen in 1.1, they are not considered as 'auxiliaries' (preverb particles and postverb particles; See the note 2) because Pwo Karen auxiliaries do not take a complement sentence.

In order to define this type of construction, I will show the difference between this construction and other constructions taking a complement sentense. There are various verbs which take a complement sentence:

(64) j@- lO_ ['@we. lI_]
1sg tell 3sg go
"I told that he had gone."

(65) j@- TI:ja. ['@we. gE.]
1sg know 3sg come
"I know that he came."

(66) j@- da: ['@we. kli:]
1sg see 3sg run
"I saw him running."

These complement sentences shows the opposition of the realis and irrealis. In other words, the irrealis marker *m@-* can be attached to the verbs of these

complement sentences.

(64') j@- lO_ '@we. m@- lI_
1sg tell 3sg IRR go
"I told that he would go."

(65') j@- TI:ja. '@we. m@- gE.
1sg know 3sg IRR come
"I know that he will come."

(66') j@- da: '@we. m@- kli:
1sg see 3sg IRR run
"I saw him preparing to run."

If the irrealis marker *m@-* is attached to the verbs of the complement sentences, the situations denoted by the verbs are interpreted to occur after the situations denoted by the matrix verbs. However, this is not the case for the Type II causative construction. For example:

(67) j@- 'an:m@n. '@we. lI_
1sg order 3sg go
"I orderd him to go."

(68) j@- plE_tO_ '@we. lI_
1sg allow 3sg go
"I allowed him to go."

(69) j@- phI:lan. '@we. lI_
1sg give 3sg go "I let him go (for his sake)."

In the sentences above, *m@-* cannot be attached to the verbs of the complement sentences.

(67') * j@- 'an:m@n. '@we. m@- lI_
(68') * j@- plE_tO_ '@we. m@- lI_
(69') * j@- phI:lan. '@we. m@- lI_

In (67), the situation "he goes" occurs after the situation "I order (him)", but even so *m@-* cannot co-occur before *lI_*. The Type II causative construction is defined as the construction where the complement sentence occuring in the object position of the matrix verb does not show the opposition of realis and irrealis[15].

Next, it will be shown that in the Type II the causee is not the object of the matrix verb, but the subject of the complement sentence. There are three evidences. The examples with *'an:m@n.* are shown below:

(i) A pause can be put before the causee as (70a), but cannot after the causee as (70b): (# denotes a pause)

(70) (a) j@- 'an:m@n. # '@we. lI_
1sg order 3sg go "I orderd him to go."
(b) * j@- 'an:m@n. '@we. # lI_
1sg order 3sg go

(ii) The whole of the complement sentence can be topicalized as (71a), but topicalization cannot be done with the causee left in the original position as (71b):

(71) (a) '@we. lI_ phja. nO: j@- 'an:m@n.
3sg go market that[16] 1sg order
"It was to go to the market that I ordered him to do."
(b) * lI_ phja. nO: j@- 'an:m@n. '@we.
go market that 1sg order 3sg

(iii) The particle *l@-* which introduce complement sentences can be put

before the causee:

(72) j@- 'an:m@n. l@- '@we. lI_
1sg order COMP 3sg go
"I ordered that he should go."

The same can be said of *plE_tO_* and *phI:lan*[17]. With the evidences above, the causee should be considered to be the subject of the complement sentence, not the object of the matrix verb.

We will see the details of each verb below.

2.1 'an:m@n.

The meaning of the verb *'an:m@n.* is "to order"[18]. In a sentence with *'@n:m@n.*, the verb of the complement sentence must be [+controllable]. Therefore, (74) is unacceptable.

(73) j@- 'an:m@n. '@we. chi.nan_
1sg order 3sg sit
"I ordered him to sit down."

(74) * j@- 'an:m@n. '@we. lan_thi.pha=
1sg order 3sg tumble

Further, the causee must be [+human]. Therefore, (76) where the causee is an animal is unacceptable.

(75) j@- 'an:m@n. j@- phU: 'an: mI_
1sg order my child eat rice
"I ordered my children to eat rice."

(76) * j@- 'an:m@n. j@- thwi: 'an: cha:
1sg order my dog eat rice

This is parallel to the fact that *'an:m@n.* cannot take a [- human] object.

(77) (a) j@- 'an:m@n. j@- phU:
1sg order my child "I ordered my child (to do something)"
(b) * j@- 'an:m@n. j@- thwi:
1sg order my dog

2.2 plE_tO_

The meaning of the verb *plE_tO_* is "to allow". As in the case of *'an:m@n.*, the verb of the complement sentence must be [+ controllable]. Therefore, (79) is unacceptable.

(78) j@- plE_tO_ '@we. chi.nan_
1sg allow 3sg sit
"I allowed him to sit down."

(79) * j@- plE_tO_ '@we. Ti.
1sg allow 3sg die

Here also the causee must be [+ human], which is the same as the case of *'an:m@n.*. Therefore, (81) is unacceptable.

(80) j@- plE_tO_ j@- phU: 'an: mI_
1sg allow my child eat rice
"I allowed my children to eat rice."

(81) * j@- plE_tO_ j@- thwi: 'an: cha:
1sg allow my dog eat feed

This is parallel to the fact that *plE_tO_* cannot take a [- human] object noun.

(82) (a) j@- plE_tO_ j@- phU:
1sg allow my child "I allowed my child (to do something)"

(b) * j@- plE_tO_ j@- thwi:
1sg allow my dog

2.3 phI:lan. (phlan.)

The meaning of the verb *phI:lan.* is "to give". It contains benefactive meaning as the causative verb *phI:lan.* which we saw in 1.1.3. However, in the Type II construction, the causee is always the beneficiary. Since sentences with *phI:lan.* of the Type I and sentences with *phI:lan.* of the Type II are the same in that they contain benefactive meaning, they can often be paraphrased with each other. See below:

(83) (a) j@- phI:lan. lI_ '@we. (Type I)
1sg give go 3sg
"I let him go (for his sake)."
(b) j@- phI:lan. '@we. lI_ (Type II)
1sg give 3sg him
"I let him go (for his sake.)"

(84) (a) phI:lan. jain= j@_ n@- cE:bein= (Type I)
give tread 1sg your bicycle
"Let me ride your bicycle."
(b) phI:lan. j@- jain= n@- cE:bein= (Type II)
give 1sg tread your bicycle
"Let me ride your bicycle."

But the construction with *phI:lan.* of the Type II differs from that of the Type I in that the causee of the Type II must be [+human], while the Type I allows a [- human] causee[19]:

(85) (a) j@- phI:lan. ja= j@- thwi: thi. (Type I)
1sg give swim my dog water
"I let my dog swim in the water (for its sake)."
(b) * j@- phI:lan. j@- thwi: ja= thi. (Type II)
1sg give my dog swim water

But they are the same in that the verb denoting a caused situation can be either [+ controllable] or [- controllable] in both the types:

(86) (a) j@- phI:lan. TI:ja. '@we. (Type I)
1sg give know 3sg "I notified him (of something)."
(b) j@- phI:lan. '@we. TI:ja. (Type II)
1sg give 3sg know

3. Summary

We can see from the discussion above that controllability of verbs and humanity of causees play important roles in the use of the causative constructions of Pwo Karen[20]. The table below summarizes the discussion:

Causative elements	Controllability of the verb	Humanity of the causee
Type I		
ma_	[- controllable]	unspecified
da_	usually [+ controllable]	unspecified
phI:lan.	unspecified	unspecified
ko_	unspecified	[+ human]
general verbs	[- controllable]	unspecified
Type II		
'an:m@n.	[+ controllable]	[+ human]
plE_tO_	[+ controllable]	[+ human]
phI:lan.	unspecified	[+ human]

Finally, it may be worth pointing out that the causative constructions of Pwo Karen do not imply whether caused situations actually happen or do not. Thus, even if a clause which negate the caused situation is put after a causative sentence, it does not yield any contradiction[21]:

(87) j@- ma_ Ti. '@we. la=nan.Ti: '@we. Ti. 'e:
1sg CAUSE die 3sg but 3sg die NEG
"I killed him, but he did not die."

(88) j@- che_ Ti. '@we. la=nan.Ti: '@we. Ti. 'e:
1sg stab die 3sg but 3sg die NEG
"I stabbed him to kill, but he did not die."

(89) j@- da_ lI_ '@we. la=nan.Ti: '@we. lI_ 'e:
1sg CAUSE go 3sg but 3sg go NEG
"I let him go, but he did not go."

(90) j@- 'an:m@n. '@we. lI_ la=nan.Ti: '@we. lI_ 'e:
1sg CAUSE 3sg go but 3sg go NEG
"I ordered him to go, but he did not go."

All these examples show that, in the causative constructions of Pwo Karen, the caused situations are represented as ones which are just expected to happen. In other words, whether they have actually happened is not expressed in the causative sentences. This fact reminds us of Ikegami's (1985) discussion which points out that the Japanese is a 'process-oriented' language compared to English which is 'goal-oriented'. According to Ikegami, the Japanese verbs of motion do not always imply the achievement of their goals, thus the sentence like below is acceptable:

(91) moyasita keredo, moenakatta [Japanese]
burned though didn't burn "I burned it, but it did not burn."

The sentences (87)-(90) imply that Pwo Karen is also a 'process-oriented' language as Japanese, although it is needless to say that this view should be examined from various points of view.

Notes

[1] Pwo Karen can be divided into two dialects based on intelligibility (See Kato 1995): the Eastern dialect which is spoken in Hpa-an, Hlainbwe, Kokareik, etc.; and the Western dialect (Delta dialect) which is spoken in Bassein, Kyonbyaw, Myaungmya, etc. The dialect treated in this paper is the Eastern dialect. The data used here were collected during my several field researches studies: researches carried out sporadically in Burma (mainly in Yangon) when the author stayed there from 1992 to 1995; research in Mae Sot from December 1995 to January 1996 (supported by the Mitsubishi Trust Yamamuro Memorial Scholarship Commitee); research in Mae Sot and Hpa-an from January to February 1997 and research in Mae Sot and Hpa-an from January to March 1998 (both supported by the Grant-in-Aid from the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture). This paper is a thoroughly revised version of the paper read at the seminar of the University of Tokyo in April 1996. I wish to thank Prof. Yasutoshi Yukawa, Prof. Tasaku Tsunoda, the other professors and the students for their helpful comments. And my special thanks are due to Saw Thurein, U Sandarwara and Saw Hta Lon who have been teaching me the Pwo Karen language.

[2] Pwo Karen verbs can be defined as the words which 'auxiliaries' can attach to. 'Auxiiaries' include preverb particles (ex. *m@-* "irrealis marker", *l@-* "negative marker" etc.) and postverb particles (ex. *jU=wa=* "try (to do)", *ba:* "inevitality" etc.).

[3] Verbs specified as [+ controllable] can be switched to [- controllable] ones by putting the verbal particle *ba:* after them. See the example below (*jain=* is specified as [+ controllable]):

j@- jain= ba: 'I:khU:lon:
1sg tread BA excrement
"I carelessly stepped on droppings ."

Nevertheless, verbs specified as [- controllable] cannot be switched to [+ controllable].

[4] If we utilize the semantic representation proposed by Van Valin and LaPolla (1997), controllable verbs may be represented as DO (x, [do' ... .

[5] If there is a need to make a sentence of imperative illocutionary force using the word *Ti.*, one of the verbal particles denoting a wish, *la=* or *da:we.*, has to be put after the verb.

(i) Ti. la= chai_
die PVP SFP "I wish that you (or he / she / I) would die."
(ii) Ti. da:we.
die PVP "I wish that you (or he / she / I) would die."

[6] In this paper, a noun which is put immediately before a verb or a verb complex is called a 'subject', and a noun which is put immediately after a verb or a verb complex is called an 'object'.

[7] The fact that *'@we.* is the logical subject of the verb *lI_* can be seen, if we think of the sentence *'@we. lI_* "he goes".

[8] In a sentence with two objects, RECIPIENT is put immediately after the verb, and PATIENT follows it:

VERB RECIPIENT PATIENT

In the case of a sentence with two objects, I will use the term 'indirect object' for a noun which occurs immediately after the verb, and the term 'direct object' for a noun which occurs after the indirect object.

[9] The particle *de=* also denotes Conjunctive :

nU:we: de= nU:wi_Tu:
broom and fan "a broom and a fan"

[10] For discussions of the proposal of Comrie (1976), see, for example, Comrie (1981), Palmer (1994), Song (1996), Van Valin and LaPolla (1997).

[11] For example, the whole of the concatenated verbs below takes two objects since the V2 is a ditransitive verb:

j@- lI_ phI:lan. '@we. lai:'aU_
1sg go give 3sg book "I went and gave him a book."

[12] Therefore, of the tests to see controllability, the test using *ma_* has exceptions.

[13] *phI:lan.* is often pronounced *phlan.*. This can also be said of the general verb *phI:lan.*.

[14] Pwo Karen also has a sentence such as below:

j@- dU: thwi: Ti. poUN=
1sg hit dog dead SFP
"I hit the dog and the dog died."

In this case, the resulted situation "dead" was not intended by the actor "I", in other words it is caused inadvertently. (This type of verb serialization was also discussed by Kato 1998). In (54), on the other hand, the dog's death was intended by "I" from the beginning. Kato (ibid.) discussed this difference from the view of 'head verb' of serialized verbs: he assumes that in the sentence above the head verb is *Ti.*, whereas in (54) the head verb is *dU:*.

[15] The fact that the opposition between realis and irrealis cannot be seen in the complement sentence of the causative construction implies that the complement sentence is strongly dependent to the matrix sentence. An evidence in favour of this is that the matrix sentence and the complement sentence cannot independently select time adverbial phrases:

* l@ni_jo_ j@- 'an:m@n. '@we. lI_ kE_kho:
today 1sg CAUSE 3sg go tomorrow

This contrasts with English which can say as below:

Yesterday Fred persuaded John to go to the market tomorrow.

[16] Here the demonstrative *nO:* "that" is used as a topic marker.

[17] (1) (a) j@- plE_tO_ # '@we. lI_
(b) * j@- plE_tO_ '@we. # lI_
(c) j@- phI:lan. # '@we. lI_
(d) * j@- phI:lan. '@we. # lI_

(2) (a) '@we. lI_ phja. nO: j@- 'an:m@n.
(b) * 'lI_ phja. nO: j@- 'an:m@n. '@we.
(c) '@we. lI_ phja. nO: j@- phI:lan.
(d) * 'lI_ phja. nO: j@- phI:lan. '@we.

(3) (a) j@- plE_tO_ l@- '@we. lI_
(b) j@- phI:lan. l@- '@we. lI_

[18] In the Western dialect, *'an_m@_*, the cognate word with *'@n:m@n.*, cannot take a complement sentence. The Western dialect has no construction corresponding to type II. The Western *'an_m@_* is used as a causative verb as below:

j@- 'an_m@_ le: '@we_
1sg CAUSE go 3sg
"I ordered him to go."

The Eastern dialect and Western dialect differs from eath other especially in the phonological level and lexical level (See Kato 1995), but in the syntactic level also, they show such a difference.

[19] Unlike *'an:m@n.* and *plE_tO_* , *phI:lan.* can take a [- human] recipient:

j@- phI:lan. j@- thwi: cha:
1sg give my dog feed
"I gave my dog a feed."

[20] All these causative expressions themselves have the characteristic of [+ controllable]. Thus, they can be used as an imperative sentence.

[21] This fact is very similar to the 'resultative constructions' of Kayah Li. (See Solnit 1997:68)

Appendix

Below is the list which shows the controllability of some Pwo Karen verbs which were selected mainly according to Hattori (1957). There are some verbs, but small in number, which are not specified about controllability as shown in (iii) below. It should also be added that the verbs denoting movement or presence, i.e. *lI_* "to go", *gE.* "to come", *naU:* "to enter", *than:* "to ascend", *lan_* "to descend", *chi.th@Un:* "to stand", *'O:* "to be", are treated as [+ controllable] when they take an animate subject, while treated as [- controllable] when they take an inanimate subject.

*The forms in parentheses ( ) are the corresponding Japanese words.

(i) [+ controllable] verbs

chi:cha.	to urinate (osikko suru)
'I:cha.	to void excrement (unci suru)
chon.na:	to listen (kiku)
To_	to wear (kiru)
kwE:	to take off (clothes) (nugu)
cha_	to sew (nuu)
'an:phon.	to cook (taku)
'an:	to eat (taberu)
T@un:	to build (tateru)
chi.nan_	to sit (suwaru)
cain:	to walk (aruku), to run away (nigeru)
lon_	to pursue (oikakeru)
'O:xaU:	to marry (kekkon suru)
'O:pwai_	to rest (yasumu)
'an:gu:	to steal (nusumu)
kli:	to run (hasiru)
khwE_	to creep (hau)
'an:ca_	to ask (tazuneru)
pO=	to read (yomu)
ko_	to call (yobu)
lo:kwe_	to play (asobu)

phI:lan. (phlan.) to give (yaru, ageru)
'an:cha. to sell (uru)
'O:kho_ to wait (macu)
ma_ch@n_ to help (tecudau)
plE_tO_ to allow (yurusu)
thaU_ to wipe (huku)
phu: to carry on one's back (seou)
ko_kI: to put (oku)
da_nE: to show (miseru)
san. to tear [Vt] (saku, yaburu)
'an:Ti.ja_ to wash (arau)
che_ to stab (sasu)
chon.mon: to consider (kangaeru)
ma_lU: to study (osowaru), to teach (osieru)
nE_'an: to believe (sinziru)
ja= to swim (oyogu)
'ain: to bite (kamu) cf. 'ain: to be sharp (surudoi)
lI_ to go (iku) with an animate subject
gE. to come (kuru) with an animate subject
naU: to enter (hairu) with an animate subject
than: to ascend (agaru, noboru) with an animate subject
lan_ to descend (sagaru, oriru) with an animate subject
chi.th@Un: to stand (tacu) with an animate subject
'O: to be, to exist (iru) with an animate subject

(ii) [- controllable] verbs
khlI_ to be bold (hagete iru)
kwE: to be unfastened (hodokeru)
mein. to be ripe (ureru)
'wi: to be delicious (oisii)
ch@n. to be sweet (amai)
gan. to be salty (siokarai)
chain: to be sour (suppai)

'u:paU_ to rot (kusaru)
nO: to awake [Vi] (mezameru)
dU: to be big (ookii)
m@n. to be alive (ikite iru)
bon: to be fat (futotte iru)
pwai_Ta_ to be tired (cukareru)
caU_cha. to be sick (byooki da)
cha. to ache (itai)
ma_n@n_ to win (kacu)
ca_ to be defeated (makeru)
Ta_sa= to be old (toshitotte iru)
ga_gon_ to be broken (kowareru)
ja: to tear [Vi] (sakeru)
the: to be cut (kireru)
lan_the: to fall (ociru)
cO: to be wet (nurete iru)
xain. to be dry (kawaite iru)
Ta_nan: to forget (wasureru)
Ta_mE: to fear (osoreru, kowai)
saU_ to be amazed (odoroku)
Ta_xwi. to be glad (yorokobu, uresii)
Ta_than: to get angry (okoru)
khU:lon: to freeze [Vi] (kooru)
phli= to melt [Vi] (tokeru)
phan_ to be light, to be bright (akarui)
khai_ to be dark (kurai)
khU= to be hot (acui)
khlein: to be cold (cumetai)
l@n_ to be warm (atatakai)
lan_b@n_ to sink [Vi] (sizumu)
lan_jwa_ to flow (nagareru)
lan_ji: to wither (kareru)
'ain: to be sharp (surudoi)

lan_thi.pha= to tumble, to fall down (korobu)
thO. to be long (nagai), to be high (takai)
phy: to be short (mizikai), to be low (hikui)
ci.ca: to be dirty (kitanai)
phlI. to be smooth (namerakana)
lE= to be wide (hiroi)
'a: to be many (ooi)
sa_ to be few (sukunai)
lI_ to go (iku) with an inanimate subject
gE. to come (kuru) with an inanimate subject
naU: to enter (hairu) with an inanimate subject
than: to ascend (agaru, noboru) with an inanimate subject
lan_ to descend (sagaru, oriru) with an inanimate subject
chi.th@Un: to stand (tacu) with an inanimate subject
'O: to be, to exist (aru) with an inanimate subject
TI:ja. to know (sitte iru)
da: to see (mieru)
na=g@n. to hear (kikoeru)
na:TI: to understand (wakatte iru)

(iii) Verbs unspecified about controllability

The verbs shown below are difficult to treat, because they are like [+ controllable] verbs in that they can be an imperative sentence, while they are like [- controllable] verbs in that they can occur in the *be. ... To_* clause, and that they can co-occur with causative *ma_*.

k@chI: to sneeze (kusyami suru)
ni= to laugh (warau)
gan: to weep (naku)
pjo_ to vomit (haku)

For the exaplanation of this fact, I assume that these verbs are not specified about controllability in the lexicon, and they can optionally take either value

of controllability.

Transcription

Consonants

p	T [ʈ]	t	c	k	' [ʔ]	s [ɕ]	x		h
ph		th	ch	kh			g [ɣ]	R [ʁ]	
b [ɓ]		d [ɗ]							
m		n	ny [ɲ]			w	j	l	r

/n/ after a vowel indicates that the latter part of the vowel is nasalized.

Vowels

i	y [ɨ]	u [ɯ]
I [ɪ]		U [ʊ]
e	@ [ə]	o
E [ɛ]	a	O [ɔ]

Tones

: [55]

= [22(3)]

_ [11]

. [51]

unmarked = atonic

(If an atonic syllable occurs before a word boundary, it is represented with hyphen.)

Abbreviations

SCM = subordinate clause marker

SFP = sentence final particle

PVP = post verb particle

References

Comrie, Bernard (1976) "The syntax of causative constructions: cross-language similarities and divergences." In Shibatani (1976), pp. 261-312.

_____ (1981) *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Givón, Talmy (1975) "Cause and control: On the semantics of interpersonal manipulation." In Kimball, John P. (1975) *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol 4, pp. 59-89. New York: Academic Press.

Hattori, Shiro (1957) *Kisogoichoosahyoo* (Questionnaire for Basic Vocabulary [in Japanese]). Department of Linguistics, University of Tokyo.

Ikegami, Yoshihiko (1985) " 'Activity' - 'accomplishment' - 'achievement' -- a language that can't say 'I burned it, but it didn't burn' and one that can." In Makkai, Adam and Alan K. Melby (eds.) (1985) *Linguistics and Philosophy: Essays in Honor of Rulon S. Wells.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jones, Robert. B. Jr. (1961) *Karen Linguistic Studies*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Kato, Atsuhiko (1993) "Sugookarengo no doosirenzoku (Verb serialization in Sgaw Karen [in Japanese])." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 45:177-204.

_____ (1995) "The phonological systems of three Pwo Karen dialects." *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 18.1:63-103.

_____ (1998) "Pookarengo (toobuhoogen) no doosirenzoku ni okeru syudoosi ni tsuite (On head verbs of serial verb constructions in Pwo Karen (the Eastern dialect) [in Japanese])." *Gengo Kenkyu* (Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan) 113:31-61.

Palmer, Frank R. (1994) *Grammatical Roles and Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sakamoto, Hinako (1985) "Tai-go no doosi no kaibunrui ni tsuite (Subcategorization of Thai verbs)[in Japanese]." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 30:177-192.

Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.) (1976) *Syntax and Semantics, Vol 6: The Grammar of Causative Constructions*. New York: Academic Press.

Solnit, David B. (1997) *Eastern Kayah Li: Grammar, Texts, Glossary*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Song, Jae Jung (1993) *Causatives and Causation: A Universal-Typological Perspective*. London: Longman.

Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. and Randy J. LaPolla (1997) *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vichit-Vadakan, Rasami (1976) "The concept of inadvertence in Thai periphrastic causative constructions." in Shibatani(1976), pp.459-476.