Year: 2014

Transitivity and affectedness in Mon

Jenny, Mathias

Abstract: The present study investigates the different uses of causative/transitive directionals in Mon and the functional differences between the basic and causative forms. Dealing with a typologically rare phenomenon, this study adds to our understanding of complex verbal predicates and transitivity not only in the Southeast Asia context, but also cross-linguistically. The study is based on original data collected in Thailand and Myanmar from different varieties of Mon, supplemented by published texts such as journal articles and short stories, as well as elicited data.

Transitivity and affectedness in Mon

Mathias Jenny
University of Zurich

Abstract
The present study investigates the different uses of causative/transitive directionals in Mon and the functional differences between the basic and causative forms. Dealing with a typologically rare phenomenon, this study adds to our understanding of complex verbal predicates and transitivity not only in the Southeast Asia context, but also cross-linguistically. The study is based on original data collected in Thailand and Myanmar from different varieties of Mon, supplemented by published texts such as journal articles and short stories, as well as elicited data.
Keywords: Mon, syntax, transitivity
ISO 639-3 codes: mnw, shp, sbe

1. Introduction

Many secondary verbs, including directionals, in Mon appear in two forms, basic/intransitive and causative/transitive. The causative/transitive forms are in either morphological causatives or suppletive lexemes. The choice of the form of the directional employed depends on the movement or affectedness of the participants of an expression, rather than the transitivity value of the main predicate. If the S/A argument is described as moving by the main verbal predicate, the basic form of the directional is used, if the P (or T) argument is set in motion, the causative form of the directional is obligatorily used. In transitive expressions, the basic form is used if the A rather than the P argument is set in motion, or if the setting in motion of P is backgrounded. In ditransitive expressions, the causative directional refers to the movement of the T, never the G argument. The main trigger for the choice of the directional is apparently the "affectedness of the O argument" (Hopper & Thompson 1980). This systematic distinction between basic and causative directionals, which is rare not only in Southeast Asian languages, but also globally, allows a distinction in the degree of (semantic) transitivity of an event based on the linguistic expression. It can be shown, for example, that morphological causatives in Mon have a higher degree of transitivity than periphrastic causatives, as only the former trigger the causative directionals.

2. Transitivity

The notion of transitivity covers both syntactic and semantic transitivity, and the phenomena are often treated together, though there are important differences between the two. As it is semantic transitivity that is relevant to the present study, syntactic transitivity in Mon will only briefly be outlined here, before giving a more detailed account of semantic transitivity and related features.

2.1 Syntactic transitivity

Verbs in Mon can take one, two or three arguments, that is they can be syntactically intransitive, transitive, or ditransitive. There is probably only one real ditransitive verb in Mon, namely *kɒ* 'give', which occurs in the pattern A V G T. With other 'ditransitive' predicates, such as *həɓah* 'show' and *pəciəʔ* 'feed', the recipient G is obligatorily marked by the oblique marker *kɒ*, which is homonymous with the verb *kɒ* 'give', and the structure is A V *kɒ* G T.

Transitive verbs take two arguments, A and P, which may be overtly expressed or left understood in a sentence, if their referents are known or recoverable from the linguistic or extralinguistic context. Typical transitive verbs include *ciəʔ* 'eat', *chan* 'love', and causatives like *həcɒt* 'kill'. These verbs may be labeled unrestricted transitives, as they felicitously combine with an object of any semantic type, possibly resulting in non-sensical, but grammatical collocations.

Intransitive verbs are verbs that cannot take more than one argument. Their class is probably rather small in Mon, compared to intransitive verbs in European languages, as many verbs may take a direct object from a semantically restricted set of nominals. This is for example true for

directed motion verbs (directionals), which combine directly with a noun expressing a conventionalized location, as seen in example (1).[1]

(1)   Restricted transitives
cao hɒəʔ   'return house'   'return home'
ʔa phja   'go market'   'go to the market'
ceh ɗac   'descend water'   'go down into the water'
mɔ̀ŋ phɛ̀ə   'stay monastery'   'stay at the monastery; be at school'

These restricted transitive verbs contrast with unrestricted transitives seen above in that they grammatically combine only with an object of a closed set. Intransitive verbs as shown in (2), on the other hand, cannot combine with an object, even it is semantically related, without an overt marker such as the oblique *kɒ* or the locative *ɗɔə*. Besides undirected motion verbs, the class of intransitive verbs also includes expressions like *mìp* 'be happy, enjoy', *toc* 'sleep', and *khjɒt* 'die'.

(2)   Intransitives
*kwac phja   'walk market'   intended: 'walk to the market'
*nùm hɒəʔ   'exist house'   intended: 'be at home'
*mìp puə   'happy fair'   intended: 'enjoy the fair'
*khjɒt kəhaŋ   'die thirst'   intended: 'die from thirst'

Syntactic transitivity is always a discreet notion, each verb having a fixed transitivity value (valency) of 1, 2, or 3 arguments. Semantic transitivity, on the other hand, is more flexible, as will be seen in the following paragraph.

2.2 Semantic transitivity

A number of authors have dealt with the notion of transitivity, establishing a number of factors that make an expression more or less transitive. In their seminal paper on the topic, Hopper and Thompson (1980) list ten parameters that define transitivity:

Parameter	HIGH	LOW
Participants	*2 or more*	*1*
Kinesis	*action*	*non-action*
Aspect	*telic*	*atelic*
Punctuality	*punctual*	*non-punctual*
Volitionality	*volitional*	*non-volitional*
Affirmation	*affirmative*	*negative*
Mode	*realis*	*irrealis*
Agency	*A high in potency*	*A low in potency*
Affectedness of O	*O totally affected*	*O not affected*
Individuation of O	*O highly individuated*	*non-individuated*

In a given expression, the value for each parameter may be either HIGH or LOW. According to Hopper & Thompson (1980), a clause is high in transitivity if it fulfills a high number of a set of factors in the HIGH column (p. 252), such as the presence of two or more participants, description of an action (rather than a state or non-action), telicity, punctuality, volitionality of the A argument, affirmation (rather than negation or questioning) of the situation described, realis mode, A argument high in potency, O argument totally affected and highly individuated. These factors involve different components of the effectiveness or intensity with which the action is transferred from the A to the O participant. "Each component of Transitivity involves a different facet of the effectiveness or intensity with which the action is transferred from one participant to the other." (p. 252)

It is evident from the above list that the parameters are almost purely semantic, with only the first involving a syntactic criterion. The system applied by Hopper & Thompson to establish the transitivity value of an expression also clearly shows that transitivity is values are gradual, rather

---

1 All Mon examples are from the author's own field notes or published texts, such as journals. Where no source is indicated, the examples are elicited with native speakers. Mon examples are phonemisised in IPA, other cited examples are given as in the sources.

than discreet values. The more components there are with [HIGH] marks, the more the situation is transitive.

Hopper & Thompson's definition of transitivity has been widely received and still is considered a classic on the topic. One point of criticism that has been raised is that all parameters are apparently given equal importance, though some may be more relevant to the notion of transitivity than others. Also, a number of parameters logically correlate, so that it is not clear how valid they are in establishing the transitivity of an expression.

Subsequent authors have addressed a number of these issues, including the question of syntactic vs. semantic transitivity (e.g. Kittilä 2002). Kittilä distinguishes syntactic (structural) transitivity from semantic transitivity. In the latter, agency of the instigator and direct affectedness of the patient along with an efficient transfer of energy from agent to patient must be present (Kittilä 2002:38). The state of the patient before and after the event must be distinguishable. (p. 41) Agency and affectedness are gradual, rather than binary features, that is, they form continua. Ana gent may be more or less agentive, and a patient more or less affected.

Kittilä (2002:39f) breaks up a transitive event into four distinct phases, namely: **planning-initiation-event-result**. All four phases are relevant to the transitivity value of an event/clause, and the further an event develops towards stage four, the higher is its transitivity value. As the stages are inherently ordered temporally, they also imply a hierarchical structure. Events that contain only the planning and instigation stages are less transitive than events that contain only the event and result stages. The former include intended acts that are not carried out to completion and therefore do not (fully) affect the patient, while the latter include non-intentional acts that nevertheless affect the patient. Individual languages may mark high transitivity by syntactic means, such as ergative marking on the agent (pp. 61ff). This shows that semantic transitivity may be relevant also in the syntax of a language. As will be shown below, Mon marks at least one type of high transitivity by the use of special forms of directionals.

In another approach, Næss (2007) uses three features that are involved in the notion of (prototypical) transitivity. Both participants in a transitive have + or - values for **volitionality**, **instigation**, and **affectedness**: [±VOL, ±INST, ±AFF]. Prototypically, transitive events show the following constellation of agent and patient.

Agent (prototypical)   =   [+VOL, +INST, -AFF]
Patient (prototypical)   =   [-VOL, -INST, +AFF]

The agent volitionally instigates the event which affects the patient, but not the agent. The patient is neither volitional nor actively instigating the event. The 'volitionality' corresponds roughly to Kittilä's 'planning' stage, 'instigation' to Kittilä's 'initiation', and 'affectedness' to Kittilä's 'result'. Kittilä's 'event' stage is probably included partly in both Næss's 'instigation' and 'affectedness'. Though the different analyses do not match exactly with one another, all accounts of transitivity apparently take two factors as (equally) crucial: agency/volitionality of the agent and affectedness of the patient. As will be seen below, in Mon the affectedness of the patient is the main characteristic of (high) transitivity.

2.3 'Transitivity harmony'

In multi-verb predicates, a number of languages exhibit what has been termed 'transitivity harmony' (see e.g. Valenzuela 2011). According to Valenzuela (2011:186), "Transitivity Harmony is understood as a morphosyntactic process whereby a semantically modifying verb or verbal morpheme adjusts its valency to match the transitivity value of a semantically main verb with which it combines, either in a mono-clausal or chained construction." In Shipibo-Konibo (Pano, Amazonia; Valenzuela 2011), basically transitive phasal verbs and modal auxiliaries are detransitivized by a middle suffix when combined with an intransitive main predicate. The transitivity harmony is structural/syntactic and works also across clause boundaries in non-nuclear serialization and clause chaining. Similar structures to the ones found in Saliba also occur in Rawang (LaPolla 2010). In the case of Rawang, too, basically transitive secondary verbs are detransitivized in combination with an intransitive main verb. Examples (3) to (6) illustrate syntactic transitivity harmony in Shipibo-Konibo (from Vlanzuela 2011).

(3) *sani-n-ra*   *yobin*   *tsaka-xon*   ***pake**-ke.*
PN-ERG-EV   fruit:ABS   hit-P.SS.AO   cause.to.fall-COMPL
'Sani hit the fruit and caused it to fall down.' (192)

(4) *yaka-yaka-kin*   *oin-a-ronki*
sitting.INTR:MID-sitting.INTR:MID-SIM.EVENT.SS.AO   see-PP2-HSY

ik-a   *iki*   *westiora*   *bimi*   *ani*   *jiwimea-x*
be-PP2   AUX   one   fruit:ABS   big   tree:LOC:ABL-so

***pake-t**-i*   *jene-nko-shaman.*
drop-MID-SIM.EVENT.SS.SO   flowing.water-LOC-INTEN
'While sitting there, he saw that a fruit fell from a big tree into the water.' (192)

(5) *e-a-ra*   *ransa-i*   ***peokoo**-ke.*
1-ABS-EV   dance-SIM.EVENT.SS.S   begin:MID-CMPL
'I began to dance (e.g., at a party).'

(6) *e-n-ra*   *(xeki)*   *bana-kin*   ***peo**-ke.*
1-ERG-EV   (corn:ABS)   sow-SIM.EVENT.SS.AO   begin-COMPL
'I began to sow (it/the corn).'

In Saliba, an Oceanic language of Papua New Guinea, verbs can be combined into multiverb predicates of the nuclear serializing type (Margetts 1999:99ff). The complex verbal predicate functions as one unit with one S/A prefix and one P suffix, that is, all arguments are shared by the constituent parts of the multi-verb predicate. Sharing all arguments, all the verbs of the complex predicate must have the same transitivity value, which according to Margetts (1999:102) is due to the 'same-subject constraint".

Margetts (1999:58) describes "transitivity as a system of discrete morpho-syntactic features", that is, it is syntactic transitivity that is relevant in the description of the language, presumably also to the transitivity harmony in Saliba. Margetts (1999:102) states that "generally, the transitivity status of complex verbs is determined by the initial stem of the construction and the following stems agree with it in transitivity status" and that "it is not possible for a non-initial stem to add a further argument." If an intransitive non-initial verb is combined with a transitive initial verb, it must be transitivized by the causative marker *he*. This is illustrated in examples (7) to (10), all from Margetts (1999:103ff). The use of a non-causative secondary verb in these expressions is ungrammatical.

(7) *ye-koi-**he**-mwaloi-Ø.*   **ye-koi-mwaloi-Ø*
3SG-hit-CAUS-dead-3SG.O
'He hit it dead.'

(8) *ku-**he**-sigi-sae-Ø.*
2SG-CAUS-move-go.up-3SG.O
'Move it up.'

(9) *ye-koi-**he**-beku-Ø.*
3SG-hit-CAUS-fall-3SG.O
'He made it fall down.'

(10) *kaputi*   *ku-ini-**he**-mwayau-Ø.*
cup   2SG-pour-CAUS-full-3SG.O
'Pour the cup full.'

If more than one intransitive verbs combine with a transitive initial verb, the causative marker is added only to the first of these, having scope over all following verbs, as seen in (11).

(11) *ye-sikwa-**he**-beku-dobi-ei-Ø.*
3SG-poke-CAUS-fall-go.down-APP-3SG.O
'He poked it down.'

According to Margetts (1999:143) "Complex verbs play an important role in the description of valence and transitivity in Saliba [...] and provide tests for word-level transitivity as well as root valence." Although Margetts apparently takes syntactic transitivity as trigger for transitivity harmony in Saliba, all the above examples also involve (high) semantic transitivity. There are in fact exceptions to the transitivity harmony, and therefore to the same-subject constraint, as in example (12) from Margetts (1999:103). Though *kita* 'see, look' is syntactically transitive, the directional *sae* 'go up' is not transitivized in the complex predicate. This may be due to the fact that the (unexpressed) patient is not directly affected by the event, that is, the event has a low semantic transitivity value.

(12) *ye-kita-sae.*
      3SG-see-go.up
      'He looked up.'

After setting the scene for transitivity and transitivity harmony, we now turn to Mon, which exhibits a system apparently very similar to Saliba.

3. Complex verbal predicates in Mon

Multi-verb constructions are a common feature of Mon, as they are in most other languages of mainland Southeast Asia. Mon makes use mostly of multi-verb predicates of the nuclear serial type, that is, all verbs making up a complex predicate are adjacent to each other. Arguments occur before (S and A) or after (P, T, and G) the complex predicate in the following pattern: A V V; A V V P, A V V G T. The position of the individual verbs in a multi-verb predicate may vary, resulting in different readings. The directed motion verb *ʔa* 'go' in (13) has a different function from the same verb in (14), due to the different positions they occupy in the verb. While (13) can be seen as expressing two events (going and buying), (14) consists of only one event. It is evident that though all three verbs in (13) are syntactically transitive, they only share the S/A argument, not the patient. In (14), the motion verb *ʔa* 'go' functions as an orientation verb, together with the directional *cao* 'return'. The transitivity value of the two directionals *cao* and *ʔa* is different from the value of the intransitive initial predicate *kwac* 'walk'. In other words, secondary verbs can introduce new arguments in Mon, unlike in Saliba.

(13) *ʔuə ʔa   ràn   ciəʔ   kwaɲ.*
      1SG go   buy   eat   snack
      'I went to buy a snack to eat.'

(14) *dɛh   kwac cao   ʔa   hɒəʔ.*
      3   walk return   go   house
      'He walked back home.'

If the initial verb expresses an event with a high semantic transitivity value in which the patient is the main affected entity, the non-initial verb(s) must have the same transitivity value as the initial verb. This is illustrated in (15).

(15) *dɛh   pɔn   həcɒt   klɒ.*
      3   shoot CAUS.die   dog
      'He shot (and killed) a dog.'

No constraints as to transitivity apply in core serialization, where the patient occurs between two verbs, as in (16) from Jenny (2005:128).

(16) *dɛh   pàc   kɔʔ   pɒt   ʔa.*
      3   cut.down neck   break.off go
      'He cut off the [bird's] neck.' (WK)

In core serialization the P of the first verb usually functions as S/A of the second verb. The verbs thus share their arguments, but the arguments may change their syntactic function. The patterns found in complex verbal predicates in Mon can be summarized as follows:

S/A V V (V) P   for nuclear serialization and
S/A V P→S/A V   for core serialization.

3.1 Secondary verbs and Resultative Verb Compounds

Secondary verbs in Mon can express a wide range of functions, including modality, aspect, manner, direction, and resultative. In most cases, verbs functioning as secondary verbs also occur as main predicates, and their semantic content may restrict their applicability to certain contexts. In other words, many secondary verbs expressing grammatical functions are not fully grammaticalized.

Most secondary verbs occur in nuclear serialization, but a few modals, such as *kɤʔ* 'get; can' and *tèh* 'hit, come into contact; know how to do, do correctly' are found in core serialization, that is, they occur after the patient argument.[2] As seen in example (16) above, also resultative verb compounds can appear in core serialization, though there are alternative expressions using nuclear serialization, as the variant of (16) in example (17) illustrates.

(17) *dɛh   pàc   həpʋt   na   kɔʔ.*
     3   cut.down   CAUS.break.off   CAUS.go   neck
     'He cut off the [bird's] neck.'

In this case, all non initial verbs must agree with the initial verb in their transitivity value, that is, they are causativized. The transitivization also applies to directionals and orientation verbs, which can be used as main predicates or as secondary verbs, indicating absolute (directional verbs) or relative (orientation verbs) direction, in a complex predicate. The directionals form a closed set of verbal morphemes, consisting of the three orientation verbs *ʔa* 'movement away from origo; go' and *klɤŋ* 'movement towards origo; come', and the directional verbs 'movement up; ascend', 'movement down; descend', 'movement in; enter', 'movement out; exit', *cao* 'movement back to point of origin; return', and *cʋp* 'arrive'. The terminology 'orientation verb' (*Orientierungsverben*) and 'directional verb' (*Richtungsverben*) is used by Bisang (1992:67f) after Gorgoniev (1966, quoted in Bisang 1992), which together form the category of *direktionale Verben* ('directional verbs').

In addition to drectionals, Mon has an open class of verbs indicating manner of motion, such as *kwac* 'walk', *krìp* 'run', *pɔn* 'fly', etc. These manner of motion verbs, which most commonly occur as main predicates, are syntactically intransitive and do not include a direction or path and cannot combine directly with an NP expressing the goal or location of movement. Some motion verbs are syntactically bivalent and may take an object. One example is *pèk* 'follow, move behind someone or something'. As with other verbs of motion, direction of movement is not part of the semantics of *pèk*, and the NP following it is interpreted as the entity behind which the A moves. Directed motion is expressed by the combination of a verb describing the manner of motion and one or two directionals. The first set of directionals consists of six verbs indicating relative direction, namely *ceh* 'move down', *tʋn* 'move up', *lùp* 'move in', *tɛt* 'move out', *cao* 'move back' and *cʋp* 'arrive'. The directionals can further combine with one of a set of the orientation verbs.

The maximal structure of motion verbs in Mon is the following:

MANNER DIRECTION (DIRECTION) ORIENTATION

Two or more directionals can be combined in a clause, though series of more than three verbs are rarely found in spontaneous language. In example (18), two directionals without verb of manner of motion and orientation verb, while (19) shows the combination of manner, direction, and orientation.

(18) **lùp   cʋp   lɤ̀ŋ.sì.**
     enter   arrive   PN
     'They arrived inside Lounzi.' (WW2Monland)

(19) *poj   tɔʔ   **khrɛʔ**   **ceh**   **ʔa.***
     1PL   PL   step.proudly   descend   go
     'We walked down proudly.' (KM_SR)

---

2 Both *kɤʔ* 'get' and *tèh* 'hit' are also used in nuclear serialization with different functions.

Unlike verbs of manner of motion, the directionals and orientation verbs can take as object an unmarked NP expressing the goal of the motion. The unmarked object of *tɛt* 'move out' is usually understood to be the goal of the movement, wit the source of the motion obligatorily marked by the ablative preposition *nù*. More commonly, *tɛt* 'exit' is combined with *ʔa* 'go' (less commonly *klɤŋ* 'come') to introduce a goal.

The orientation verb *ʔa* 'go', less commonly *klɤŋ* 'come', also has aspectual function, indicating that an event extends from the point of reference to the (relative) future, resulting in a continuous or imperfective reading. In other contexts *ʔa* 'go' indicates that the event is completed or its result is out the sphere of control of the speaker, giving a perfective reading, often implying (or implicating) a notion of irreversibility and discontinued interest of the speaker. With stative verbs, *ʔa* 'go' as secondary verb often indicates a change of state which has come about, combining aktionsart and aspect.

Mon has two complete sets of directionals and orientation verbs, one basic or intransitive, the other causative or transitive. The two sets are given in table 1.

Table 1: Directionals and orientation verbs

Directional			Orientation		
Basic	Causative	Movement	Basic	Causative	Movement
ceh	*phjeh*	'down'	*ʔa*	*na*	'away from CoI'
tɒn	*pətɒn~hətɒn*	'up'	*klɤŋ*	*nèŋ*	'toward CoI'
lùp	*plop~həplup*	'into'			
tɛt	*pətɛt~hətɛt*	'out'			
cao	*phjao*	'back'			
cɒp	*cɒp~həcɒp*	'arrive'			

In most cases, the causative directionals are transparent morphological derivations of the basic forms with the causative prefix *pə-/p-*. This prefix regularly merges with initial *c* into *phj*, as in *phjeh* 'bring down', and is replaced by the semi-productive prefix *hə-* in some colloquial varieties, as in *hətɛt* 'take out'. The shape of *həcɒp* 'bring to' (for the expected, but unattested *phjɒp) suggests that it is of more recent origin, which is also confirmed by the fact that in Old Mon the basic form *cip* was used in both transitive and intransitive contexts. The causative form first appears in Middle Mon inscriptions as <bacuip>, which apparently goes back to an unattested frequentative-causative form *<piñcup>, or is built after analogous forms in other verbs. In modern Mon too, *cɒp* 'arrive' as secondary verb can be used in transitive and intransitive expressions and in this respect differs from the other directionals, as will be seen below.

The causative orientation verbs are not directly historically related to the basic forms. Venitive *nèŋ* 'bring here' goes back to Pld Mon <raṅ> 'bring', which already in Old and Middle Mon functions as venitive V2. The morphological causative of Old Mon <tlūṅ> 'come' (modern Mon *klɤŋ*) survives in Modern Mon as *kəlɤŋ* with the specialized meaning 'welcome, receive'. In *na* 'take away', Old Mon <rinʔār> 'take away, carry off' seems to merge with the Old Mon particle <nā> 'away' (Shorto 1971:318). The regular reflection of the latter in Modern Mon would be *nèə. The form <rinʔār> is seen as a contraction of <raṅ ʔār>, which came to serve as causative form of <ʔār> 'go' (Shorto 1971:318). In Middle Mon the shortened form <nʔā> is used as a main predicate and as V2, while in Modern Mon *na* only occurs as secondary verb.

Examples (20) and (21) illustrate the use of the directionals in intranstive and transitive contexts.

(20) *kon.ŋàc   kwac   **cao**   ʔa   phèə.*
child   walk   return   go   school.
'The child walked back to school.'

(21) *rɔ̀ə*   kok ***phjao***   ***na***   hʋə́ʔ.   (**kok cao ʔa*)
      friend   call CAUS.return   CAUS.go   house
      'The friend brought (her) back home.'

In the following section we will have a closer look at the use of intransitive and transitive forms of the directionals, as these show rather consistent patterns of transitive-intransitive alternation.

4. Intransitive and transitive directionals

4.1 Intransitive directionals

Intransitive directionals are regularly used with intransitive main predicates expressing a manner of motion. If no spatial movement is involved in the event, especially *ʔa* (and less frequently *klɤŋ*) may be used to indicate aspectual values, such as change of state, as seen in (23) and (24). In this function, they they often implicate completion of the event or telicity, though this can be canceled by the context. Without the addition *hùʔ ʔon*, example (23) would normally be interpreted that Lamaing burned down completely.

(22) ***krìp ceh***   ***ʔa,***   ***krìp tʋn***   *plɔn.*
      run   descend   go   run   ascend   again
      'We ran down, then we ran up again.' (KM_SR)

(23) *ləmàŋ*   ***tao ʔa***   *hùʔ ʔon.*
      PN   burn go   NEG few
      'Lamaing burned down a lot.' (WW2Monland)

(24) *ʔu.phɤ.ʔɔŋ*   *tɔʔ*   ***lùə ʔa***   *lə-kɔ̀h*   *lè.*
      PN   PL   easy go   TEMP-MEDL   EMPH
      'Now this was when U Hpo Aung and his family got rich.' (WW2Monland)

If the main predicate does not describe a movement, intransitive directionals are possible, even if the main predicate is transitive. In this case the directional has a non-spatial value, usually aspectual. In (25), *ʔa* 'go' indicated that the talking went on for some time, in (26) marks the event of forgetting as complete and irreversible. In (27) the same directional expresses an emotional distance of the speaker to the event or its outcome, along the lines 'nothing can be done about it', together with a notion of irreversibility.

(25) *dɛ̀h* ***hʋm***   ***ʔa***   *ʔərè*   *ɓʋt* *ɓa* *nədî.*
      3   speak   go   language about two   hour
      'He continued to talk for about two hours.'

(26) *pərao*   *chan poj* *ɲèh*   *ɓa* *dɛ̀h* ***wɤ̀t***   ***ʔa***   *jaʔ.*
      matter   love 1PL person   two 3   forget   go   FOC
      'She has forgotten our love.' (song lyrics)

(27) *lùp* *klɤŋ*   *dɤŋ* *sem* *nɔʔ*   *kɔ̀h*   ***tèh***   ***ʔa***   *pɤ̀ŋ.*
      enter come   land Thai PROX   MEDL   hit   go   bomb
      'In Thailand [the railway] was hit by a bomb.' (WW2Monland)

If the main predicate is transitive expresses a movement, intransitive directionals are used if the A, rather than the P argument, moves, or the movement of the agent is foregrounded. In (28), both agent and patient move, but it is the movement of the agent that is more relevant to the situation. The English ride donkeys because they want to move from place A to place B themselves, not make the donkeys move.

(28) *ʔɛŋkəlòc*   *kɔ̀h*   *mùʔ*   ***dak klɤŋ***   *mùʔ,* ***dak klɤŋ***   *la.*
      English   MEDL   what   ride come   what ride come   donkey
      'What did the English ride coming here? They rode donkeys.' (WW2Monland)

The verb *pèk* means 'move behind something or someone', and can be translated as 'follow' if the movement of the agent is foregrounded, as in (29). The king is not set in motion by the event described in the main predicate; therefore the use of the intransitive *ʔa* 'go' is adequate in this

context. The sentence is ambiguous as to the subject of the second part/clause. Both Tok Khae and the king return to the palace, so either can be seen as subject of *cao ʔa* 'go back'. There is no syntactic clue that one or the other would be favored as subject.

(29) *tɔk.khɛ*   **pɛ̀k**   *ʔa*   *ʔekəràt*   **cao**   *ʔa*   *nòn.*
     PN   follow   go   king   return   go   palace
     'Tok Khae followed the king back to the palace.' (MCL_stories)

If the patient occurs between the main verb and the directional (in core serialization), it becomes subject of the non-initial clause and the directional appears in the intransitive form, as seen in examples (30) and (31). As (30) shows, this is also true in periphrastic causative constructions, which are structurally biclausal.

(30) *ʔəmè*   **kɒ**   *kon*   **kwac**   *ʔa*   *phɛ̀ə.*
     mother   give   offspring   walk   go   school
     'The mother made her child walk to school.'

(31) *dɛh*   **hədiəŋ**   *klɒ*   **tɛt**   *ʔa*   *nù*   *kɒ*   *klɔʔ.*
     3   chase   dog   exit   go   ABL   OBL   garden
     'He chased the dog out of the garden.'

In a few cases, intransitive directionals are found where transitive forms would be expected from the context. In examples (32) and (33), the basic forms of the directional verbs *tɒn* 'go up' and *cɒp* 'arrive' are combined with the regular transitive forms of the orientation verb.

(32) *ɓɛ̀ʔ*   *ʔədì*   *kɔ̀h*   *həlɛ̀h*   **tɒn**   *na.*
     REF   PN   MEDL   CAUS.free   ascend   CAUS.go
     'Adi let them go up there.' (WW2Monland)

(33) *hwɛ̀ʔ*   *kɔmməthan*   *nɔʔ*   *kɤ̀ʔ*   *pəlɔŋ*   **na**   *cɒp,*   *kɤ̀ʔ*   *tɒp*
     corpse   corpse   PROX   get   convey   CAUS.go   arrive   get   bury

     dɔə   *saoʔsan*   *tɤʔ*   *kɔ̀h*   *klàj*   *mənìh*   *hùʔ*   *kɤ̀ʔ.*
     LOC   cemetery   DIST   MEDL   seek   man   NEG   get
     'I cannot find anyone who would take this body there, who would bury it in the cemetery.' (mkp)

In summary, apart from a few unexplained exceptions, intransitive directionals are used if 1. the main predicate is intransitive, 2. the main predicate is transitive but does not express a spatial movement of the arguments, and 3. if the main predicate is transitive and expresses a spatial movement, but the agent is presented as mainly affected, rather than the patient.

4.2 Transitive directionals

As seen above (table 1), all directionals in Mon have a basic and a derived transitive/causative form. Similar to Saliba, in Mon multi-verb predicates of the nuclear serial type share all arguments and generally have the same transitivity value. While in Saliba only the first non-initial verb is transitivized, in Mon all secondary verbs combining with a transitive main verb take the causative form individually, as seen in example (34).

(34) *dɛh*   *tɛk*   **phjeh**   **na**   *phan.*
     3   strike   CAUS.descend   CAUS.go   glass
     'He struck the glass down.'

Another difference is that transitivity harmony in Mon is triggered purely by semantic transitivity, not syntactic transitivity, as is apparently the case in Saliba as well as Shipibo-Konibo. The situation in Mon is of rather recent origin, as a comparison with Old Mon data shows. In Old Mon causative directionals are not used as V2. To express a caused motion, a full verb like <raṅ> 'bring' can be combined with the basic directionals, as in <raṅ tīt> 'bring out', <raṅ lop> 'bring in', <raṅ tlūṅ> 'bring here'. If functioning as main predicate with causative meaning, directionals appear in the causative form, as <niman plop raṅ> 'invite to enter' (Shorto 1971:312). In this example, the verb <raṅ> 'bring (here)' appears as directional. By Middle Mon, directionals show at least partial transitivity harmony in multi-verb predicates, as in <nʔā bacuip> 'bring to' and <bak

plon phyau nʔār> 'send back home' (lit. 'follow-return-CAUS.return-CAUS.go') (Shorto 1971:318).[3] In modern Mon, as seen above, the system of directionals is fully developed into intransitive and transitive forms. The transitive forms of he directionals are used in different contexts, as shown below.

Morphological causative main verbs always trigger the transitive directionals if they occur in the same clause in nuclear serial constructions, as seen in the following examples. The normal order is A V DIR OR P. The P argument can be either the causee or the goal of the movement. Overt expression of both causee and goal is avoided in spoken Mon.

(35) *ʔəmὲ* **kəwac** **phjao** **na** *kon.*
mother CAUS.walk CAUS.return CAUS.go offspring
'The mother made her child walk back.'

(36) *dὲh* **həlὲh** **nὲŋ** *kon.cao* *ʔəcùʔ* *mùə.*
3 CAUS.free CAUS.come grandchild old.man one.
'They released the grandchild of an old man.'

(37) *cəre* *kɔ̀h* **plon** **nὲŋ** *dɤŋ sem nɔʔ.*
secretary MEDL CAUS.exceed CAUS.come land Thai PROX
'The secretary brought him across (the border) here to Thailand.' (WW2Monland)

(38) *lə-kɔ̀h* *dὲh* **pəlɔŋ na** **həcʋp** **cʋp** *hʋəʔ*
TEMP-MEDL 3 convey CAUS.go CAUS.arrive arrive house

ʔjkkəthaʔ *ʔɔŋ.thon.*
chairman PN
'Then they brought me to the house of Chairman Aung Hton.' (WW2Monland)

Sentence (38) shows the regular construction for 'bring someone/something somewhere', as opposed to the structure seen in example (33), where the order of directional verb and orientation verb is inverted and the basic form of the directional verb is used.

Transitive directionals are also employed if the main predicate is semantically transitive and the movement of the patient is foregrounded or the predicate describes an induced movement. As seen in example (39), the volitionality of the agent is irrelevant to the choice of directional. The first predicate *kəpɔh* 'gather' is volitional, the second *kɤʔ* 'get' non-volitional, but both combine with the transitive orientation *na*.

(39) **kəpɔh** **na** *ʔəpot* *toə* *dὲh* **kɤʔ** **na** *həmaj.kao.*
gather CAUS.go stuff finish 3 get CAUS.go flowerpot
'They gathered (and took away) stuff, and they got a flowerpot.' (WW2Monland)

If the main verb does not in itself express an induced motion, transitive directionals can nevertheless be used, as seen in (40).

(40) *dὲh* **tɛk** **pətɛt** **nὲŋ** *hə-kɔ̀h* *raʔ.*
3 strike CAUS.exit CAUS.come ADV-MEDL FOC
'They beat them like this (so that they left from there).' (WW2Monland)

If the main verb has different readings according to the context, the choice of the form of the dirational can disambiguate, as in example (41). The verb *pὲk* 'move behind someone or smething' (consistently glossed as 'follow' for convenience) gets the interpretation 'chase' by the use of the transitive directional verb *phjeh* 'bring down'. If the intransitive *ceh* 'go down' were used, the reading would be 'follow down' (see section 4.3).

(41) *səthi* *kɔ̀h* *kɔ̀h* *dὲh* **pὲk** **phjeh** *nù hʋəʔ.*
rich.man MEDL MEDL 3 follow CAUS.descend ABL house
'That rich man chased him out of the house.' (WW2Monland)

---

3 According to Shorto (1971:253), <plon> is a rare variant of <plan>, 'return; do again'. An alternative interpretation would be to see it as causative of <lon> 'go beyond, go past'.

If the main verb does not describe a real spatial movement, but rather a metaphorical one, the transitive directionals are used if the patient is described as mainly affected by the event. Compare sentence (42) with example (25), where the intransitive orientation verb *ʔa* 'go' is used to modify the act of speaking, rather than the movement of the patient. In (42), the important part of the event os that the speech moved away from the speaker and reached the hearer, that is, the speech as patient is the mainly affected entity, though it is not overtly expressed in the sentence.

(42) | *ʔəca* | *pənèh* | *tok* | *həbah* | ***hʊm*** | ***pjah*** | ***na***.
| teacher | horoscope | calculate | show | speak | explain | CAUS.go
'The astrologer made the calculations and explained them to her.' (mkp)

The choice of the venitive or andative orientation verb depends on the perspective of the speaker. In (43) the act of electing a president results in the president being conceptually closer to the sphere of interest of the speaker, therefore the venitive *nèŋ* 'bring here' is the adequate choice. In (44), on the other hand, the enumeration of objects goes on and the speaker (or writer in this case) is not involved with the enumerated objects in any way. They do not enter his sphere of interest or control, therefore the andative orientaion verb *na* 'take away' is used.

(43) | *mənìh* | *pjùʔ~pjùʔ* | *kɔh* | *dɛh* | ***rùj*** | ***hətʊn*** | ***nèŋ***.
| man | old~RED | MEDL | 3 | choose | CAUS.ascend | CAUS.come
'The old people chose [him].' (WW2Monland)

(44) | *mìʔ.kon.plɛm* | *jèm* | ***rˀh.rìəŋ*** | ***na*** | *sʊm* | *nɔm* | *mənɔh*.
| PN | cry | enumerate | CAUS.go | INCL | tree | jackfruit
'In her weeping Mi Kon Plem enumerated (everything), including the jackfruit tree.' (mkp)

With verbs of creation, both *na* and *nèŋ* can be used, depending on the real or figurative movement of the created object. In (45), the letter written is brought into the sphere of interest of the speaker. If the andative form *na* 'take away' were used in the same sentence, the interpretation would be that someone close to the speaker wrote a letter to someone further away.

(45) | *həka* | *klˀŋ* | *kok*, | ***khju nèŋ*** | *lòc*, | *khju* | *lòc* | *lè*.
| layman | come | call | write CAUS.come | text | write | text | EMPH
'A layman came to call, he wrote a letter for you.' (KM_SR)

With verbs of destruction, only *na* can normally be used, as no movements toward center of interest is usually possible (P disappears with the event). Sentences (46) and (47) show events of destruction, in which the venitive *nèŋ* 'bring here' would be ungrammatical. Example (47) also proves that the agent does not have to be volitional, but may be an inanimate instrument rather than an animate agent.

(46) | *dɛh* | ***pəlʊm*** | ***na*** | *hʊəʔ*.
| 3 | CAUS.destroyed | CAUS.go | house
'They destroyed the house.'

(47) | *kja* | *kɔh* | ***kəpak*** | ***na*** | *taj* | *dɔə* | *wɛ̀ə* | *hə-ʔʊt* | *ʔa* | *raʔ*.
| wind | MEDL | dash | CAUS.go | hut | LOC | filed | ADV-all | go | FOC
'The wind tore the hut in the field apart completely.'

As we have seen in the preceding examples, the choice of a transitive directional is always triggered by the foregrounded affectedness of the patient. We will return to other potential factors of transitivity again in section 5.

4.3 Contrastive minimal pairs

With the choice of the form of directionals being primarily based in the semantics of the clause, it is not surprising that these can be used to distinguish meanings of he same verbal lexemes. The directionals are not semantically empty grammatical morphemes, but they add to the overall meaning of the expression beyond pure directionality. There are numerous examples of minimal pairs, that is, the same verb combining with either intransitive or transitive directionals to express different notions. These notions can be different readings of the same verb, such as the specification of the semantically underspecified verb *pèk* 'move behind something or someone'. If

the agent is mainly affected (or moved) by the event expressed, the intransitive form is used, as in the following examples. In both examples both A and P move, but it is the motion of A that is the important fact or the aim of the act. If you drive a car, you want to move from one place to the other, the movement of the car is only a means to achieve this goal. Similarly, when following people, they necessarily move in space, but the important movement is the one by the agent.

(48)　*dɛh*　**pɛ̀k**　　　*ʔa*　*ka.*
3　　follow　　　go　　car
'He drove a car (away from here).'

(49)　*dɛh*　**pɛ̀k**　　　*ʔa*　*rɔ̀ə*　　　*tɔʔ.*
3　　follow　　　go　　friend　　PL
'He followed his friends.' 'He went with his friends.'

If, on the other hand, the aim of the activity is to make the patient move from one place to another, the transitive directional is employed, as in (50).

(50)　*dɛh*　**pɛ̀k**　　　　**na**　　　*klɛ̀ə.*
3　　follow　　　CAUS.go　cow
'He is driving the cattle.'

Notice that in all three preceding examples, the general meaning of 'A moves behind P' is present. The different translations follow from the semantics of the secondary verbs, which foreground the movement of either the agent or patient, though in all cases both equally move in space. The following examples further illustrate the different readings arising from the use of different directionals.

Movement of agent foregrounded → intransitive DIR

(51)　*ʔɛŋkəlòc*　*kɔ̀h*　　　*mùʔ*　**dak**　**klɤŋ**　　　*mùʔ,*　**dak**　**klɤŋ**　*la.*
English　　MEDL　　　what　ride　come　　　what　ride　come　donkey
'What did the English ride coming here? They rode donkeys.' (WW2Monalnd)

Movement of Patient foregrounded → transitive DIR
(52)　*kɤ̀ʔ*　**nɛ̀ŋ**　　　　*Ø*　*toə.teh*　*wì*　　*nù*　*pəŋaʔ*　**dak**　**nɛ̀ŋ**　　　*kɒ*　　*klɤ̀ŋ.*
get　　CAUS.come　　　then　tend　ABL　PN　ride　CAUS.come　OBL　boat
'They got him and took care of him, and they brought him over from Panga in a boat.'
(WW2Monland)

Movement of agent foregrounded → intransitive DIR

(53)　*kjàn*　**kɤ̀ʔ**　*ʔa*　*sɔt*　*pì*　*pɔn*　*mɛ̀ʔ*.
PN　　get　go　fruit　bael　four　CL
'Kyan got four bael quinces (and went away).' (KM_SR)

Movement of Patient foregrounded → transitive DIR

(54)　*dɛh*　**kɤ̀ʔ**　**na**　　　*həmaj.kao*　*hɒəʔ*　　　*poj*
3　　get　CAUS.go　flowerpot　house　　　1PL
'They got (and took away) a flowerpot from our house.' (WW2Monland)

If the main verb does not describe a concrete spatial movement, the use of transitive directionals is still possible if the patient is seen as mainly affected by the activity. The contrast of affectedness of agent vs. affectedness of patient is illustrated in examples (55) and (56). In (56) only the andative *na* 'take away' is possible, as the rice has been removed from the center of interest or sphere of control of the speaker. The result of the event, that is the affected patient, is not visible and therefore not potentially relevant to the situation anymore.

Affectedness of Agent foregrounded → intransitive DIR

(55) *ɗὲh* **ciəʔ ʔa** *pɤŋ* *ɓa* *pəŋan.*
3   eat   go   cooked.rice two dish
'He ate two dishes of rice.' (he is full now)

Affectedness of Patient foregrounded → transitive DIR

(56) *ɗὲh* **ciəʔ na** *pɤŋ* *ɓa* *pəŋan.*
3   eat   CAUS.go cooked.rice two dish
'He ate two dishes of rice.' (the rice is gone now)

If the affected patient is visible, as in (58), the venitive orientation verb is used, while the andative form is used if the affected patient is removed from the center of interest. Sentence (59) could be uttered in a situation where there was an annoying dog in the neighborhood, and someone removed it by killing it. Sentence (57) is appropriate if the dog-killer is back from his activity without the dead dog.

Affectedness of Agent foregrounded → intransitive DIR

(57) *ɗὲh* **həcɒt** **klɤŋ** *klɒ.*
3   CAUS.die come   dog
'He killed a dog.' (he is here now)

Affectednes of Patient foregrounded → transitive DIR

(58) *ɗὲh* **həcɒt** **nὲŋ** *klɒ.*
3   CAUS.die CAUS.come   dog
'He killed a dog.' (the dead dog is here/visibile)

(59) *ɗὲh* **həcɒt** **na** *klɒ.*
3   CAUS.die CAUS.go dog
'He killed the dog.' (the dog is gone/invisible)

The use of the different forms of directionals (and, less systematically, other non-initial verbs in complex predicates) allows for an assessment of semantic transitivity in Mon in terms of affectedness. We will briefly sum up the findings and see their implication for the notion of transitivity in the following section.

5. Transitvity in Mon - conclusions

In general terms, Mon can be described as a fundamentally intransitive language in Nichols' (1982:458; see also Margetts 1999:61ff) terminology. The transitivity value (syntactic and semantic) of a verb can be changed in Mon by adding a causativizing morpheme, both to intransitive and transitive stems, a morphological process that is only marginally productive in Mon. If no morphological causative is available for a verb, a periphrastic causative construction, made up of a main verb and the preverbal causative (permissive, jussive) *(paʔ) kɒ* '(do) give', is used. There is no grammaticalized means to detransitivize a transitive verb.

Mon has been shown to be a language that makes clear distinction between syntactic and semantic transitivity. Syntactically transitive verbs can be either intransitive or transitive. Transitive verbs are further divided into monotransitive and ditransitive, according to the number of arguments they license. Monotransitive verbs further have a subclass of 'restricted transitives', which grammatically combine only with a restricted set of objects, while unrestricted transitive verbs felicitously combine with any NP as object (though possibly with semantically nonsensical outcomes).

Syntactic transitivity in Mon is clearly a discreet notion, any one verb being either intransitive or transitive. Semantic transitivity, on the other hand, is scalar notion, with an expression being more or less transitive, depending on a number of language-dependent factors. The findings of this study strongly suggest that the main factor defining high transitivity. We have seen in several examples above that agency, intention, or volitionality of the agent are not crucial factors in determining the semantic transitivity value. In Kittilä's analysis of transitive events, it is

obviously the third and fourth stages of an event that are relevant to high transitivity, which is regularly marked by transitivity harmony in complex verbal predicates in Mon.

Transitivity harmony only applies in monoclausal complex predicates of the nuclear serial type. Core serialization, on the other hand, is excluded from the transitivity harmony. As periphrastic causatives are biclausal, they do not participate in transitivity harmony. Compared with morphological or lexical causatives, periphrastic causatives are therefore less transitive, which is also seen in the fact that the result of a periphrastic causative expression can be canceled, as in (60) while the same is not true for morphological causatives, as in (61).

(60)   *dɛ̀h*   **həɗiəŋ**   *klɒ*   *tɛt*   *ʔa*   *nù*   *kɒ*   *klɔʔ*   *ra,*
      3   chase   dog   exit   go   ABL   OBL   garden   FOC
      'He chased the dogs out of the garden.'

      chaʔ.kɛ̀h   *klɒ*   *tɔʔ*   *kɔ̀h*   *hùʔ*   *tɛt*   *pùh.*
      but   dog   PL   MEDL   NEG   exit   NEG
      '...but the dogs didn't go out.'

(61)   *dɛ̀h*   **həɗiəŋ**   **pətɛt**   **na**   *klɒ*   *nù*   *kɒ*   *klɔ*   *ʔ*   *ra.*
      3   chase   CAUS.exit   CAUS.go   dog   ABL   OBL   garden   FOC
      'He chased the dogs out of the garden.'

      *chaʔ.kɛ̀h   *klɒ*   *tɔʔ*   *kɔ̀h*   *hùʔ*   *tɛt*   *pùh.*
      but   dog   PL   MEDL   NEG   exit   NEG
      '...but the dogs didn't go out.'

Example (60) is less transitive than example (61), because the event is not carried out to completion, though presumably the planning and instigating stages are realized, as is the third stage of the event itself. But the event fails to produce the intended result, and the patient is not fully affected. In (61) the result is achieved and the patient fully affected, a fact that is expressed by the use of the transitive directionals in a nuclear serial construction. This systematic encoding of high transitivity in Mon is of rather recent origin, and is a characteristic feature of Mon grammar. Other languages of the region, both related and unrelated, do not this consistence in distinguishing high transitivity on the one side from low transitivity and intransitivity on the other. Of the main languages influencing Mon over the past centuries, namely Thai and Burmese, Thai does not have anything similar to the Mon system, while Burmese exhibits transitivity harmony in some cases, but far less consistently than Mon. One example illustrating the phenomenon in Burmese is given in (62), where the use of the intransitive directional *tʰwɛʔ* 'exit' would be ungrammatical.

(62)   *di=lu-gá*   *kʰwɛ̀-dwe-go*   *ʔein-ɕé-tɕʰàn-dɛ̀-gá.ne*
      PROX=person-SBJ   dog-PL-OBJ   house-front-garden-inside-ABL

      tɕʰauʔ-tʰouʔ-*laiʔ-tɛ,*   **màun-tʰouʔ**-*laiʔ-tɛ.*
      CAUS.fear-CAUS.exit-follow-NFUT   drive-CAUS.exit-follow-NFUT
      'This man scared the dogs away, chased them out of the frontyard.'

Though this Burmese example closely parallels the Mon sentence in (61) (both are elicited translations of the same English sentence), Burmese does not have the regular system fund in Mon and nothing can be said at the present state of research about the origin of the Mon paradigm.

Abbreviations

A agent; ABL ablative; ABS absolutive; ADV adverbial; AFF affectedness; AO agent-oriented; APP applicative; CAUS causative; COMPL completive aspect; ERG ergative; EV direct evidential; FOC focus; HRY reportative evidential; INCL inclusive; INST instigation; INTEN intensifier; LOC locative; MEDL medial demonstrative; NEG negation; O object (in Saliba); OBJ object; OBL oblique; P previous event (in Shipibo-Konibo); P patient (general); PL plural; PN proper name; PP2 past/completive participle; PROX proximal demonstrative; RED reduplication; S single argument; SBJ subject; SG singular; SIM.EVENT simultaneous event; SO subject-oriented; SS same subject; TEMP temporal adverbial; VOL volitionality

Sources:

KM_SR	Conversation (two brothers, Kanni, Kayin State; audio)
MCL_stories	Short stories (Sangkhlaburi, Thailand; audio)
mkp	Short story (Mawlamyaing, Mon State; published in print)
WW2_Monland	Conversation (elderly couple, Kawdot, Mon State; audio)

References:

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. Multi-verb constructions: setting the scene. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Pieter C. Muysken (eds.) *Multi-verb constructions.* Leiden: Brill, 1-26.

Bisang, Walter. 1992. *das Verb im Chinesischen, Hmong, Vietnamesischen, Thai und Khmer.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Hopper, Paul J. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language 56*, 251-99.

Jenny, Mathias. 2005. *The verb system of Mon.* Zurich: ASAS.

Kittilä, Seppo. 2002. *Transitivity: towards a comprehensive typology.* Turku: University of Turku.

LaPolla, Randy. 2010. Transitivity harmony in the Rawang language of northern Myanmar. In de Beuzeville, L. and P. Peters (eds), *From the southern hemisphere: parameters of language variation - p*roceedings of the 2008 Conference of the Australian Linguistics Society. http://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/handle/2123/7107

Margetts, Anna. 1999. *Valence and transitivity in Saliba, an Oceanic language of Papua New Guinea.* Nijmegen: MPI Series in Psycholinguistics.

Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical transitivity.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nichols, Johanna. 1982. Ingush transitivization and detransitivization. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 8, 445-462.

Shorto, Harry L. 1971. *a dictionary of the Mon inscriptions from the sixth to the sixteenth centuries.* London: Oxford University Press.

Valenzuela, Pilar M. 2010. Multi-verb predicates and transitivity harmony in Shipibo-Konibo. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Pieter C. Muysken (eds.) *Multi-verb constructions.* Leiden: Brill, 185-212.