

VALENCE-CHANGING PARTICLES IN PWO KAREN*

Atsuhiko KATO
Osaka University

Abstract: Pwo Karen has a large number of verb particles, some of which may increase or decrease the valence of the verb. This paper describes such valence-changing verb particles. When Pwo Karen is compared with Burmese, a neighboring Tibeto-Burman language, from the viewpoint of valence-changing, the difference between these two languages is brought into high relief. Burmese only has a few valence-changing auxiliary-like morphemes, and especially it does not have a valence-decreasing one. Many of the situations which are expressed with the valence-changing verb particles in Pwo Karen are conveyed by using particles following the nouns in Burmese, therefore we can say that Pwo Karen shows stronger head-markingness than Burmese. Pwo Karen and Burmese are largely different not only in word order but also in the details of their grammars, though they are neighboring languages of the same linguistic stock.

Keywords: Pwo Karen, Karenic, Tibeto-Burman, grammaticalization, head-markingness

1. INTRODUCTION

Pwo Karen is a Tibeto-Burman language which belongs to the Karenic branch.¹ It is spoken mainly in the Irrawaddy delta and the surrounding areas of the Burma-Thai border including Karen State. The number of speakers is unknown because of the lack of accurate statistics, but it may be between one million and two millions. Dialects can be largely grouped into the western dialects that are spoken in the Irrawaddy delta and the eastern dialects spoken around the Burma-Thai

* This paper is based on the paper presented at the 39th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics held in Seattle, September 14-17, 2006. I especially wish to express my gratitude to James A. Matisoff who made a number of helpful suggestions during my stay at the University of California, Berkeley. I also thank David Solnit, Kenneth VanBik, Dominic Yu, and Motoyasu Nojima for valuable advice on the early version of this paper, and acknowledge helpful comments from the attendants of the Conference, especially James A. Matisoff, Randy LaPolla, Martine Mazaudon, Justin Watkins, Hideo Sawada. I am also grateful to two anonymous reviewers and Randy LaPolla for helpful criticism on the first draft.

¹ Important studies on the history of Karenic languages include Haudricourt (1946), Haudricourt (1953), Luce (1959), Jones (1961), Burling (1969), Benedict (1972), Haudricourt (1975), Mazaudon (1985), Luce (1991), etc. For genealogical positioning of Pwo Karen within the Karenic branch, see Shintani (2003).

border.² The dialect treated in this paper is spoken around Hpa-an, the capital of Karen State, Burma (Myanmar), and belongs to the eastern group.

Pwo Karen is an analytic SVO-type language, like the other Karenic languages. All of the Karenic languages which have so far been described are SVO, which is aberrant among the Tibeto-Burman languages, the large majority of which are of SOV-type. The sentences (1)(2)(3) below are examples of intransitive, monotransitive, and ditransitive sentences, respectively.

- (1) θàʔwà chînàN
 (name) sit
 ‘Thawa sat down.’
- (2) θàʔwà ʔán khòθá
 (name) eat mango
 ‘Thawa ate a mango.’
- (3) θàʔwà phílân θàkhléiN khòθá
 (name) give (name) mango
 ‘Thawa gave Thakhlein a mango.’

The single argument of an intransitive verb is always put before the verb, and this is also true of existential or phenomenal sentences. In a ditransitive clause, the recipient is put right after the verb, and the theme follows it. In this paper, I call the noun phrase appearing before the verb the ‘subject’, and the noun phrase(s) appearing after the verb ‘object’. For a ditransitive clause, I call the object appearing first the ‘first object’ and the one following it the ‘second object’. Note that the terms ‘first object’ and ‘second object’ only signify their word order and do not imply that either of them has the syntactic privilege. Therefore they differ from Dryer's (1986) concept of ‘primary object’ and ‘secondary object’.

Pwo Karen has over sixty particles occurring with verbs (see Kato 2004), called ‘verb particles’ in this paper. Here we will examine the behavior of the verb particles which change the valence of the verb; and I will proceed to characterize one of the important aspects of Pwo grammar by contrasting it with Burmese, a neighboring Tibeto-Burman language.

2. VERB PARTICLES

Kato (2004) classified Pwo Karen words into four parts of speech: nouns, verbs³, adverbs, particles. The criterion to single out particles is whether the form can

²The western dialects and the eastern dialects are mutually unintelligible, and there are also a lot of differences within the western and eastern groups. Kato (1995) treats two Eastern dialects (Hpa-an and Tavoy). For the dialects on the Thai side, see Phillips (1996, 2000).

³ The category of ‘adjective’ is not posited. All of the Pwo Karen verbs can be divided into active verbs and stative verbs. Words with meanings that correspond to those of adjectives in

occur in isolation. While nouns, verbs and adverbs can occur in speech in isolation, particles cannot do so. Particles have to occur with other forms in order to appear in speech. Particles can be classified according to what element they occur with. Verb particles are defined as particles that occur with a verb when they are used in speech.

There are two types of verb particles: those that precede verbs and those that follow them. The construction consisting of a verb and verb particle(s) is called a ‘verb complex’, and is diagrammed by bracketing it with [_{vc}] in this paper. See the following examples (*bá* and *θuí* are verb particles) :

(4) θàʔwà [_{vc} **bá** ð]
 (name) must go
 ‘Thawa must go.’

(5) θàʔwà [_{vc} ð **θuí**]
 (name) go stealthily
 ‘Thawa went stealthily.’

When a noun occurs after a verb particle following a verb (i.e., VERB + VERB PARTICLE + NOUN), the verb particle might look as though it were an adpositional particle. The adpositional particles have a function similar to the prepositions and postpositions of other languages. Take the verb particle *dá* ‘comparison’ for example:

(6) ʔəjò ʔì **dá** ʔəʔò
 this good that
 ‘This is better than that.’

dá is, however, not an adpositional particle. That is clear when we compare its behavior with that of genuine adpositional particles, e.g. the adpositional particle *dē* indicating instrument or accompaniment:

(7) θàʔwà ð **dē** kā
 (name) go with car
 ‘Thawa went by car.’

In (6) and (7), the sequences of ‘VERB + PARTICLE + NOUN’ of both examples look like the same structure. But the *dē kā* part of (7) can be put into the sentence initial position by topicalization, while the *dá ʔəʔò* part of (6) cannot be:

other languages are classified into stative verbs in Pwo Karen. Many of the stative verbs are intransitive.

(6') ***dá** ʔəʔò nó ʔəjò ʔì
 that TOP this good

(7') **dē** kā nó θàʔwà ñ
 withcar TOP car go
 'It is by car that Thawa went.'

On the other hand, the noun ʔəʔò of the *dá ʔəʔò* part of (6) can be removed, while the noun *kā* of the *dē kā* part of (7) cannot be:

(6'') ʔəjò ʔì **dá**
 this good
 'This is better.'

(7'') *θàʔwà ñ **dē**
 (name) go with

These reflect the fact that a verb particle forms a constituent with a verb, and an adpositional particle forms a constituent with a noun.

3. VALENCE-CHANGING VERB PARTICLES

In this paper, the total number of noun phrases which can occur in the subject and object slots when a verb or a verb complex is used is called the 'valence' of the verb or the verb complex. When a verb particle occurs with a verb, the valence of the verb complex sometimes differs from that of the original verb. I call verb particles which have such a function 'valence-changing verb particles'. Some verb particles have the function of preventing the object of the original verb from occurring and of introducing a new noun phrase as the object. In such a case, the valence of the original verb and that of the verb complex remain the same, but we can consider the valence to have been decreased and increased at the same time. I therefore also include such particles in the category of valence-changing verb particles.

In the following sections, we will see each of the valence-changing verb particles of Pwo Karen. These are a group of five verb particles which express causation (*dà*, *mà*, *phílân*, *kò*, *lò*), *bá* 'subject of judgment', *nī* 'for, to', *khè* 'substitution', *phílân* 'benefaction', *dá* 'limitation; single-handedness; comparison', *náin* 'comparison', *wī* 'precedence', *ʔə̀N* 'accompaniment', *bò* 'assistance', *θà* 'reflexivity; spontaneity', *lóθà* 'reciprocity'. The five particles expressing causation are preverbal, and all of the remaining particles are postverbal.

Some of the valence-changing verb particles are grammaticalized nouns or verbs.⁴ For the ones which originated from nouns or verbs, we need to examine whether they have actually grammaticalized into particles. The diagnostic criteria used in this paper to distinguish the verb particles from the original nouns or verbs are semantic, syntactic and phonological. Heine and Kuteva (2002:2) say that grammaticalization involves four main interrelated mechanisms; i.e. (a) desemantization (or “semantic bleaching”) -- loss in meaning content, (b) extension (or context generalization) -- use in new contexts, (c) decategorialization -- loss in morphosyntactic properties characteristic of lexical or other less grammaticalized forms, and (d) erosion (or “phonetic reduction”) -- loss in phonetic substance. Semantic difference is related to (a), syntactic difference to (b) and (c), and phonological difference to (d). Unfortunately, all three of these differences cannot always be observed. For detailed discussions of each of the particles' grammaticalization, see below.

3.1. Causative particles

There are five verb particles which express causation, here called “causative particles”. They are *dà* (also pronounced *dàv*, *dài* or *də*; perhaps *dàv* is the original pronunciation), *mà*, *phílân*, *kò*, *lò*. The canonical pattern of sentences with a causative particle is as follows, taking *dà* as an example. With an intransitive verb, the causee occurs as the object:

- (8) ʔəwê [vc **dà** chíɴàɴ] θàʔwà
 3sg sit (name)
 ‘He let Thawa sit down.’

With a monotransitive verb, the causee occurs as the first object and the original object appears as the second object:

- (9) ʔəwê [vc **dà** ʔáɴ] θàʔwà khòθá
 3sg eat (name) mango
 ‘He let Thawa eat a mango.’

With a ditransitive verb, the causee is introduced by the preposition *dē*, the first object of the original verb occurs as the first object, and the second object of the original verb occurs as the second object:

- (10) ʔəwê [vc **dà** phílân] θàkhléiɴ khòθá dē θàʔwà
 3sg give (name) mango with (name)
 ‘He asked Thawa to give Thakhlein a mango.’

All of the causative particles can occur either with active or stative verbs.

Out of the five causative particles, *dà* and *mà* are used most frequently. *dà* is used when the causer does not have direct control of the situation, while *mà* is

⁴ For grammaticalization in Southeast Asian languages see Matisoff (1991).

used when the causer does have direct control. *mà* originates in the verb *mà* meaning ‘to do, to make’.

- (11) jə [vc **dà** θî] ?ə
 1sg die 3sg
 ‘I let him die (as he wanted to die).’

- (12) jə [vc **mà** θî] ?ə
 1sg die 3sg
 ‘I killed him.’

phílân (also pronounced *phlân*) is a particle which indicates benefactive causation; it originates in the verb *phílân* (also pronounced *phlân*) ‘to give’ (its first syllable comes from Proto-Tibeto-Burman *bøy [Matisoff 2003 (HPTB)]). As Matisoff (1991) shows, many Southeast Asian languages have grammaticalized the verb ‘to give’ as a causative or benefactive marker (see also 3.5 of the present paper).

- (13) jə mə [vc **phílân** ð] nə
 1sg IRR go 2sg
 ‘I will let you go (for your sake).’

kò indicates causation which is achieved by inviting or calling someone, and originates in the verb *kò* ‘call’ (HPTB *gaw).

- (14) jə [vc **kò** nóN thán] ?ə
 1sg wake up 3sg
 ‘I called him and woke him up.’

l̂ denotes that a situation is caused by saying something to someone, and originates in the verb *l̂* ‘to tell’.

- (15) ?əwê [vc **l̂** châ] jə
 3sg ache 1sg
 ‘He spoke ill of me.’ (literally: He talked to me so that I would ache.)

dà is a real particle, that is, there is no verb that can be identified as its origin. But the rest of the causative particles originate in verbs. In order to identify the latter as particles, we need to explain the difference between the first verb of a verb serialization as in (16) and these causative particles.

- (16) jə **dú** θî ?ə
 1sg hit die 3sg
 ‘I hit him intending to kill him.’

Pwo Karen has verb serialization like many other Southeast Asian languages. There are two types of verb serialization in Pwo Karen: one is the concatenated type where the verbs are juxtaposed as in (17)⁵ and the other is the separated type where other elements like noun phrases can intervene between the verbs as in (18).⁶

(17) jə ʔánphôn ʔán m̀ì
 1sg cook eat rice
 ‘I cooked rice to eat.’

(18) jə ʔánphôn m̀ì phlé
 1sg cook rice fast
 ‘I cook rice quickly.’

In the concatenated type, when the combination of the verbs is ‘transitive + intransitive’, the logical object of the first verb and the logical subject of the second verb become coreferential, and as a result, the clause shows a causative-like meaning as in (16). In the other combinations (i.e. ‘intr. + intr.’, ‘intr. + tr.’, ‘tr. + tr.’), the logical subjects of the two verbs are always the same as can be seen in (17).

The difference between the causative particles and the first verb of the serialized verbs as in (16) is that the causative particles can take a transitive verb which denotes the caused event. *m̀à*, *phílân*, *k̀ò*, *l̀ò* can co-occur with transitive verbs:

(19) jə [vc m̀à pj̀ò] ʔ̀è m̀ì
 1sg vomit 3sg rice
 ‘I made him vomit rice.’

⁵ The term “verb concatenation” was introduced in Matisoff (1969).

⁶ Solnit (2006a) says the Karenic languages show “preference for nuclear over core serialization”. Nuclear serialization equals the concatenated type here, and the core serialization equals the separated type. ‘Core’ and ‘nuclear’ are the terms of Role and Reference Grammar (Cf. Van Valin and LaPolla 1997). On the whole, the SVO-type languages of Southeast Asia prefer core serialization, but the Karenic languages generally prefer to use nuclear serialization and some of them do not have core serialization. For example, Geba, one of the Karenic languages spoken in northern Karen State, is such a language, and the serialized verbs corresponding to (18) exemplify nuclear serialization: ja ʔā plá dí (1sg-eat-fast-rice) ‘I eat rice quickly’ (my data). Although Pwo has core serialization, it also makes much use of nuclear serialization as compared with other Southeast Asian SVO-type languages. For the detail of Pwo Karen verb serialization, see Kato (1998). For verb serialization of the other Karenic languages, see Ratanakul (1981), Kato (1993), Lord and Craig (2004) on Sgaw Karen, and Solnit (1997:Chapter 4, 2006b) on Kayah Li.

- (20) ʔəwê [vc **phílân** θíjâ] jè pərêN nó
 3sg know 1sg news that
 ‘He let me know that news (for my sake).’

- (21) jə [vc **kò** ʔáN] ʔè mì
 1sg eat 3sg rice
 ‘I invited him to eat.’

- (22) jə [vc **lè** ʔêN] ʔè pòUN
 1sg hear 3sg tale
 ‘I told him a fairy tale (so that he could hear).’

In an ordinary serialization, however, the verb which denotes the caused event cannot be a transitive verb:

- (23) *jə dú pjò ʔè mì
 1sg hit vomit 3sg rice
 (I hit him to make him vomit rice.)

This difference in syntactic behavior is the criterion to distinguish the causative particles originating in verbs from general transitive verbs. But since these four causative particles still preserve more or less the meanings of the original verbs and have not shown phonological changes, we could say that their degree of grammaticalization is low.

3.2. *bá* ----- *introducing a subject of judgment*

This particle is also pronounced *wá*. It originates in the verb *bá* ‘to hit against, to bump’. Below is an example sentence with the verb *bá*:

- (24) phlā bá jè
 arrow hit 1sg
 ‘An arrow hit me.’

The particle *bá* has many uses such as indicating inevitability, experience etc. It causes valence-change when it introduces a noun as an object indicating someone who judges the situation expressed by the verb, and often can be translated into English with the prepositions ‘for’ or ‘to’, as seen in (25) and (26). *bá* occurs with intransitive verbs, which are chiefly stative verbs.

- (25) láíʔàù lə béiN jò [vc máu **bá**] jè
 book one NC this comfortable 1sg
 ‘This book is enjoyable to me.’

- (26) ʔəjò [vc təmjàN **bá**] nè ɛâ
 this strange 2sg QUE
 ‘Is this strange for you?’

This verb particle can be considered to have originated as the second element of a serialization, as below. The first and second elements are shown bracketed respectively with [v1] and [v2]:

- (27) mūmé ʔəljāphàN [v1 chèçõ làN] [v2 **bá**] jè
 sun light shine down hit 1sg
 ‘The light of the sun came down and hit me.’

In this example, the light of the sun in fact hits ‘me’, but in (25) and (26), *bá* has lost the meaning ‘to hit’, and nothing hits ‘me’ or ‘you’.

Phonologically, the verb particle *bá* may be pronounced *wá* while the verb *bá* cannot be pronounced *wá*:

- (28) [vc máu **wá**] jè
 comfortable 1sg

- (29) *phlā wá jè
 arrow hit 1sg

The verb particle *bá* is semantically and phonologically different from the verb *bá*. A syntactic difference has not so far been found, but there would be no problem in classifying it as a particle.⁷

3.3. *nī*----- ‘for, to’

This particle originates in the verb *nī* ‘get’ (HPTB *r-ney-t). Below is an example sentence with the verb *nī*:

- (30) jə nī já lə béiN
 1sg get fish one NC
 ‘I got a fish.’

The particle *nī* occurs with intransitive verbs (chiefly stative verbs), introducing a noun referring to someone which the event or the state denoted by

⁷ In Southeast Asian languages, negatability of a verb can often be a test for the grammaticalization of the verb. But this test cannot be used as a criterion for the grammaticalization of *bá*, because verb serializations such as (27) and verb complexes such as (25) and (26) behave in the same way with respect to negation. When a concatenated type serialization is negated, the whole set of serialized verbs are negated: the negative particle *lə* appears before the set of serialized verbs. In a ‘verb + verb particle’ construction, *lə* also appears before the whole construction. Thus, we cannot distinguish the full verb *bá* from the verb particle *bá* based on the manner of negation.

the verb is related to. Just like *bá* in section 3.2, it can be translated into English with the prepositions ‘for’ or ‘to’, as seen in (31).

- (31) chədòchəlá jò [vc yì n̄] hə
 vegetable this good 1pl
 ‘This vegetable is good to us.’

The difference between *n̄* and *bá* is that, while a clause with *bá* shows the subjective judgment of the referent of the object noun, a clause with *n̄* is neutral about whose judgment the situation expressed by the verb is. Therefore the sentence (32) does not show whose judgment ‘the shirt is beautiful’ is, but in (33) it is ‘she’ that thinks ‘the shirt is beautiful’.

- (32) châiN lə béiN jò [vc xî n̄] ?ə
 shirt one NC this beautiful 3sg
 ‘This shirt is beautiful for her.’

- (33) châiN lə béiN jò [vc xî bá] ?ə
 shirt one NC this beautiful 3sg
 ‘This shirt is beautiful for her.’

The verb particle *n̄* seems to have originated as the second element of a concatenated type verb serialization, as seen below, though the process of its semantic change is unknown.

- (34) phənN kàin [v1 θəwài] [v2 n̄] thî
 potteryfragment suck get water
 ‘The piece of pottery sucked water.’

In this example, the water moves into the pottery and the pottery ‘possesses’ the water, but in (31) and (32) for example, *n̄* has lost the meaning ‘to get’, and ‘us’ or ‘her’ is not possessed by anything. Neither syntactic nor phonetic evidence has so far been found, but I would like to consider the *n̄* described above a verb particle, on the basis of the semantic difference between these sentences.

In a concatenated type verb serialization which has *n̄* as the second element, the first verb is usually a verb denoting an action or an event, but *n̄* indicating ‘for, to’ usually occurs with a stative verb. This fact also might be considered evidence in support of the claim that *n̄* has been grammaticalized.

3.4. *khè* ----- *substitution*

khè denotes that someone substitutes for someone else, and can be translated with ‘in place of’ or ‘instead of’. An etymologically related noun or verb for this particle has not been found yet. It chiefly occurs with active verbs.

When this particle occurs with an intransitive verb, the noun showing the person who is substituted for appears as the object, as seen in (35).

- (35) ʔəwê [vc ð khè] jə
 3sg go 1sg
 ‘He went in place of me.’

With a transitive verb, the noun which shows the substituted person occurs as the first object, and the original object occurs as the second object, as seen in (36).

- (36) ʔəwê [vc ʔánphôn khè] jə m̀
 3sg cook 1sg rice
 ‘He cooked rice in place of me.’

3.5. *phílân* ----- *benefaction*

phílân is also pronounced *wílân*, *phlân*, *phí* or *wí*, and originates in the verb *phílân* ‘to give’ (HPTB *bəy). Below is an example sentence with the verb *phílân*:

- (37) jə phílân ʔə láíʔəu
 1sg give 3sg book
 ‘I gave him a book.’

The verb particle *phílân* denotes that an action is carried out for someone's sake.⁸ It chiefly occurs with active verbs.

When this particle occurs with an intransitive verb, the noun showing the beneficiary occurs as the object of the verb complex, as seen in (38).

- (38) jə [vc ð phílân] ʔə
 1sg go 3sg
 ‘I went for his sake.’

When it occurs with a transitive verb, the beneficiary occurs as the first object, and the original object appears as the second object, as seen in (39).

- (39) ʔəwê [vc p̄ phílân] jə láí
 3sg read 1sg letter
 ‘He read a letter for me.’

⁸ Chappell (1992) discusses in detail the Sgaw Karen benefactive marker *nè* (her transcription is *ne*²) which comes from the verb *nè* ‘to get’. The behavior of Pwo *phílân* seems very similar to that of Sgaw *nè*. She argues that *nè* forms a constituent with the following benefactive NP and cannot be considered an enclitic to the main verb, but in my Sgaw Karen data, *nè* can never be detached from the verb complex, therefore I would like to consider it to be similar to the verb particle of Pwo Karen. In my data Sgaw Karen has another benefactive marker ʔé, perhaps cognate with Geba ʔí that is a main verb meaning ‘to give’, but it is not used as a main verb in Sgaw. I do not know the difference between *nè* and ʔé.

This *phílân* can be considered to be what was originally the second element of the serialized verbs as is shown in (40).

- (40) jə [v1 ð] [v2 **phílân**] ?ð láí?àu
 1sg go give 3sg book
 ‘I went and gave him a book.’

As already mentioned above, Matisoff (1991) points out that the verb meaning ‘to give’ in many Southeast Asian languages became the benefactive marker. Pwo Karen *phílân* is another example. It has lost the meaning ‘to give’ and come to show benefaction.

Phonologically, the verb particle *phílân* may be pronounced *wílân*, as seen in (41), but the verb *phílân* cannot be, as seen in (42).

- (41) jə [vc ð **wílân**] ?ð
 1sg go 3sg
 ‘I went for his sake.’

- (42) *jə **wílân** ?ð láí?àu
 1sg give 3sg book

In addition to this, the verb particle also has the shortened form *phí* (or *wí*), as seen in (43), but the verb does not have such a form, as seen in (44).⁹

- (43) jə [vc ð **phí**] ?ð
 1sg go 3sg
 ‘I went for his sake.’

- (44) *jə **phí** ?ð láí?àu
 1sg give 3sg book

In addition, the verb particle *phílân* differs syntactically from the verb *phílân*. While the verb *phílân* can take two objects referring to the recipient and the theme as seen in (40), in a verb complex with the verb particle *phílân*, it is only the noun referring to the beneficiary that *phílân* introduces as the object. Compare (40) with (38).

As discussed above, the verb particle *phílân* is semantically, phonologically and syntactically different from the verb *phílân*. There would be no problem in classifying it as a particle.

⁹ In an idiomatic elaborate expression such as *phí yāin phí bjà* (give-strength-give-power) ‘support’, the form *phí* may appear.

3.6. *dá* ----- limitation; single-handedness; comparison

dá is also pronounced *ká*. It has three uses: limitation, single-handedness and comparison. An etymologically related noun or verb for this particle has not been found yet.

3.6.1 Limitation

When *dá* is used in this way, a noun phrase which limits the referent of the subject noun occurs as the object of the verb complex, and the sentence is translated into English with the meaning ‘only’. Examples are shown in (45) and (46). With this usage, the particle *dá* can occur with an intransitive verb only, but that verb can be either active or stative.

- (45) phlòUNmwì [vc ʔó **dá**] θǎN ɣà
 guest be three NC
 ‘There are only three guests.’

- (46) ʔəθí [vc ɣê **dá**] ʔəkhwâ
 3pl come male
 ‘Only the male ones of them came.’

This verb particle *dá* cannot occur with a transitive verb, thus the sentences with the transitive verb *tàin* in (47) and (48) below are ungrammatical.

- (47) *phlòUNmwì [vc tàin **dá**] θǎN ɣà
 guest make three NC

- (48) *ʔəθí [vc tàin **dá**] ʔəkhwâ
 3pl make male

If you want to express the meaning ‘only three of the guests made (it)’ and ‘only the male ones of them made (it)’, one of the ways to do this is to use a cleft sentence and add the particle *lô* indicating emphasis in the sentence-final position, as seen in (49) and (50).

- (49) tàin nó phlòUNmwì θǎN ɣà lô
 make TOP guest three NC EMPHASIS
 ‘It is only three of the guests that made (it).’

- (50) tàin nó ʔəkhwâ lô
 make TOP male EMPHASIS
 ‘It is only the male ones of them that made (it).’

3.6.2 Single-handedness

When *dá* is used in this way, the clause can be translated into English using ‘by oneself’ or ‘for oneself’. In this usage, a pronoun coreferential with the subject is placed after *dá*. (51) is an example with an intransitive verb, and (52) with a transitive verb. Notice that the verbs occurring with this particle are chiefly active verbs.

(51) jə [vc ɣê **dá**] jə
 1sg come 1sg
 ‘I came by myself.’

(52) jə [vc tàin **dá**] jə
 1sg make 1sg
 ‘I made (a cake) by myself.’

In the case of transitive verbs such as (52), the original object of the verb cannot appear. In other words, in this case *dá* introduces a new argument, i.e. the pronoun coreferential with the subject, and at the same time, prevents the original object from occurring. (53) and (54) show that if the original object appears, the sentence is ungrammatical.

(53)*jə [vc tàin **dá**] kú
 1sg make cake

(54)*jə [vc tàin **dá**] jə kú
 1sg make 1sg cake

In order to say ‘I made a cake by myself’ in Pwo Karen with a single sentence, we need to use, for instance, a sentence such as (55) below, which has two clauses.

(55) jə tàin kú ʔəkhâ, jə [vc tàin **dá**] jə
 1sg make cake when 1sg make 1sg
 ‘When I made a cake, I did (it) by myself.’

3.6.3 Comparison

In this usage, *dá* occurs chiefly with stative verbs, and indicates comparison. The verb complex with this particle can take a noun referring to the compared entity as the object.

(56) ʔəjò [vc ɣì **dá**] ʔəʔò
 this good that
 ‘This is better than that.’

3.7. *náin* ----- *comparison*

Just like *dá* (3.6.3), *náin* also expresses comparison. An etymologically related noun or verb for this particle has not been found yet. The difference from *dá* is that *náin* is more formal and old-fashioned. *náin* also chiefly occurs with stative verbs.

- (57) *nə* [vc thə **náin**] *nə*
 mouth high nose
 ‘The mouth is higher than the nose. (=to be talkative)’

3.8. *wī* ----- *precedence*

The particle *wī* indicates that someone carries out an action ahead of someone else, or that an action is carried out before another action. A valence-change occurs in the former case. An etymologically related noun or verb for this particle has not been found yet. It chiefly occurs with active verbs.

When *wī* occurs with an intransitive verb, the noun referring to the compared person occurs as the object, as seen in (58).

- (58) *jə* *m ə* [vc *l̩* **wī**] *nə*
 1sg IRR go 2sg
 ‘I will go ahead of you.’

Similarly, when *wī* occurs with a transitive verb, the noun referring to the compared person occurs as the object, as seen in (59), but if the noun is used, the original object of the verb cannot appear, as demonstrated in (60).

- (59) *jə* [vc *ʔán* **wī**] *nə*
 1sg eat 2sg
 ‘I ate ahead of you.’

- (60) **jə* [vc *ʔán* **wī**] *nə* *m̩*
 1sg eat 2sg rice

If a noun referring to the compared person does not occur in the sentence, the original object can occur as the object of the verb complex, as seen in (61).

- (61) *jə* [vc *ʔán* **wī**] *m̩*
 1sg eat rice
 ‘I ate rice ahead [of you].’

Therefore, unlike *dá* meaning ‘single-handedness’ which we saw in 3.6.2, the original object does not entirely lose the right of appearing in the sentence.

3.9. $\gamma\grave{\text{e}}\text{N}$ ----- *accompaniment*

The particle $\gamma\grave{\text{e}}\text{N}$ indicates that an action is carried out with another person. An etymologically related noun or verb for this particle has not been found yet. It chiefly occurs with active verbs.

When $\gamma\grave{\text{e}}\text{N}$ occurs with an intransitive verb, the noun referring to the accompanying person occurs as the object, as seen in (62).

- (62) $j\grave{\text{a}}$ [vc h $\gamma\grave{\text{e}}\text{N}$] $\text{?}\grave{\text{e}}$
 1sg go 3sg
 ‘I went with him.’

With a transitive verb, the noun referring to the accompanying person occurs as the first object and the original object occurs as the second object, as seen in (63).

- (63) $j\grave{\text{a}}$ [vc $\text{?}\acute{\text{a}}\text{Nch}\grave{\text{a}}$ $\gamma\grave{\text{e}}\text{N}$] $\text{?}\grave{\text{e}}$ $\text{k}\acute{\text{u}}$
 1sg sell 3sg cake
 ‘I sold cakes with him.’

This verb particle resembles the adpositional particle $d\bar{\text{e}}$ in that both particles indicate accompaniment. The propositional meanings of the two sentences below are the same, but the sentence (64) with $\gamma\grave{\text{e}}\text{N}$ has the implication that the actor ‘I’ feels a sense of closeness with ‘him’.

- (64) $j\grave{\text{a}}$ [vc $\text{?}\acute{\text{a}}\text{N}$ $\gamma\grave{\text{e}}\text{N}$] $\text{?}\grave{\text{e}}$ $\text{m}\grave{\text{i}}$
 1sg eat 3sg rice
 ‘I ate rice with him.’

- (65) $j\grave{\text{a}}$ $\text{?}\acute{\text{a}}\text{N}$ $\text{m}\grave{\text{i}}$ $d\bar{\text{e}}$ $\text{?}\grave{\text{e}}$
 1sg eat rice with 3sg
 ‘I ate rice with him.’

Note that the next sentence means that ‘I’ and ‘Thawa’ ate together with someone (i.e. there are three participants).

- (66) $j\grave{\text{a}}$ [vc $\text{?}\acute{\text{a}}\text{N}$ $\gamma\grave{\text{e}}\text{N}$] $\text{m}\grave{\text{i}}$ $d\bar{\text{e}}$ $\text{th}\grave{\text{a}}\text{?}\text{w}\grave{\text{a}}$
 1sg eat rice with (name)
 ‘I and Thawa ate rice [with someone].’

3.10. $b\grave{\text{o}}$ ----- *assistance*

The particle $b\grave{\text{o}}$ indicates that an action is carried out to help someone. An etymologically related noun or verb for this particle has not been found yet. It chiefly occurs with active verbs.

When *bò* occurs with an intransitive verb, the noun referring to the person who is helped occurs as the object, as seen in (67).

- (67) jə [vc thán **bò**] ?à
 1sg climb 3sg
 ‘I climbed [the mountain helping] him [carry the rock].’

With a transitive verb, the noun referring to the person who is helped occurs as the first object and the original object occurs as the second object, as seen in (68).

- (68) jə [vc ?ánphôn **bò**] ?à mì
 1sg cook 3sg rice
 ‘I helped him cook rice.’

3.11. *θà* ----- *reflexivity; spontaneity*

This particle originates in the noun *θà* ‘heart’ (HPTB *sak “BREATH(e)”¹⁰), and shows reflexivity or spontaneity.

3.11.1 Reflexivity

Occurring with a transitive active verb, the particle *θà* meaning reflexivity denotes that the patient is the actor himself. It often co-occurs with the verb particle *làn* ‘down’.¹¹

In Pwo Karen, when the referent of the subject performs an action that is directed at himself, an object coreferential with the subject cannot occur. Thus, (69) is ungrammatical.

- (69) *?əwê_i chè làn ?à_i
 3sg stab down 3sg

In order to make this sentence grammatical, we have to use the particle *θà* and remove the noun from the object slot:

- (70) ?əwê [vc chè làn **θà**]
 3sg stab down
 ‘He stabbed himself.’

¹⁰ This morpheme should not be associated with *sam ≈ *sem “HEART” (HPTB; p.311, p.537) because the Proto-Sgaw-Pwo form (perhaps *sa? or *sak) had the stopped tone (corresponding to Haudricourt’s 1946 third tone).

¹¹ *làn* can also be pronounced *βàn* and originates in the verb *làn* ‘descend’. In passing, the verb particle *thán* (also pronounced *βán*) originates in the verb *thán* ‘ascend’ and means ‘up’.

$\theta\grave{a}$ originates in the noun meaning ‘heart’, but $\theta\grave{a}$ in (70) is not the object noun. This can be demonstrated by showing that while objects can generally be topicalized, $\theta\grave{a}$ in (70) cannot. For example, the object noun *thwí* in (71) can be topicalized and put in the sentence-initial position as in (71').

(71) ʔəwê dú thwí
 1sg hit dog
 ‘He hit a dog.’

(71') thwí nó ʔəwê dú
 dog TOP 3sg hit
 ‘As for a dog, he hit one.’

$\theta\grave{a}$ in (70), however, cannot be topicalized, as demonstrated in (70') below.

(70') * $\theta\grave{a}$ nó ʔəwê ch̀è l̀àN
 TOP 3sg stab down

(70') may mean ‘As for the heart, he stabbed it’, but cannot mean ‘He stabbed himself’. Thus, it is evident that $\theta\grave{a}$ in (70) is different from the noun meaning ‘heart’ both semantically and syntactically. Thus it would be no problem to consider $\theta\grave{a}$ in (70) a particle although it is phonologically the same as the noun $\theta\grave{a}$. The verb complex in (70) cannot have an object. In other words, we can say the verb complex is intransitivized.

3.11.2 Spontaneity (middle voice)

The combination of $\theta\grave{a}$ plus a transitive active verb sometimes denotes that the result of the verbal action has happened spontaneously. Transitive verbs used in this way with $\theta\grave{a}$ are basically volitional, but become unvolitionalized in this construction.

In sentences of this type, the original object occurs in the subject slot. See (72) first.

(72) ʔəwê p̀əu th̀áN p̀àitə̀r̀áN
 3sg open up window
 ‘He opened the window.’

When $\theta\grave{a}$ is used with this sentence, the original object *p̀àitə̀r̀áN* appears as the subject:

(73) p̀àitə̀r̀áN [vc p̀əu th̀áN $\theta\grave{a}$]
 window open up
 ‘The window opened.’

θà originates in the noun meaning ‘heart’, but *θà* in (73) is not the object noun, just as we saw in 3.11.1, because *θà* cannot be topicalized as in (73') below.

(73') **θà* *nó* *pàitərân* *pàu* *thán*
 TOP window open up

Thus, *θà* in (73) should be considered a verb particle as well as *θà* indicating reflexivity, as discussed in 3.11.1.

The sentence in (73) cannot have an object. In other words the verb is intransitivized. Intransitivization was observed also in the use of *θà* meaning ‘reflexivity’, but it is noteworthy that *θà* meaning ‘spontaneity’ changes the object into the subject. We can call this phenomenon middle voice. The phenomenon whereby a morpheme showing reflexivity comes to indicate spontaneity or middle voice has been observed cross-linguistically.¹² Therefore, it is likely that this use of *θà* originated from *θà* indicating reflexivity.

Pwo Karen lacks semantically and phonologically related pairs of intransitive and transitive verbs, as are found in many other Tibeto-Burman languages, e.g.: Burmese *câ* ‘to fall’ : *châ* ‘to drop’. It usually has only an intransitive verb, and a causative particle has to be used in order to express the corresponding transitive situation. For example, *làn^hé* ‘to fall’ vs. *mà làn^hé* ‘to drop’; *θi* ‘to die’ vs. *mà θi* ‘to kill’; *ɣà^hòn* ‘to break (intr.)’ vs. *mà ɣà^hòn* ‘to break (tr.)’; *káin* ‘to be bent (intr.)’ vs. *mà káin* ‘to bend (tr.)’.

However, there are a few cases where Pwo Karen has only the transitive equivalents, and that is the main reason why *θà* is used. It is used in order to express intransitive situations, e.g.: *pàu θà* ‘to open (intr.)’ vs. *pàu* ‘to open (tr.)’; *θàu θà* ‘to move (intr.)’ vs. *θàu* ‘to move (tr.)’; *wái θà* ‘to twist (intr.)’ vs. *wái* ‘to twist (tr.)’; *ɽò θà* ‘to peel (intr.)’ vs. *ɽò* ‘peel (tr.)’; *ɽánlɛ θà* ‘to change (intr.)’ vs. *ɽánlɛ* ‘change (tr.)’.

3.12. *lóθà* ----- reciprocity

lóθà is also pronounced *wóθà* or *ɓóθà*. It shows reciprocity. An etymologically related noun or verb for this particle has not been found yet, though the second syllable *θà* might be related to the noun *θà* ‘heart’. This particle can occur either with active or stative verbs. In clauses with this particle, there are two ways to introduce the participants of a reciprocal situation. In the first of these constructions one of the participants is shown by the subject and the other participant is expressed by the noun with the preposition *dē*:

(74) *jə* [_{vc} *máu* *lóθà*] *dē* *ɽə* [intransitive]
 1sg comfortable with 3sg
 ‘I am getting along well with him.’

¹² See Shibatani (1985) and Kemmer (1993:151-200) for examples. For middle voice marking in Tibeto-Burman languages, see LaPolla (1996).

- (75) $jə$ [_{vc} $dó$ $ló\theta\grave{a}$] $dē$ $ʔ\grave{a}$ [transitive]
 1sg hit with with 3sg
 ‘He and I hit each other.’

In the other construction the subject refers to both of the participants:

- (76) $hə$ [_{vc} $máu$ $ló\theta\grave{a}$] [intransitive]
 1pl comfortable
 ‘We are getting along well.’

- (77) $hə$ [_{vc} $dó$ $ló\theta\grave{a}$] [transitive]
 1pl hit
 ‘We hit each other.’

In both constructions the sentences with a transitive verb (75) and (77) above cannot take an object. In other words, $ló\theta\grave{a}$ can cause valence-change.

However, an entity which is not a participant in a reciprocal situation can appear as the object. See the sentences below.

- (78) $jə$ [_{vc} $phón$ $ló\theta\grave{a}$] $cú$ $dē$ $ʔ\grave{a}$
 1sg catch hand with 3sg
 ‘I held hands with him.’

- (79) $hə$ [_{vc} $phón$ $ló\theta\grave{a}$] $cú$
 1pl catch hand
 ‘We held hands with each other.’

4. CONCLUSION

Table 1 summarizes the discussion above from the point of view of whether the verb particles increase or decrease valence. Since $dá$ ‘single-handedness’ introduces a new argument and at the same time prevents the original object from occurring, I put ‘yes’ in both columns. In the case of $wī$ ‘precedence’, since the original object cannot occur in certain environment, the ‘yes’ in the right column is bracketed. Out of these, the particles which increase valence can be called applicative markers (For further information on applicative constructions, see Peterson 2007).

<i>Verb particle</i>	<i>Valence-increasing</i>	<i>Valence-decreasing</i>
causative particles	yes	---
bá (subject of judgment)	yes	---
nī (“for, to”)	yes	---
khè (substitution)	yes	---
phílân (benefaction)	yes	---
dá (limitation)	yes	---
dá (single-handedness)	yes	yes
dá (comparison)	yes	---
náin (comparison)	yes	---
wī (precedence)	yes	(yes)
γèn (accompaniment)	yes	---
bò (assistance)	yes	---
θà (reflexivity)	---	yes
θà (spontaneity)	---	yes
lóθà (reciprocality)	---	yes

Table 1. Valence-increasing and -decreasing of the verb particles.

When we compare the valence-changing behavior of Pwo Karen with that of Burmese, a Tibeto-Burman language with which Pwo Karen now has the closest contact, we can see more clearly the characteristics of Pwo Karen grammar.

Burmese does not have many verb particles or versatile verbs which can be considered to cause valence-change: the only ones are the causative morphemes (-*kháin*, -*sè*, *pé*-), -*pé* denoting benefaction, and -*pyâ* denoting the showing of something:

(80) tû gò ñá sá **kháin** dè
 him NON-SUBJECT fish eat CAUS REALIS
 ‘(I) let him eat fish.’

(81) ñâ gò dǎgá phwîn **pé** bà
 me NON-SUBJECT door open BENE POL
 ‘Please open the door for me.’

(82) ñâ gò sà?ou? pha? **pyâ** bà
 me NON-SUBJECT book open ‘show’ POL
 ‘Please read a book for me.’

These are all related to valence-increasing, but there is no particular morpheme which causes valence-decreasing in Burmese.

Furthermore, many of the same meanings expressed by the valence-changing verb particles of Pwo Karen are often expressed in Burmese by attaching certain markers to nouns. Each of the markers shown in bold type in the Burmese sentences below form a constituent with the preceding noun.

(83) *tû ʔătwɛʔ káUN dè*
 3sg for good REALIS [subject of judgment; “for, to”]
 ‘(It) is good for him.’

(84) *tû ʔăsá twá yâ dè*
 3sg instead go must REALIS [substitution]
 ‘(I) had to go in place of him.’

(85) *yauʔcá ḍà là dè*
 male only come REALIS [limitation]
 ‘Only the males came.’

(86) *tû dɛʔ káUN dè*
 3sg than good REALIS [comparison]
 ‘(She) is better than he.’

(87) *khǎlé jíN yaiʔ t̄è*
 child each.other hit REALIS [reciprocity]
 ‘The children hit each other.’

We could therefore say that Pwo Karen shows stronger head-markingness than Burmese.¹³ Since Pwo Karen does not have verb agreement and has a number of adpositional particles¹⁴, we cannot say it is a typical head-marking language. However, Pwo has at least two head-marking phenomena besides valence-changing verb particles. One is the possessive expression where a personal pronoun corresponding to the possessor noun may be attached to the possessed noun, which is the head of this construction. The reason why a pronoun is used can be considered to show that the whole structure is not a compound noun but a possessive expression. Since the form which clarifies the meaning of possession is attached to the head, we can say this construction is a kind of head-marking:

¹³ On the definition of head-marked and dependent-marked, see Nichols (1986, 1992).

¹⁴ The important adpositional particles include: *l̄ó ~ l̄é* ‘at ; to ; from’, *d̄ɛ* ‘with’, and *b̄ɛ ... θ̄ò* ‘like’. Many of the adpositional particles are put before the noun, but in case of *b̄ɛ ... θ̄ò*, the noun is put between *b̄ɛ* and *θ̄ò* as *b̄ɛ phlòUN θ̄ò* ‘like a Karen’.

- (88) chərâ [(ʔə) láiʔàʊ]
 teacher his book
 ‘The teacher's book.’

The other is that the weakened forms of personal pronouns are used before verbs, and are phonetically dependent on them. It could be taken for a harbinger of ‘pronominalization’:¹⁵

- (89) jə nɔ́ jə ɬ
 1sg TOP 1sg go
 ‘As for me, I went.’

What has been said above (having a large number of valence-changing particles) is also true of the other Karenic languages that I have researched (i.e., Sgaw Karen and Geba).¹⁶ Karenic languages and Burmese, neighboring Tibeto-Burman languages, are quite different not only in word order (all of the Karenic languages are SVO languages), but also in the details of their grammar. This fact might be highly significant when we consider the history of the Karenic languages.

APPENDIX 1 : PHONEMIC INVENTORY OF THE HPA-AN DIALECT

The transcription of this paper is phonemic. /N/ occurs only as a final. It is a uvular nasal, but its closure often is not complete, and as a result it only nasalizes the preceding vowel.

Consonants

p	θ	t	c	k	ʔ
ph	th	ch	kh		
b[β]	d[d]				
		ç	x	h	
			ɣ	ʁ	
m	n	ɲ	ŋ	N	
w		j			
	l				
	r				

Vowels

i	ɨ	u
ɪ [ɪ]		ʊ
e	ə	o
ɛ	a	ɔ

Tones

má [55]
mā [22(3)]
mà [11]
mâ [51]
(mə atonic)

¹⁵ My intuitive impression is that Sgaw Karen seems to use the weakened pronouns more frequently than Pwo Karen. For example, *jə* in (89) is often “omitted”, but in the similar construction of Sgaw Karen, it seems that the weakened pronouns tend not to be “omitted”. For the similar construction of Sgaw Karen, see Dai et al. (1991). LaPolla (1994) sees this phenomenon of Sgaw Karen in the context of pronominalization.

¹⁶ According to David Solnit (p.c. Sept. 2006), some of the Pwo Karen verb particles discussed above have close equivalents in Eastern Kayah Li, and some are etymologically cognate as well as functionally similar. Looking at Henderson (1997) makes me feel that Bwe Karen also has similar characteristics.

All rhymes

i	í	u	ai	au	(iN)	əN	eIN	əuIN	ouN
ɪ		ʊ			aN	oN		aiN	
e	ə	o							
ɛ	a	ɔ							

APPENDIX 2 : PRONOUNS OF THE HPA-AN DIALECT

The form I is mainly used before verbs (i.e. subject) or nouns (i.e. possessor), while the form II is mainly used after verbs (i.e. object) and with adpositional particles. The emphatic form is typically used when the pronoun is topicalized, but also in the subject or object slots.

	Form I	Form II	Emphatic form
1sg	jə	jə̀	jəwê, jəwêdá
1pl	hə (pə)	hə̀ (pə̀)	həwê (pəwê) həwêdá (pəwêdá)
2sg	nə	nə̀	nəwê, nəwêdá
2pl	nəθí	nəθí	nəθíwê, nəθíwêdá
3sg	ʔə	ʔə̀	ʔəwê, ʔəwêdá
3pl	ʔəθí	ʔəθí	ʔəθíwê, ʔəθíwêdá
	ʔəθíʔə (only before nouns)		

ABBREVIATIONS

1,2,3	first, second, third person pronouns	NEG	negation
BENE	benefactive	pl	plural
CAUS	causative	PERF	perfect
COP	copulative verb	POL	politeness
EMPH	emphatic	REFL	reflexivity
INTER	interjection	QUE	question
IRR	irrealis	SFP	sentence final particle
LOC	location	sg	singular
NC	numeral classifier	TOP	topic
NE	the particle <i>nê</i> used before a pause	Vptc	verb particle

TEXT

“MAGIC STICK”

(recorded in Hpa-an, November 2000)

- (1) phjā mú çā ʔó lə yà
 thing maleold be one NC:HUMAN
- (2) ʔə phómúí nó
 3sg daughter TOP
- ʔəwê dàikhâ dē lùlêin nó
 3sg make.marry with swindler that
- (3) lùlêin nótā çàu dá lé ʔə lé
 swindlerTOP rub Vptc EMPH 3sg stick
- nī cúkhú lə kàu jò
 as forearm one NC:PIECE this
- (4) çàu dá lé nótā
 rub Vptc stick TOP
- cəxwà phúkhwâ ì dá phō
 king son go see VIVIDNESS
- (5) “nə mə mà chəlê, nə lé jò”
 2sg IRR do what 2sg stick this
- (6) “lé jò phlòUN θàçā θí
 stick this person old also
- dú bán làn θà ké” lə wê
 hit youngdown REFL capable tell EMPH
- (7) “mə mwēɛâ” cəxwà phúkhwâ lə
 IRR COP QUE king son tell

(8) “mwē nâ” lə wê
 COP SFP tell EMPH

(9) “mə mwē ɛâ, lə mwē ɛâ,
 IRR COP QUE NEG COP QUE

nə dú jū bá ní jō”
 2sg hit try (<look) Vptc a little SFP

(10) ʔəwê mèinçā nó ʔəwê pàké ʔə mâ
 3sg mother-in-law TOP 3sg make 3sg wife

(11) ʔə mâ mōmô nó ʔəwê kòkí
 3sg wife true TOP 3sg put

lú dò phèn ʔò
 LOC room inside that

(12) ʔəwê mjòn thán nī ʔə mèinçā thí lô
 3sg drag up get 3sg mother-in-law once just

(13) ðài cáin làn khwái lé yéin khlôun nó,
 CAUS walk down Vptc LOC house back after

ðài klí khwái phlòpài
 CAUS run Vptc in.haste

(14) ʔəwê thàin dú thàin khló lú ʔò
 3sg return hit Vptc mat LOC there

pàupàupàu θān thí
 ONOMATOPOEIA three time

(15) ʔəwê thàu thán nī thàin ʔə mâ mōmô
 3sg drag up get Vptc 3sg wife true

(16) “báŋkláN jǎbò”
 young SFP

(17) báŋkláN thōnnóθò nó, cəxwà phókhwâ
 young like.that because king son

ʔáŋkèiN xwè tək̀lè l̩ jǎbò
 ask buy instantly just SFP

(18) lànthé báθà dú bǎN làN ké phòphô
 that.is.to.say hit young down capabl like that

nó, mə thàiN dú bǎN làN báθà
 if IRR return hit young down want.to

phā nānthí j̄ jǎbò
 father a little also SFP

(19) cəxwà phókhwâ chē khwái cì pjàpjàpjà
 king son pay V_{ptc} money ONOMATOPOEIA

tà, thàiN n̄ wê lú
 after return get EMPH LOC

ʔə nū phèn jǎbò
 3sg palace inside SFP

(20) ʔə phā kəchā ʔáncà “nə mə mà chəlê
 3sg father master ask 2sg IRR do what

phókhwâ, lé lə bòn jò”
 son stick one NC:LONG.OBJECT this

(21) “lé phjā jò jā pā,
 stick thing this QUE father

phlòUN θàçā θí dú bán làn θà ké”
 person old also hit youngdown REFL capable

(22) “ʔà mə mwē ɛâ phúkhwâ
 oh IRR COP QUE son

(23) “mwē pâ. ʔəkhōNthò nótā
 COP SFP effect TOP

jə dá mōmô pâ”
 1sg see truly father

(24) “ʔè dá bá bò” ʔə phā lè
 if see Vptc if 3sg father tell

“kèkhó nó báchâInlé phlòUN θàçā nó
 tomorrow TOP about person old TOP

cáIN còɲâ bá kò ɣà dè jābò”
 walk announce Vptc every NC:HUMAN every SFP

(25) thōNnóθò nó cáIN còɲâ θèmjânó,
 like.that TOP walkannounce after

bálə̀nə̀nə̀ ɣê dē núthò,
 some come with cane

bálə̀nə̀nə̀ ɣê tháU dē láIN
 some come ride with cart

(26) ɣê cáIN thòN ʔé
 come walk arrive NEG

(27) phlòUN θàçā jābò
 person old SFP

(28) bǎN lǎN báθà dù
 young down want.to SFP

(29) thōNNóθò nó “kòUN jàU ɛâ” cəxwà lə
 like that TOP assemble PERF QUE king tell

(30) “kòUN jàU”
 assemble PERF

(31) “ʔè kòUN, jə bá dú wī”
 if assemble 1sg must hit PRECEDENCE

(32) “jə dú ʔè ɣòN khô ʔò,
 1sg hit if finish side if

nəθí dú thàIN θâ kò ɣà dè”
 2sg hit Vptc next every NC:HUMAN every

(33) thōNNóθò lə thí nó
 like.that one time TOP

ʔə phú dú ɛàU pàUpàUpàU θǎN thí nó,
 3sg child hit Vptc ONOMATOPOEIA three time after

cəxwà khwàINDàIN
 king die

(34) phjā ɣê dē lǎIN θè mŭkhó
 thing come with cart pl right now

mà lǎIN khlàU nāN ɣà ʔé
 take cart have.time any NC:HUMAN NEG

(35) thàIN cáIN thàIN thòN pìpì
 return walk Vptc arrive all

(1) There was an old woman. (2) She made her daughter marry a swindler. (3) (One day) the swindler was rubbing a stick as big as a forearm. (4) When he was rubbing the stick, the son of the king passed by and saw him. (5) “What will you do with that stick?” (6) “(With) this stick, even an old man can be (made) young by hitting himself with it,” he said. (7) “Is that true?” the son of the king said. (8) “It's true,” (the swindler) said. (9) “You hit yourself so that I can see if it's true or not.” (10) The swindler made his mother-in-law pretend to be his wife. (11) He kept his true wife inside the room. (12) He brought his mother-in-law (to meet the son of the king). (13) He took her behind the house, and made her run away in haste. (14) He hit a mat three times (behind the house). (15) Then he brought his true wife out (of the room). (16) “She is young, isn't she?” (17) Since she became young like that, the son of the king asked to buy the stick at once. (18) He thought, “If one can hit someone and make him so young, I want to make my father young by hitting him (after going back home).” (19) The son of the king paid money and took (the stick) back to the palace. (20) His father asked, “What will you do with this stick, Son?” (21) “(With) this stick, an old man can be (made) young by hitting (himself) with it.” (22) “Oh, is that true, Son?” (23) “It's true, Father. I saw the effect actually.” (24) “If you actually saw that,” his father said, “tomorrow, let's walk around and let every old person know that.” (25) After announcing this, some (old people) came with canes, some came with carts. (26) They couldn't come on foot, (27) because they were old people. (28) They wanted to be young. (29) Then, “Are you all here?” the king said. (30) “We are all here.” (31) “If you are all here, I must hit myself first.” (32) “After I finish hitting myself, then you guys all hit yourselves.” (33) Then, when the son hit the king three times, the king died. (34) The people who came with carts didn't even take the time to ride the carts. (35) They were all able to walk back home!

REFERENCES

- Benedict, Paul K. 1972. *Sino-Tibetan: A Conspectus*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Burling, Robbins. 1969. Proto-Karen: a reanalysis. *Occasional Papers of the Wolfenden Society on Tibeto-Burman Linguistics* 1:1-116.
- Chappell, Hilary. 1992. The benefactive construction in Moulmein Sgaw Karen. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 15.1:11-30.
- Dai Qingxia (戴慶厦), Liu Juhuang (劉菊黄) & Fu Ailan (傅愛蘭). 1991. Gelunyu 克倫語. In Dai Qingxia (戴慶厦), Huang Bufan (黄布凡), Fu Ailan (傅愛蘭), Renzengwangmu (仁增旺姆) & Liu Juhuang (劉菊黄) (eds.), *Zangmianyu Shiwuzhong 藏緬語十五種 (Fifteen Tibeto-Burman Languages)*, 388-414. Peking (北京): Beijing Yanshan Chubanshe (北京燕山出版社).
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1986. Primary objects, secondary objects, and antidative. *Language* 62.4:808-845.

- Haudricourt, André-G. 1946. Restitution du karen commun. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 42.1:103–111.
- Haudricourt, André-G. 1953. A propos de la restitution du Karen commun. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 49.1:129-132.
- Haudricourt, André-G. 1975. Le système des tons du karen commun. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 70.1:339-343.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henderson, Eugenie J. A. 1997. *Bwe Karen Dictionary, with Texts and English-Karen Word List*. 2 Vols. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Jones, Robert B. 1961. *Karen Linguistic Studies*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Kato, Atsuhiko (加藤昌彦). 1993. Sugookarengo no doosirenzoku (Verb serialization in Sgaw Karen). *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 45:177-204. (In Japanese)
- Kato, Atsuhiko. 1995. The phonological systems of three Pwo Karen dialects. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 18.1:63-103.
- Kato, Atsuhiko. 1998. Pookarengo (toobuhoogen) no doosirenzoku ni okeru syudoosi ni cuite (On head verbs of serial verb constructions in Pwo Karen). *Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan* 113:31-61. (In Japanese)
- Kato, Atsuhiko. 2004. *Pookarengo Bunpoo* (A Pwo Karen grammar). Tokyo: University of Tokyo PhD dissertation. (In Japanese, pp.603)
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1994. Parallel grammaticalizations in Tibeto-Burman Languages: Evidence of Sapir's 'drift'. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area*, 17.1:1-18.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1996. Middle Voice Marking in Tibeto-Burman. *Pan-Asian Linguistics: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Languages and Linguistics, Vol. V, 1940-1954*. Mahidol University, Thailand.
- Lord, Carol & Louisa Benson Craig. 2004. Conjunction and concatenation in Sgaw Karen. In Martin Haspelmath (ed.), *Coordinating Constructions*, 357-370. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Luce, Gordon H. 1959. Introduction to the comparative study of Karen languages. *Journal of Burma Research Society* 42.1:1-18.
- Luce, Gordon H. 1991. *Phases of Pre-Pagan Burma: Languages and History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matisoff, James A. 1969. Verb concatenation in Lahu: the syntax and semantics of 'simple' juxtaposition. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 12.1:69-120.
- Matisoff, James A. 1991. Areal and universal dimensions of grammaticalization in Lahu. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization* Volume II, 383-453. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Matisoff, James A. 2003. *Handbook of Proto-Tibeto-Burman*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press. (Abbreviated as HPTB in this paper.)
- Mazaudon, Martine. 1985. Proto-Tibeto-Burman as a two-tone language? Some evidence from proto-Tamang and proto-Karen. In Graham Thurgood, James A. Matisoff & David Bradley (eds.), *Linguistics of the Sino-Tibetan Area: The State of the Art. Papers Presented to Paul K. Benedict for his 71st Birthday* (Pacific Linguistics, Series C-87), 201-229.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1986. Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar. *Language* 62(1):56-119. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Peterson, David A. 2007. *Applicative Constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, Audra. 1996. Dialect comparison among the Pwo Karen of Central Thailand. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Languages and Linguistics* Vol.III:1122-1162.
- Phillips, Audra. 2000. West-Central Thailand Pwo Karen phonology. *33rd ICSTLL Papers*, 99-110. Bangkok: Ramkhamhaeng University.
- Ratanakul, Suriya. 1981. Transitivity and causation in Sgaw Karen. *Linguistics Across Continents, Studies in Honor of Richard S Pittman*, 156-179. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics (Philippines).
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1985. Passives and related constructions: a prototype analysis. *Language* 61.4:821-848.
- Shintani, Tadahiko L. A. 2003. Classification of Brakaloungic (Karenic) languages in relation to their tonal evolution. In Shigeki KAJI (ed.), *Proceedings of the Symposium Cross-linguistic Studies of Tonal Phenomena: Historical Development, Phonetics of Tone, and Descriptive Studies*, 37-54. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Solnit, David. 1997. *Eastern Kayah Li: Grammar, Texts, Glossary*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Solnit, David. 2006a. Karen and Sino-Tibetan. Paper presented at the Pre-Conference Workshop, 39th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, University of Washington, Seattle, September 14th, 2006.
- Solnit, David. 2006b. Verb serialization in Eastern Kayah Li. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-linguistic Typology*, 144-159.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. & and Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.