

ON THE STRUCTURE OF CAUSATIVES IN AKAN

Reginald Akuoko Duah

University of Ghana, Legon/Humboldt-Universität, Berlin
raduah@ug.edu.gh

Obadele Kambon

University of Ghana, Legon
obkambon@ug.edu.gh

Abstract

In this article, we discuss the syntactic properties and structure of two analytic causative constructions, which we have referred to as the ‘no’ causative and ‘ɔ’ causative, in Akan (Kwa, Niger-Congo). We show that although the two analytic causative constructions have often received a unitary analysis as a serial verb construction (e.g. Osam 1994, 2004; Agyeman 2002; Morrison 2007) they, in fact, exhibit different syntactic behavior and structure in the language. In this vein, we apply Haspelmath’s (2016) definitional criteria for serial verb constructions as a diagnostic for the two causatives and show that while one of the causatives behaves similar to a serial verb construction the other does not but displays clausal embedding. We argue that the ‘no’ causative involves symmetrical sharing of the object marked causee argument by both V_1 and V_2 similar to what Hiraiwa and Bodom (2008) proposed for some Dagaare serial verb constructions. Evidence for symmetric sharing of the object comes from adverb placement and reflexivization. The syntactic behavior of causatives in Akan brings to the fore the need for refinements in generalizations about so-called comparative concepts like serial verb constructions because such concepts may not be discreet, compartmentalized categories but may be distributed along a continuum.

Keywords: analytic causatives, serial verb constructions, syntax, Akan

1. Introduction

This paper discusses the syntactic properties and structure of two analytic causative constructions in Akan, one with the causee argument as a grammatical subject (‘ɔ’ causative) and another in which the causee argument occurs as a grammatical object (‘no’ causative). The problem is that the two causative constructions have been analyzed together by some as a type of monoclausal serial verb construction (SVC) (e.g. Osam 1994, 2004, Agyeman 2002, Morrison 2007) and by others as a type of clausal complementation (Saah 1989; Campbell 1998; Boadi 2005). Invariably, the difference between the two analytic causative constructions is often reduced to nothing more than dialectal variation. Our view is that such analyses obscure the unique syntactic properties and structure of the causatives and do not sufficiently demonstrate the clausal status of the constructions. Firstly, we show that the two analytic causative constructions are used frequently in the same Twi dialect, although only one of the constructions is available in the Fante dialect. Secondly, we propose that a viable approach to analyze the causatives is to isolate all the properties of analytic causative constructions in Akan before attempting to categorize it as a particular constructional type. In this vein, we employ Haspelmath’s (2016) five definitional criteria for serial verb constructions to test the null hypothesis that the two types of analytic causative constructions involve the same properties and differ only in superficial variation in the coding of the causee argument. The results show that each of the two analytic causatives display features of a different constructional type; the ‘no’ causative involves clause union akin to a partial-lexicalized serial verb construction (PL-ISVC), but the ‘ɔ’ causative maintains the major properties of clausal embedding in the language. The study

also emphasizes the relevance of language-internal tests to complement generalizations for so-called crosslinguistically comparative concepts such as serial verb constructions.

Data for this study were collected during the authors' fieldwork across many Akan speaking towns and cities in Ghana (e.g. Cape Coast, Takoradi, Nsuaem, Tarkwa, Wasa Akropong, Sunyani, Chiraa, Kumasi, Koforidua). We elicited and recorded data from farmers, kente weavers, palmwine tappers, hunters, etc. in their local communities over a period of nearly two years. The default dialect used in the examples presented in this paper is Asante; when data from other dialects are used these are appropriately labelled.

The paper is organized into five sections. In section 2, we present two types of analytic causative constructions in Akan. Section 3 tests the null hypothesis that the two types of analytic causatives are the same kind of serial verb constructions by using Haspelmath's (2016) definitional criteria for serial verb constructions as diagnostics. In section 4, we present a proposal that the 'no' causative involves symmetric sharing of the object marked causee argument by V₁ and V₂, evidence for which can be seen in facts about adverb placement and reflexivization. Our conclusions are presented in Section 5.

2. Analytic causatives in Akan

Analytic causatives¹ involve the expression of causation with two (or more) verbs, one for cause and the other for effect (Comrie 1989; Dixon 2000). The prototypical analytic causative in Akan involves the use of the causative verb **má** and another verb of effect (1a-b).

- (1) a. **Osei mà-à Adwoa sù-ì.²**
 Osei CAUS-PST Adwoa cry-PST
 'Osei made/caused Adwoa cry.'
- b. **Kofi mà-à Ama hwè-è fám.**
 Kofi CAUS-PST Ama fall-PST down
 'Kofi caused/made Ama fall down.'

Analytic causatives are sometimes regarded as an example of cause-effect serial verb construction (or serial causative) where there are, at least, two verbs – each of which encodes a separate micro-event of the causative situation (Song 2013). For example, the sentences in (2a-b) both express causation through two verbs: the initial verb describes the causing event while the non-initial verb expresses the caused event component. In cause-effect SVCs, the verbs are ordered to reflect the conceptual sequence of causation (Durie 1997:330-331). In this iconic pattern, the initial verb expresses the initial action, a causing event, while the non-initial verb conveys the resulting event.

- (2) a. **Yaw tiá-à bǔ̀̀lò nó só pàé-é nó.**
 Yaw step.on-PST ball DET top burst-PST 3SG.OBJ
 'Yaw stepped on the ball and burst it.'

¹ We will use the term 'causative(s)' invariably to refer to analytic causatives.

² We follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules in glossing the examples: 1/2/3 = first/second/third person, ACC = accusative, CAUS = causative, COMP/C = complementizer, COMPL = completive, CONS = consecutive, DAT = dative, DEF = definite, DET = determiner, F = focus, FUT = future, INA = inanimate, IND = indicative, NEG = negation, NMLZ = nominalizer, NOM = nominative, OBJ = object, PST/PAST = past, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, PRF = perfect, PROG = progressive, RED = reduplicated, SBJ = subject, SG = singular, TOP = topic.

- b. **Nti b̀̀-̀̀ àbóá nó kù̀̀m-̀̀m nò.**
 Nti hit-PST animal DET kill-PST 3SG.OBJ
 ‘Nti hit the animal and killed it.’

Nevertheless, analytic causatives and cause-effect SVCs differ semantically. One major property of analytic causatives is that they do not explicitly express the causing event, rather they express the abstract notion of causation (Dixon 2000). Thus, while in cause-effect SVCs the causing event is explicitly encoded by the initial verb, e.g. STEP ON, HIT (2a-b), no specific action is expressed by **má** as constituting the causing event. Thus, analytic “causative sentences in Akan are neutral to the type of instigation implied” (Essilfie 1984:56).

Akan causatives display alternation in the coding of the causee argument; the causee argument may occur as SUBJECT (Subject marking used for Agent) or as OBJECT (Object marking used for Theme/Patient).³ Because Akan does not have morphological case marking on nouns, the different realization of the causee in the causative sentence can be seen only when the causee argument is pronominalized, as shown in (3)–(5). In each case, the (a) version shows how arguments in the simplex (non-causativized) construction are marked; the (b) version illustrates the causee argument occurring as a syntactic subject and the (c) version shows the causee argument occurring as a syntactic object. For ease of exposition, we refer to the causative construction with the causee marked as object as the ‘no’ causative and the one with the causee marked as subject as the ‘ɔ’ causative. One reason for the proposed labels is that the third person singular subject prefix (*ɔ-*) and the third person singular object pronoun (*nɔ*), are the most morpho-phonologically contrastive subject/object pair in the pronominal system.⁴

(3) Causative of intransitives

- a. **Ó-s̀̀-̀̀-̀̀.**
 3SG.SBJ-cry-PST
 ‘He cried.’
- b. **Abena mà-à ó-s̀̀-̀̀-̀̀.**
 Abena CAUS-PST 3SG.SBJ-cry-PST
 ‘Abena made/caused him to cry.’

³ Alternative coding of the causee in causatives has been found in many other languages. For language specific studies, see Cole (1976) for Hebrew; Cole (1983) for Bolivian Quechua, Hungarian and Kannada; Alsina (1992) for Chichewa; Shibatani (1973) and Miyagawa (1999) for Japanese; Kozinsky and Polinsky (1993) for Korean; Kemmer and Verhagen (1994) for Dutch.

⁴ The alternative marking of the causee applies to inanimate entities acting as causee in the causative sentence as well. Compare (1a-c).

- (1) a. **Kofi mà-à káà nó tú gyà-à pàpá nó.**
 Kofi CAUS-PST car DET fly leave-PST man DET
 ‘Kofi caused/made the car leave the man behind.’
- b. **Kofi mà-à é-tú gyà-à pàpá nó.**
 Kofi CAUS-PST 3SG.SBJ.INA-fly leave-PST man DET
 ‘Kofi caused/made it leave the man behind.’
- c. **Kofi mà-à nó tú gyà-à pàpá nó.**
 Kofi CAUS-PST 3SG.OBJ fly leave-PST man DET
 ‘Kofi made it leave the man behind.’

- c. **Abena mà-à nó sù-ì.**
Abena CAUS-PST 3SG.OBJ cry-PST
'Abena made/caused him to cry.'
- (4) Causative of monotransitive
- a. **Ò-kùm-m̀ nò.**
3SG.SBJ-kill-PST 3SG.OBJ
'She killed him.'
- b. **Kwabena mà-à ó-kùm-m̀ nò.**
Kwabena CAUS-PST 3SG.SBJ-kill-PST 3SG.OBJ
'Kwabena caused her to kill him.'
- c. **Kwabena mà-à nó kùm-m̀ nò.**
Kwabena CAUS-PST 3SG.OBJ kill-PST 3SG.OBJ
'Kwabena caused her to kill him.'
- (5) Causative of ditransitive
- a. **Ì-kyè-è nò siká.**
3SG.SBJ-give.as.gift-PST 3SG.OBJ money
'She gave him money (as a gift).'
- b. **Yaw mà-à í-kyè-è nò siká.**
Yaw CAUS-PST 3SG.SBJ-give-PST 3SG.OBJ money
'Yaw caused her to give him money (as a gift).'
- c. **Yaw mà-à nó kyè-è nò siká.**
Yaw CAUS-PST 3SG.OBJ give-PST 3SG.OBJ money
'Yaw caused her to give him money (as a gift).'

Alternative coding of the causee argument in causative constructions often corresponds to pragmatic and syntactic differences. An often-cited example is Japanese, where the causee may be marked by accusative suffix *-o* (6a) or dative *-ni* (6b), but the former expresses 'sociative causation' and the latter involves indirect causation (Shibatani and Chung 2002). Also, in Korean, when the causee is marked as dative or accusative the causee functions as the object of the matrix verb (7b) but when it is marked with nominative case it functions as the subject of the embedded verb (7a) (Shibatani and Pardeshi 2002:103).

- (6) Japanese
- a. **Hahaoya-wa kodomo-o kooen-de asoba-se-ta.**
mother-Top child-Acc park-in play-cause-Past
'The mother got the child to play in the park.'
- b. **Hahaoya-wa kodomo-ni kooen-de asoba-se-ta.**
mother-Top child-Dat park-in play-cause-Past
'The mother got the child to play in the park.' (Shibatani and Chung 2002:38)

(7) Korean

- a. **Ai-ka chaek-ul ilk-etta.**
child-NOM book-ACC read-PAST.IND
'The child read the book.'
- b. **Emeni-ka [ai-ka chaek-ul ilk-key] hay-etta.**
mother-NOM child-NOM book-ACC read-COMP do-PAST.IND
'Mother made the child read the book.'
- c. **Emeni-ka ai-ekey/lul [chaek-ul ilk-key] hay-etta.**
mother-NOM child-DAT/ACC book-ACC read-COMP do-PAST.IND
'Mother made the child read the book.' (Shibatani and Pardeshi 2002:103)

In Akan, however, the different realizations of the causee argument in analytic causatives is held to reflect dialectal variation in the language (Saah 1989; Osam 1994, 2004). The 'ɔ' causative occurs in the Fante dialect, but not the 'no' causative. On the other hand, the Twi dialects (e.g. Asante, Akyem, Wassa, Kwahu and Akuapem) have both 'ɔ' and 'no' causatives. However, at least in Asante, the 'no' causative occurs more frequently. It can be noted though that the two causatives in the dialects of Akan do not display any differences in meaning and can be used interchangeably to describe the same causative situation.⁵ Nevertheless, we will demonstrate that the 'ɔ' and 'no' causatives do not have the same syntactic properties and structure and thus, do not behave in the same manner when various syntactic tests are applied to them.

3. Analysis of analytic causatives

In this section, we analyze the syntax of analytic causatives in Akan. The two analytic causative constructions tend to be lumped together as either a type of serial verb construction or a complement sentence. We argue that such analyses are not satisfactory as they do not show the unique syntactic properties of each construction. We examine analytic causatives in light of Haspelmath's (2016) definitional criteria and (universal) generalizations for SVC-hood along with language internal tests.⁶ The analytic causative construction provides an excellent test case for the proposed criteria for SVC-hood as a comparative crosslinguistic concept and its implications for analyzing clause structure.

Haspelmath (2016) proposes five (5) definitional criteria for crosslinguistic comparison of a serial verb construction. He defines a serial verb construction as in (8); the key components of the definition are presented in (9).

⁵ According to Hopper (1991) and Hopper and Traugott (2003), semantic change may characterize advanced or end stage development of forms and constructions, which perhaps, we are yet to see regarding analytic causative constructions in Akan.

⁶ We agree with an anonymous reviewer's observation that Haspelmath (2016) is not the 'gold standard' for SVCs, and much earlier work on the subject can be found (e.g., Stahlke 1970; Bamgbose 1974, 1982; Schachter 1974, among others). However, since Haspelmath (2016) is a more recent incarnation of the criteria for SVC-hood and makes far-reaching claims about what is and what is not SVC, we hope to contribute novel data which shed light on some of the components of his proposed criteria. For a critical assessment of Haspelmath's (2016) definitional criteria and generalizations about SVCs, see Alexandra Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon's reply available at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330577987>.

- (8) a serial verb construction is a monoclausal construction consisting of multiple independent verbs with no element linking them and with no predicate–argument relation between the verbs (Haspelmath 2016:269).
- (9) Key components: (Haspelmath 2016:269)⁷
- construction
 - monoclausal
 - independent verbs
 - no linking element
 - no predicate–argument relation between the verbs

Along with the criteria in (8), Haspelmath (2016) outlines ten (10) generalizations which describe a serial verb construction. However, he does not show how the generalizations relate to the definitional criteria. In what follows, we employ each of the five (5) criteria as a diagnostic for testing the null hypothesis that analytic causatives are serial verb constructions.

The first criterion we apply is CONSTRUCTION, which is defined in (10). By this criterion, the meaning of a sentence must be (fully) transparent, i.e. a sum of the meaning of the verbs in order to be categorized as SVC. While this criterion is not new, it differs, in terms of its definition, from how ‘construction’ is generally applied to the category.

- (10) **Criterion 1:** a serial verb construction must be a productive schematic CONSTRUCTION such that the meaning of a concrete construct can be determined on the basis of the meanings of its parts and the construction meaning (Haspelmath 2016:296).

As already noted, the analytic causative construction involves at least two verbs, one expressing the notion of CAUSE while the other expresses EFFECT. The analytic causative construction is compositional in the sense that there is a ‘regular schematic’ meaning for the construction (11a-c). However, it is possible to analyze the causative construction as non-compositional since the causative verb (glossed as CAUS) and the verb ‘give’ have the same morphological and phonological form in the language, as illustrated in (12). In fact, ‘give’ is used as a causative verb in many Kwa languages including Ewe (Larnyo 2013) Ga and Dangme (Caesar 2013; see Newman 1996 for a detailed discussion). Since there are no meaning differences between ‘no’ and ‘ɔ’ causatives, they have the same value for criterion 1.

- (11) a. **Pàpá á-mà Kwame à-dá.**
father PRF-CAUS Kwame PRF-sleep
‘Father has made Kwame sleep.’
- b. **Pàpá á-mà ɔ-à-dá.**
father PRF-CAUS 3SG.SBJ-PRF-sleep
‘Father has made him sleep.’

⁷ Haspelmath (2016:306) does not consider the sharing of arguments, e.g. subject sharing, as necessary for defining SVCs because “there are no constructions that would be excluded from the class of SVCs only because they lack these properties.” However, argument sharing has long been shown to be a hallmark of SVCs (e.g. Collins 1997, Ameka 2006 for Ewe; Osam 1994, 2004 for Akan; Bodomo 2004, Hiraiwa and Bodomo 2008 for Dagaare; Rose 2009 for Emerillon).

- c. **Pàpá á-mà nó à-dá.**
 father PRF-CAUS 3SG.OBJ PRF-sleep
 ‘Father has made him sleep.’
- (12) **Pàpá á-mà Kwame àsààsé.**
 father PRF-give Kwame land
 ‘Father has given Kwame (a piece of) land.’

It seems, however, that many non-compositional combinations of verbs have a level of interpretation which is fully compositional. For example, as (13) shows the verbs *gye* ‘take’ and *di* ‘eat’ can combine to produce a meaning that is either compositional ‘I take and eat it’ or idiomatic ‘I believe it’. However, it is not clear how the syntactic properties of the compositional meaning of the verb combination differs from the idiomatic interpretation. In other words, how does one categorize the same string as different constructional categories? (see Kambon *et al.* 2015 for more discussion).

- (13) **Mè gyè Ø dí.**
 1SG take 3SG.OBJ.INA eat
 ‘I believe it’ or ‘I take it and eat.’

We turn now to criterion 2 as the next diagnostic for the two causatives. This criterion invokes monoclausality as a hallmark of serial verb constructions. As Haspelmath notes, this criterion has often been proposed by various scholars over the years as critical to identifying a serial verb construction. Haspelmath’s definition of monoclausality is provided in (14).

- (14) **Criterion 2:** in a serial verb construction, there is only one way to form the negation, usually with scope over all the verbs (Haspelmath 2016:299).

In both ‘no’ and ‘ɔ’ causative constructions, negation marking seems to follow the pattern identified for putative serial verb constructions.⁸ As shown in (15), in the putative

⁸ Manipulative complement sentences may also share common negative marking, as shown in (1a-c) below. This restriction may not apply in non-manipulative complement sentences (2a-c).

- (1) a. **Kofi à-m-bòá Esi mà ð-à-n-yé èdwúma nó.** (Fante)
 Kofi COMPL-NEG-help Esi COMP 3SG.SBJ-COMPL-NEG-do work DEF
 ‘Kofi did not help Esi to do the work.’ (Osam 1998: 36, ex. 34a)
- b.* **Kofi à-m-bòá Esi mà ð-yé-è èdwúma nó.** (Fante)
 Kofi COMPL-NEG-help Esi COMP 3SG.SBJ-do-COMPL work DEF
 ‘Kofi did not help Esi to do the work.’ (Osam 1998: 36, ex. 34b)
- c.* **Kofi bóá-à Esi mà ð-à-n-yé èdwúma nó.** (Fante)
 Kofi help-COMPL Esi COMP 3SG.SBJ-COMPL-NEG-do work DEF
 ‘Kofi did not help Esi to do the work.’ (Osam 1998: 36, ex. 34c)
- (2) a. **Kofi á-m-fré sé ð-à-m-má.**
 Kofi PST-NEG-call COMP 3SG.SUBJ-PST-NEG-come
 ‘Kofi did not call that he did not come.’
- b. **Kofi á-m-fré sé ð-bà-àyè.**
 Kofi PST-NEG-call COMP 3SG.SUBJ-come-PST
 ‘Kofi did not call that he came.’
- c. **Kofi fré-é sé ð-à-m-má.**
 Kofi call-PST COMP 3SG.SUBJ-PST-NEG-come
 ‘Kofi called that he did not come.’ (i.e. the person he was expecting did not come)

SVC when negation is marked on the initial verb, it must be marked on the non-initial verb(s) as well. Similarly, in both ‘no’ and ‘o’ causatives marking negation on the causative verb requires that the verb describing effect is also negated. Osam (1998:36) notes that by negating both verbs, “it is ensured that there is unity even in an irrealis situation.” Thus, the concordant negation marking in the causative is expected since when the causing event is negated (does not occur), the effect cannot occur either. At first glance, this result seems to prove that the causatives are monoclausal just like the putative serial verb construction.

- (15) a. **Akua á-m̀-*fré* Yaa á-m̀-*má*.**
 Akua PST-NEG-call Yaa PST-NEG-come
 ‘Akua did not call Yaa to come.’
- b.* **Akua á-m̀-*fré* Yaa bà-*àè*.**
 Akua PST-NEG-call Yaa come-PST
 ‘Akua did not call Yaa to come.’
- c.* **Akua *fré-é* Yaa á-m̀-*má*.**
 Akua call-PST Yaa PST-NEG-come
 ‘Akua did not call Yaa to come.’
- (16) a. **Frema á-m̀-*má* àbòfrá nó à-*̀n-sú*.**
 Frema PST-NEG-CAUS child DET PST-NEG-cry
 ‘Frema did not make the child cry.’
- b. **Frema á-m̀-*má* ò-*à-̀n-sú*.**
 Frema PST-NEG-CAUS 3SG.SBJ-PST-NEG-cry
 ‘Frema did make him cry.’
- c. **Frema á-m̀-*má* nó à-*̀n-sú*.**
 Frema PST-NEG-CAUS 3SG.SBJ PST-NEG-cry
 ‘Frema did not make him cry.’

The two causatives, however, behave differently when it comes to negating only the non-initial verb of effect. As shown in (17)–(18), while the ‘o’ causative allows for negation of only the verb which expresses the effect sub-event (17b, 18b), negating only the second verb results in an ungrammatical sentence in the ‘no’ causative (17c, 18c). Thus, the ‘no’ causative behaves like the putative serial verb construction in allowing for only ‘single negatability’. Thus, the ‘no’ causative appears to be monoclausal. Nevertheless, there is language-internal evidence that the ‘no’ causative, unlike monoclausal serial verb constructions, involves clausal embedding, similar to the ‘o’ causative. The evidence for this comes from reflexivization and adverbial scope in the causative constructions, which are discussed below.

- (17) a. **Opoku mà-*à* Kusi à-*̀n-kó* sùkúù.**
 Opoku CAUS-PST Kusi PST-NEG-go school
 ‘Opoku caused it that Kusi did not go to school.’

- b. **Opoku mà-à ò-à-ń-kó sùkúù.**
Opoku CAUS-PST 3SG.SBJ-PST-NEG-go school
'Opoku caused it that he did not go to school.'
- c.* **Opoku mà-à nó á-ń-kó sùkúù.**
Opoku CAUS-PST 3SG.OBJ PST-NEG-go school
'Opoku caused it that he did not go to school.'
- (18) a. **Wó bé-má Ama ñ-sùá àdédé.**
2SG FUT-CAUS Ama NEG-study thing
'You will cause Ama not to study.'
- b. **Wó bé-má ó-ń-sùá àdédé.**
2SG FUT-CAUS 3SG.SBJ-NEG-study thing
'You will cause her not to study.'
- c.* **Wó bé-má nó ñ-sùá àdédé.**
2SG FUT-CAUS 3SG.SBJ NEG-study thing
'You will cause her not to study.'
- Reflexivization casts doubt on the monoclausality of the 'no' causative. In Akan, the reflexive (a pronoun + *hó* 'self') is "necessarily coreferent with some structurally defined local antecedent" and "there is no reflexivization across clause boundaries in the language" (Saah 1989:16, 28). Thus, an antecedent and a reflexive must be in the same local clause for the two to co-refer. Both the 'ó' and 'no' causatives behave differently from putative serial verb constructions in antecedent binding of a reflexive.
- (19) a. **Abena; mà-à Kwame; tì-ì nè hó_{j/*i}.**
Abena CAUS-PST Kwame pinch-PST 3SG.POSS self
'Abena made Kwame pinch himself.'
- b. **Akua; mà-à ò_j-tì-ì nè hó_{j/*i}.**
Akua CAUS-PST 3SG.SBJ-pinch-PST 3SG.POSS self
'Akua made him pinch himself.'
- c. **Nana; mà-à nó_j fèfè-è nè hó_{j/*i}.**
Nana CAUS-PST 3SG.OBJ RED.vomit-PST 3SG.POSS self
'Nana made her vomit on herself.'
- (20) a. **Ama; tám-mè sékán_j twà-à nè hó_{*j/i}.**
Ama take-PST knife cut-PST 3SG.POSS self
'Ama cut herself with a knife.'
- b. **Kwaku; hwè-è Ama; mà ò_j-pìrà-à nè hó_{j/*i}.**
Kwaku look-PST Ama COMP 3SG.SBJ-hurt-PST 3SG.POSS self
'Kwaku watched Ama hurt herself.'

- c. **Yaw_i kà-à sé Nti_j tì-ì nè hój/*i.**
 Yaw say-PST COMP Nti pinch-PST 3SG.POSS self
 ‘Yaw said that Nti pinched himself.’

In (19a-c), the reflexive co-refers with the causee argument, whether it is a lexical NP (19a), a subject (19b) or object (19c). However, the reflexive cannot co-refer with the causer NP argument. Since “Akan obeys the clausemate condition on [r]eflexivization” (Saah 1989:28) it appears that causatives involve some sort of a biclausal structure where the causee argument occurs in the same clause as the reflexive while the causer argument occurs in a different clause. This pattern of reflexive binding is also found in complement clauses in general (20b-c). On the other hand, in a monoclausal serial verb construction a reflexive can only co-refer with the subject of the clause, i.e. the initial NP (20a).

Reflexivization in causatives, however, presents a situation which is not encountered elsewhere in the syntax of Akan. Although it has been noted that in Akan “subjects only can be antecedents of reflexives” (Saah 1989:28), we observed in (19c) that the object marked causee may also control the reflexive. Thus, the ‘no’ causative presents us with a dilemma of whether to amend the claim that “subjects only can be antecedents of reflexives” to include objects or to argue that the causee argument in the ‘no’ causative is not a true object. What is clear, however, is that the object-marked causee argument is able to control a reflexive because of its unique position in the causative sentence – as object of the causative verb and subject of the verb of effect, which is evidence of clausal integration.

Another language-internal test which shows that causatives involve a more complex structure involves adverbial scope and placement. In this test, we find a difference between the ‘no’ and ‘o’ causatives. In a monoclausal sentence, an adverb can only occur either at the initial clause boundary or after the final boundary and has scope over the entire event expressed in the sentence (Saah 1994, 2004). For instance, in (21a), the adverb *énnórà* modifies both acts of buying and giving. Similarly, in (21b), the events described by the verbs, *throwing* and *hitting*, must have both taken place in the morning, albeit successively.

- (21) a. **Kofi tò-ò èmó mà-à Akosua énnórà.**
 Kofi buy-PST rice give-PST Akosua yesterday
 ‘Kofi bought rice for Akosua yesterday.’
- b. **Ènné Yaw tò-ò bós bò-ò Mensa.**
 today Yaw throw-PST stone hit-PST Mensa
 ‘Yaw threw a stone to hit Mensa.’

In the causative construction, an adverb may not take scope over the whole sentence but may be limited to only a part of the sentence. Thus, (22a-b) are ambiguous regarding the temporal reference of the causing and caused events: the adverb can have scope only over the causing event or the caused (effect) event.

- (22) a. **Afiriye mà-à Adwoa sù-ì énnórà.**
 Afiriye CAUS-PST Adwoa cry-PST yesterday
 ‘Afiriye made Adwoa cry yesterday.’
- b. **Darko mà-à Yaw kò-ò sùkúù ènné.**
 Darko CAUS-PST Yaw go-PST school today
 ‘Darko made Yaw go to school today.’

Nevertheless, the ‘no’ and ‘o’ causatives behave differently regarding where an adverb can be inserted within the sentence. In the ‘o’ causative, an adverb may be inserted between the causative verb and the causee argument, in which case the adverb has scope over only the verb of effect (23b). However, (23c) shows that in the ‘no’ causative the adverb cannot occur between the causative verb and the causee NP nor can it occur between the causee NP and the verb of effect. Thus, in terms of adverbial placement within the sentence, the ‘o’ causatives behave like the biclausal sentence in (24a) while the ‘no’ causative displays the same restrictions as in a monoclausal serial verb construction (see van der Veen 1998:48).

- (23) a. **Òhéné nó mà-à ènnórà Yaw kò-ò fié.**
king DET CAUS-PST yesterday Yaw go-PST home
‘The king let the man go home yesterday.’
- b. **Òhéné nó mà-à ènnórà ò-kò-ò fié.**
king DET CAUS-PST yesterday 3SG.SBJ-go-PST home
‘The king let him go home yesterday.’
- c. * **Òhéné nó mà-à (*ènnórà) nó (*ènnórà) kò-ò fié.**
king DET CAUS-PST yesterday 3SG.OBJ yesterday go-PST home
‘The king let him go home yesterday.’
- (24) a. **Ama bé-ká sè ènnórà ò-kò-ò Kùmásé.**
Ama FUT-say COMP yesterday 3SG.SBJ-go-PST Kumase
‘Ama will say that he went to Kumase yesterday.’
- b. * **Kofi bò-ò énnórà nó kùm-m nó.**
Kofi hit-COMPL yesterday 3SG.OBJ kill-COMPL 3SG.OBJ
‘Kofi hit and killed it yesterday.’

So far, we have shown that applying single negatability as a test for monoclausality returns a false positive for analytic causatives. In other words, even though the ‘no’ causative can be negated in only one way this does not mean that it is, in a matter of speaking, a monoclausal construction because additional tests like reflexivization and adverbial scope show that the construction involves a more complex structure.

We now turn attention to the next criterion, which is the requirement about the use of only INDEPENDENT VERBS in a serial verb construction (25).

- (25) **Criterion 3:** the verbs in an SVC must be INDEPENDENT VERBS, that is, they must be able to occur on their own without another verb (Haspelmath 2016:303).

This criterion would reject constructions with auxiliaries and ‘role-making’ verbs such as serialization with instrumental verb *de* ‘take’, which does not take any tense/aspect marking and cannot occur without another verb (26a-c).

- (26) a. **Ò-dè àdùané bré-è mè.**
3SG.SBJ-take food bring-PST 1SG
‘He brought me food.’

b.* **Ǿ-dè àdùàné.**
3SG.SBJ-take food
'He took food.'

c.* **bré-è mè.**
bring-PST 1SG
'He brought it to me.'

As far as the causative verb **má** is concerned, it seems that it cannot be used to express causation without another verb (27a), although the verb **má** can be used without another verb to express permission when it combines with an inherent complement (**hó**) **kwáń** 'path', shown in (27b). It should be noted though that causative verbs encode a construct which necessarily involves another verb so they may not be good candidates for passing criterion 3. Therefore, it is not clear whether criterion 3 excludes the concept of causation or the construction or both.

(27) a. * **Ama mà-àè Ø.**
Ama CAUS-PST 3SG.SBJ.INA
'Ama caused it.'

b. **Wǿfà á-mà mè (hó) kwáń.**
uncle PRF-give 1SG concerning path
'Uncle has given me permission.'

Shibatani (2009:256), however, argues that since a serial verb construction involves a monoclausal with a single negative scope, and a monoclausal typically involves a 'single predication', one would expect a dependent relation between the verbs in a serial verb construction.⁹ Also, serial verb constructions typically have one tense value, therefore, some of the verbs in the series would depend on another verb for their tense specification. For example, in Akan, non-initial verbs must be marked with the past tense if the initial verb is marked with past tense, as in (28a). However, when the initial verb is marked with future tense (or progressive aspect), non-initial verb(s) can only be marked with the consecutive, as in (28b). It should be noted though that the consecutive affix is never marked in a clause with only one verb but depends on an initial verb marked with future tense or progressive aspect (see Dolphyne 1987; Osam 2004).¹⁰ Thus, all serial verb constructions in Akan involve, at least, one dependent verb in the future tense.

(28) a. **Mè tǿ-ǿ mpàbòá kyè-è wò.**
1SG buy-PST shoes give.as.a.gift-PST 2SG
'I bought shoes for you (as a gift).'

⁹ Haspelmath (2016) considers the term 'single predicate' in relation to serial verb constructions as 'impractical' because it is unclear what it means. However, Defina (2016) shows that in Avatime serial verb constructions typically occur with 'single gestures' which span the entire construction in contrast to complex clauses which are produced with 'distinct gestures' for individual verbs.

¹⁰ Boadi (2005) analyzes the dependent aspectual prefix *a-* as an infinitive marker, much like *to* in English, suggesting that all serial verb constructions involve clausal embedding when the initial verb is marked with future tense.

- b. **M-é-tó mpàbòá á-kyè wò.**
 1SG-FUT-buyshoes CONS-give.as.a.gift 2SG
 ‘I will buy shoes for you (as a gift).’

In both ‘ó’ and ‘no’ causatives, the tense or aspect category marked on the causative verb tends to be also taken by the non-initial verb which expresses effect. As (29) – (30) show, in both causatives past tense is marked on both the causative verb and verb of effect but when the causative verb is marked with future tense the verb of effect takes the consecutive marker, just like in the putative serial verb construction (28b).

- (29) a. **Kofi mà-à Ama b̀-̀ fám.**
 Kofi CAUS-PST Ama hit-PST ground
 ‘Kofi caused Ama to fall down.’
- b. **Kofi mà-à ́-b̀-̀ fám.**
 Kofi CAUS-PST 3SG.SBJ-hit-PST ground
 ‘Kofi caused her to fall down.’
- c. **Kofi mà-à nó b̀-̀ fám.**
 Kofi CAUS-PST 3SG.OBJ hit-PST ground
 ‘Kofi caused her to fall down.’
- (30) a. **Adu bé-má Ata á-k̀ Kumase.**
 Adu FUT-CAUS Ata CONS-go Kumasi
 ‘Adu will make Ata go to Kumasi.’
- b. **Adu bé-má ̀-̀-̀ Kumase.**
 Adu FUT-CAUS 3SG.SBJ-CONS-go Kumasi
 ‘Adu will make him go to Kumasi.’
- c. **Adu bé-má nó á-k̀ Kumase.**
 Adu FUT-CAUS 3SG.OBJ CONS-go Kumasi
 ‘Adu will make him go to Kumasi.’

Although causatives appear to involve a single tense and aspect marking, there can be mixed tense and aspect which can only be found in complement sentences but do not occur in a serial verb construction. Here, we find a difference between the behavior of ‘ó’ causative and ‘no’ causative. As (32)–(33) show, while in the ‘ó’ causative the causative verb may be marked for aspect and the verb of effect for tense, this is not possible in the ‘no’ causative. Thus, all tense-aspect combinations which are not allowed in putative serial verb constructions are also ruled out for the ‘no’ causative but not the ‘ó’ causative. In other words, in the ‘no’ causative the tense specification on the initial causative verb determines the tense (or aspect) of the non-initial verb of effect, just like in putative serial verb constructions.¹¹

¹¹ Osam (2004:19) observes that there can be mixed progressive-perfect aspects in a serial verb construction (1a). Interestingly, the ‘no’ causative also allows for the same mixed aspects found in serial verb constructions (1b).

- (32) a. **Adwoa á-mà Kumi bé-kó Kumase.**
 Adwoa PRF-CAUS Kumi FUT-go Kumasi
 ‘Adwoa has caused it that Kumi will go to Kumasi.’
- b. **Adwoa á-mà ð-bé-kó Kumase**
 Adwoa PRF-CAUS 3SG.SBJ-FUT-go Kumasi
 ‘Adwoa has caused it that he will go to Kumasi.’
- c. * **Adwoa á-mà nó bé-kó Kumase.**
 Adwoa PRF-CAUS 3SG.OBJ FUT-go Kumasi
 ‘Adwoa has caused it that he will go to Kumasi.’
- d. * **Òmànpàníń á-fré nó bé-kó fie.**
 president PRF-call 3SG.OBJ FUT-go home
 ‘The president has called him, and he will go home.’
- e. **Òmànpàníń á-kà sè ð-bé-kó fie.**
 president PRF-say COMP 3SG.SBJ-FUT-go home
 ‘The president has said that he will go home.’
- (33) a. **Yaa mà-à mààmé nó á-fré àpòlísifóó.**
 Yaa CAUS-PST woman DET PRF-call police
 ‘Yaa made the woman call the police.’
- b. **Yaa mà-à ð-á-fré àpòlísifóó.**
 Yaa CAUS-PST 3SG.SBJ-PRF-call police
 ‘Yaa made her call the police.’
- c.* **Yaa mà-à nó á-fré àpòlísifóó.**
 Yaa CAUS-PST 3SG.SBJ PRF-call police
 ‘Yaa made her call the police.’
- d.* **Mààmé nó nòá-à àdùàné nó á-dí.**
 woman DET CAUS-PST food DET PRF-eat
 ‘The woman cooked the food and ate it.’
- e.* **Mààmé nó fré-è sè àdùàné nó á-béń.**
 woman DET call-PST COMP food DET PRF-be.cooked
 ‘The woman called that the food was cooked.’

-
- (1) a. **Ama á-fà ñwómá nó-ò kènkáń.**
 Ama PRF-take book DET-PROG read
 ‘Ama has taken the book and she is reading it.’
- b. **Kofi á-mà nó-ò didí.**
 Kofi PRF-CAUS 3SG.OBJ-PROG eat.RED
 ‘Kofi has caused it that he is eating.’

The next criterion to be considered is ABSENCE OF A LINKING ELEMENT (34):

- (34) **Criterion 4:** the absence of a coordinator or subordinator (more generally a linking element) in serial verb constructions is perhaps the most striking property of serial verb constructions (Haspelmath 2016:304).

Osam (1994, 2004) observes that in Akan, Integrated Serial Verb Constructions (ISVCs) or “serial verb constructions proper” (van der Veen 1998) do not allow for their constituent parts to be separated by a linker (35a-b).

- (35) a. **Aba yé-è àsór má-à Kofi.** (Fante)
 Aba do-COMPL prayer give-COMPL Kofi
 ‘Aba prayed for Kofi.’ (Osam 2004:15)
- b. * **Aba yé-è àsór na má-à Kofi.** (Fante)
 Aba do-COMPL prayer and give-COMPL Kofi
 ‘Aba prayed for Kofi.’ (Osam 2004:15)

We see a difference between the ‘no’ and ‘ɔ’ causatives with regards to whether a linking element can occur in the sentence. As (36a-b) show, in the Fante dialect, the ‘ɔ’ causative has a complementizer *mà*, which is evidence of clausal embedding.¹² However, in the ‘no’ causative a complementizer or any other linking element is not allowed in the sentence, which explains the ungrammaticality of (36c). Once again, we note a pattern between the ‘no’ causative and serial verb constructions on one hand, and the ‘ɔ’ causative and complement sentences on the other.

- (36) a. **Ekow má-à mà Araba sú-ì.** (Fante)
 Ekow CAUS-PST COMP Araba cry-PST
 ‘Ekow made Araba cry.’
- b. **Ekow má-à mà ósú-ì.** (Fante)
 Ekow CAUS-PST COMP 3SG.SBJ-cry-PST
 ‘Ekow made her cry.’
- c.* **Ekow mà-à mà nó sù-ìè.**
 Ekow CAUS-PST COMP 3SG.OBJ cry-PST
 ‘Ekow made her cry.’

¹² In many Kwa languages an overt complementizer in the causative sentence is optional (1-3).

- (1). **E-na (be) me ðu nu.** (Ewe, Anlo dialect)
 3SG.SBJ-CAUS COMP 1SG.SBJ eat thing
 ‘S/he made me eat.’
- (2). **E-ha (ni) e-fo.** (Ga)
 3SG.SUBJ-CAUS COMP 3SG.SBJ-cry
 ‘S/he made him/her cry.’
- (3). **Teddy há (né) Vivian yè fufùí.** (Dangme, Caesar 2013:70)
 Teddy make COMP Vivian eat fufu
 ‘Teddy made/let Vivian ate fufu.’

Haspelmath's (2016) final definitional criterion is stated in (37):

- (37) **Criterion 5:** the construction should NOT INVOLVE A PREDICATE–ARGUMENT RELATION, that is, it should not be the case that one of the verbs is (part of) an argument of the other verb (Haspelmath 2016:305).

Thus, Haspelmath rules out causatives as serial verb constructions because they typically involve a complement clause. It can be noted, however, that Haspelmath's (2016) test for monoclausality (criterion 2) does not show the 'no' causative to involve a biclausal structure but produces the same result for monoclausal serial verb constructions (17c, 18c). Nevertheless, language-internal tests such as adverbial scope and placement and reflexivization show that the 'no' causative involves a complex structure.

A summary of the properties of causatives is presented in Table 1. The evidence shows that the 'no' causative shares more properties with serial verb constructions than a complement sentence but the 'ɔ' causative displays all the hallmarks of a complement-clause construction. In the next section, we present a proposal on the structure of the two causative constructions.

Table 1: Syntactic properties of analytic causatives in Akan

Criteria	SVC	'no' causative	'ɔ' causative	Complement- sentence
1. CONSTRUCTION	√	√	√	√
2. SINGLE NEGATABILITY	√	√		
(i) different adverb scope		√	√	√
(ii) Inter-clausal adverbial insertion	√		√	
(iii) higher agent binds reflexive				
3. INDEPENDENT VERBS			√	√
(i) single tense specification				
4. NO LINKING ELEMENT	√	√		
5. NOT INVOLVE PREDICATE-ARGUMENT RELATION		√	√	√

4. Structure of the 'no' causative

We propose that the 'no' causative involves symmetric sharing of the object marked causee argument with the causative verb and the verb of effect. Our proposal follows Hiraiwa and Bodomo's (2008) analysis of serial verb constructions in Dàgáárè.¹³ Hiraiwa and Bodomo (2008) show that in some serial verb constructions the object forms a syntactic

¹³ Argument sharing analyses have been a staple of serial verb constructions for over three decades. A historical thread of the relevant analyses can be found in Baker (1989) Collins (1997) Stewart (1998) Baker and Stewart (2002). Aboh (2009), however, argues against argument sharing of any kind as a feature of serial verb constructions.

constituent with both V_1 and V_2 . This can be seen in predicate-object pied-piping, where the shared object can be extracted together with only V_1 , V_2 and V_1+V_2 (38a-c).¹⁴

(38) Dàgáárè (Hiraiwa and Bodomo 2008:798)

- a. **nénè sééó lá ká ó sé òò.**
meat roast.Nml F C 3Sg. roast eat
'It is roasting meat that he did and ate.' (clefting of V_1+OBJ)
- b. **nénè óóó lá ká ó sé òò.**
meat eat.Nml F C 3Sg. roast eat
'It is eating meat that he roasted and did.' (clefting of V_2+OBJ)
- c. **nénè sé-óóó lá ká ó sé òò.**
meat roast-eat.Nml F C 3Sg. roast eat
'It is roasting meat and eating it that he did.' (clefting of V_1+V_2+OBJ)

We propose that in the 'no' causative the object marked causee is *symmetrically shared* by V_1 and V_2 , however, unlike in Dagaare, the object has different grammatical relations properties toward each verb in the construction. In the 'no' causative, V_2 does not share its object with V_1 . However, the object of V_1 is simultaneously with V_2 as the subject of V_2 . In other words, the object marked causee forms a constituent with V_1 on one hand, and V_2 on the other.

One piece of evidence for the direct object status of the object marked causee is word order. In Akan, a direct object immediately follows the verb; in a serial verb construction, each verb has a direct object that immediately follows the verb and it is not possible to rearrange their positions in the clause (Osam 1994). Thus, in the 'no' causative there are two direct objects, one for each verb (39a). Additionally, "if a sentence has a direct object nothing can come between it and the verb" (Osam 1998:39). As already observed, no adverb can occur between the object marked causee and the causative verb (39b) because the object marked causee forms a constituent with the causative verb as a direct object. However, in the 'o' causative an adverb can be inserted between the causee and V_1 , since the causee is not a direct object of the verb (39c).

- (39) a. **Kwame mà-à nó bò-ò nó.**
Kwame CAUS-PST 3SG.OBJ beat.up-PST 3SG.OBJ
'Kwame let her beat him up.'

¹⁴ Akan has serial verb constructions in which the object seems to be shared by both V_1 and V_2 (1a). However, neither V_1 nor V_2 can be pied-piped with the object in this construction. More importantly, each verb has its own grammatical object, which is phonologically null for inanimate objects but overt with animate nouns (1b).

- (1) a. **Mè nòá-à àdùané dì-ìè.**
1SG cook-PST food eat-PST
'I cooked food and ate it.'
- b. **Yaw bò-ò àpòhkyé nó kùm-m nò.**
Yaw hit-PST goat DET kill-PST DET
'Yaw hit the goat and killed it.'

- b.* **Kwame mà-à ènnórá nó bò-ò nó.**
 Kwame CAUS-PST yesterday 3SG.OBJ beat.up-PST 3SG.OBJ
 ‘Kwame let her beat him up yesterday.’
- c. **Kwame mà-à ènnórá ò-bò-ò nó.**
 Kwame CAUS-PST yesterday 3SG.SBJ-beat.up-PST 3SG.OBJ
 ‘Kwame let her beat him up yesterday.’

On the other hand, the object marked causee simultaneously forms a constituent with V_2 by functioning as the subject of V_2 . Evidence that the object marked causee has subject properties can be seen in control of zero anaphora in clause chaining. According to Osam (1994:158) “in Akan, only NPs that bear the subject relation control the deletion, under coreferentiality, of a second and subsequent NPs in clause chaining.” As (40a-b) show, while a subject pronominal prefix on a non-initial verb can be deleted if it has the same referent as the subject, the object of a non-initial verb cannot be deleted although it may corefer with the direct object of the initial verb. Also, the direct object of the initial verb cannot control deletion of subject prefixes on the non-initial verb (40c). However, the object marked causee controls equi-deletion of subject prefix on non-initial verb just like the subject of a serial verb construction (41a-b).

- (40) a. **Mè hùrí mé ś.**
 1SG jump 1SG catch
 ‘I jump and I catch it.’
- b. **Mè hùrí Ø ś.**
 1SG jump 1SG catch
 ‘I jump and I catch it.’
- c.* **Mè_i fré-è Kofi_j Ø_i-sòmá-à Ø_j.**
 1SG call-PST Kofi 1SG-send-PST 3SG.OBJ
 ‘I called Kofi and I sent him.’
- (41) a. **Ë_i-kò-ò fié Ø_i-kò-nòá-à àdùàné Ø_i-dì-iè.**
 3SG.SBJ-go-PST home 3SG.SBJ-go-cook-PST food 3SG.SBJ-eat-PST
 ‘He went home, he cooked, and he ate.’
- b. **Wò_i-mà-à nó_j Ø_j-kò-ò fié Ø_j-kò-nòá-à**
 3PL.SBJ-CAUS- PST 3SG.OBJ 3SG.SBJ-go-PST home 3SG.SBJ-go-cook-PST
àdùàné Ø_i-dì-iè.
 food 3SG.SBJ-eat-PST
 ‘They let him go home and he cooked and ate.’

Some serial verb constructions appear to share the object argument in the manner of the ‘no’ causative. For instance, in (42a-b) the direct object of V_1 appears also to be the actor of V_2 , resulting in a ‘subject mismatch’ as in the ‘no’ causative. In fact, Aboh (2009:23) argues that in constructions like (42a-b) “only the causative meaning results from the syntactic configuration of such series, and whether the canonical subject is affected or not by the event CAUSE is left vague.”

- (42) a. **Ǿ-tò-ò** **bóó** **b̀̀-ò** **Adu.**
 3SG.SBJ-throw-PST stone hit-PST Adu
 ‘She threw a stone to hit Adu.’
- b. **Ẁ̀-ǵiá-à** **Kwame** **tò-ò** **fámí.**
 3PL.SBJ-push-PST Kwame throw-PST ground
 ‘They pushed Kwame to the ground.’

However, there are differences between serial verb constructions like (42) and the ‘no’ causative with regards to the direct object that occurs between V_1 and V_2 . As noted by Osam (1994), the object of V_1 is not a subject of V_2 in the same way as in the ‘no’ causative. As we have already noted, in the ‘no’ causative the object marked causee argument controls any clause-final reflexive evincing its status as subject of V_2 (43b). On the other hand, a reflexive can only be controlled by the subject of V_1 in the serial verb construction (43a). Thus, if the serial verb construction in (42) and the ‘no’ causative ‘result from the same syntactic configuration’ the differences between them in terms of the properties of the causee argument, which is licensed as object in both constructions, would be unexpected.

- (43) a. **Ǿ_i-tò-ò** **bóó** **b̀̀-ò** **ne** **ho_i.**
 3SG.SBJ-throw-PST stone hit-PST 3SG.POSS self
 ‘She threw a stone to hit herself.’
- b. **Ẁ̀-mà-à** **nó_i** **b̀̀-ò** **nè** **hó_i.**
 3PL.SBJ-CAUS-PST 3SG.OBJ hit-PST 3SG.POSS self
 ‘They caused Kwame to hit himself.’

We have considered evidence that show that the object marked causee forms a constituent simultaneously with V_1 and V_2 but has different relations with each verb. The causee argument in the ‘no’ causative is a direct object of V_1 and simultaneously functions as subject of V_2 (44).

- (44). [s [Co NP_{causer} V₁ [C1 NP_{causee}] V₂ ...]]

The ‘no’ causative involves a clause union or restructuring, “a process that unites two clauses into one” (Aboh 2015:294) along the patterns of serialization. The ‘no’ causative is undoubtedly derived from a complex construction in which a causative verb takes a clause containing a causee NP and a predicate of effect as a complement (45). The causative construction has an overt complementizer in Fante but not in Twi dialects like Akuapem, Asante and Akyem.

- (45). [s NP_{causer} V [COMP [s1 NP_{causee} V ...]]]

One reason why there is no complementizer in the causative construction in the Twi dialects is because these dialects do not have that kind of complementizer. In Akan, there are two types of complementizers, manipulative **má** and non-manipulative **sé**, but only **má** is allowed in the causative construction (Osam 1998). In the Twi dialects, **má** can be used in clause chaining multiverbal constructions as a lexical verb that is marked for tense, aspect, mood and polarity (see Osam 1998).

- (46) a. $\dot{\text{O}}\text{-má-à}$ mà $\dot{\text{o}}\text{-dзі-ì}$ èdzibàń nó. (Fante)
 3SG.SBJ-CAUS-PST COMP 3SG.SBJ-eat-PST food DET
 ‘He made her eat the food.’
- b.* $\dot{\text{O}}\text{-mà-à.}$ sé $\dot{\text{o}}\text{-sú-í.}$
 3SG.SBJ-CAUS-PST COMP 3SG.SBJ-cry-PST
 ‘He made her cry.’

Thus, in the Twi dialects both ‘ $\dot{\text{o}}$ ’ causative and ‘no’ causative occur without an overt complementizer but only the latter undergoes restructuring similar to partial lexicalized-integrated serial verb construction (PL-ISVC) while the ‘ $\dot{\text{o}}$ ’ causative maintains a biclausal structure. One consequence of this analysis is that the notion of ‘switch-subject’ is not a feature of serial verb constructions in Akan but more appropriately applies to complement sentences. In other words, the ‘ $\dot{\text{o}}$ ’ causative cannot be used as evidence of ‘switch-subject’ in serial verb constructions because it is not a serial verb construction, it is a complement sentence.

5. Conclusion

Our goal in this paper has been to provide a viable analysis for the structure of two analytic causative constructions, one with an object-marked causee (‘no’ causative) and another with the causee marked as subject (‘ $\dot{\text{o}}$ ’ causative), in Akan. Both causatives tend to receive a unitary analysis as a type of serial verb construction or a complement sentence. However, we have proposed that a clearer understanding of the syntactic properties of causatives in this language begins with recognizing that there are two types of analytic causatives in the language and these are structurally different. The evidence shows that the ‘no’ causative shows more properties of a serial verb construction, specifically properties of functional partial lexicalized-integrated serial verb constructions (PL-ISVCs), in which the object marked causee is symmetrically shared by V_1 and V_2 . On the other hand, the ‘ $\dot{\text{o}}$ ’ causative shows more properties of a complement sentence. Thus, the two causatives exhibit characteristics prototypical of two different and distinct types of constructions. A major theoretical implication of this analysis is that differences in linguistic behavior of superficially similar constructions may form a justification or substantiation that varieties of a given language are, indeed, separate dialects. Further, although universally comparative definitions like the ones proposed by Haspelmath (2016) for serial verb constructions are relevant for crosslinguistic generalizations they necessarily need to be complemented with relevant language-internal tests otherwise such ‘narrow definitions’ run the risk of yielding false positives/negatives, just as we have demonstrated for Akan causatives. More importantly, the ‘no’ causative presents a challenge for a priori assumptions about serial verb constructions and monoclausality which requires further attention.

Acknowledgements

This article is based on a chapter of the first author’s PhD dissertation *Force dynamics and causation in Akan* submitted to the Department of Linguistics, University of Ghana, Legon. We would like to thank our supervisors Prof E. K. Osam, Prof K. K. Saah and Prof Nana Aba Amfo for their comments on earlier incarnations of this research. This research was funded by the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) – African Humanities Program (AHP) Dissertation Completion Fellowship 2012. It was also supported by the University of Ghana Staff Development Grant.

References

- Aboh, Enoch O. 2009. Clause structure and verb series. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 40(1), 1-33.
- Aboh, Enoch O. 2015. *The emergence of hybrid grammars: Language contact and change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Agyeman, Nana Ama. 2002. Serial verb constructions in Akan. NTNU, Trondheim MA thesis.
- Alsina, Alex. 1992. On the argument structure of causatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21(2). 517-555.
- Baker, Mark and Stewart, Osamuyimen T. 2002. A serial verb construction without constructions. Ms., Rutgers University.
- Baker, Mark. 1989. Object sharing and projection in serial verb constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 513-553.
- Bamgbose, Ayo. 1974. On serial verbs and verbal status. *Journal of West African Languages* 9.1, 17-48.
- Bamgbose, Ayo. 1982. Issues in the analysis of serial verb constructions. *Journal of West African Languages* 12(2), 3-21.
- Boadi, Lawrence A. 2005. *Three syntactic structures in Akan: Interrogatives, complementation and relativization*. Accra: Black Mask.
- Bodomo, Adams. 2002. The syntax of serial verbs in Dagaare. In Felix Ameka and Kweku Osam (eds.), *New directions in Ghanaian linguistics*, 27-54. Accra: Advent Press.
- Caesar, Regina Oforiwah. 2013. *Syntax and semantics of causative verbs in Dangme*. Winneba: University of Education PhD thesis.
- Campbell, Richard. 1998. A note on subject clitics in Akan. *Studies in African Linguistics* 27(1). 49-66.
- Cole, Peter. 1976. A causative construction in Modern Hebrew: Theoretical implications. In Peter Cole (ed.), *Studies in Modern Hebrew syntax and semantics*, 99-128. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Cole, Peter. 1983. The grammatical role of the causee in universal grammar. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49. 115-133.
- Collins, Chris. 1997. Argument sharing in serial verb constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28. 461-497.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology*. London: University of Chicago press.
- Defina, Rebecca. 2016. Do serial verb constructions describe single events?: A study of co-speech gestures in Avatime. *Language*, 92(4), 890-910.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2000. Typology of causative constructions. In R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*, 30-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dolphyne, Florence A. 1987. On negating the consecutive verb in Akan. *Journal of West African Languages* 19(1). 70-80.
- Durie, Mark. 1997. Grammatical structures in verb serialization. In Alex Alsina, Joan Bresnan and Peter Sells (eds.), *Complex predicates*, 289-354. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Essilfie, Thomas. 1984. *Causation and the role of serialisation in Fante*. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 27. 52-63.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2016. The serial verb construction: Comparative concept and cross-linguistic generalizations. *Language and Linguistics*, 17(3), 291-319.
- Hiraiwa, Ken and Adams Bodomo. 2008. Object-sharing as symmetric sharing: Evidence from Dagaare. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 26(4), 795-832.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticization. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, 1, 17-35. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Traugott, Elizabeth Closs., 2003. *Grammaticalization*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Kambon, Obadele, E. Kweku Osam and Nana Aba A. Amfo. 2015. A case for revisiting definitions of serial verb constructions—Evidence from Akan serial verb nominalization. *Studies in African Linguistics* 44(2), 75-99.
- Kemmer, Suzanne and Arie Verhagen. 1994. The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 115-157.
- Kozinsky, Isaac and Maria Polinsky. 1993. Causee and patient in the causative of transitive: Coding conflict or doubling of grammatical relations? In Bernard Comrie and Maria Polinsky (eds.), *Causatives and transitivity*, 177-240. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Larnyo, A. Phillips. 2013. A Linguistic study of Ewe causative constructions. Legon: University of Ghana MPhil thesis.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1999. Causatives. In Natsuko Tsujimura (ed.), *The handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, 236-269. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

- Morrison, Michelle. 2007. Towards a revised definition of the serial verb construction: evidence from the Asante dialect of Akan. Term paper for Linguistics 408 Linguistic Field Methods, Rice University, Houston, Texas.
- Newman, John. 2010. *Give: A cognitive linguistic study* (Vol. 7). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Osam, Kweku E. 1994. *Aspects of Akan grammar: A functional perspective*. Eugene, University of Oregon PhD thesis.
- Osam, Kweku E. 1998. Complementation in Akan. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 19, 21-43.
- Osam, Kweku E. 2004. *The Trondheim Lectures—an introduction to the structure of Akan: Its verbal and multiverbal systems*. Legon: Department of Linguistics, University of Ghana.
- Rose, Francoise. 2009. The origin of serialization: The case of Emerillon. *Studies in Language* 33(3), 644–684.
- Saah, Kofi K. 1989. Reflexivization in Akan. *Journal of West African Languages* 19(2). 15-28.
- Saah, Kofi K. 1994. *Studies in Akan: Syntax, acquisition and sentence processing*. Ontario: University of Ottawa PhD thesis.
- Saah, Kofi K. 2004. A survey of Akan adverbs and adverbials. *Journal of West African Languages*, 31(2), pp.46-74.
- Schachter, Paul. 1974. A non-transformational account of serial verb constructions. *Studies in African Linguistics Supp. 5*, 153–271.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi and Chung, Yeo Sung. 2002. Japanese and Korean causatives revisited. In Akatsuka Noriko M. and Susan Strauss (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics Vol 10*, 32-49. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information (CSLI) Publications.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi and Prashant Pardeshi. 2002. The causative continuum. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation*, 85-127. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1973. Lexical versus periphrastic causatives in Korean. *Journal of Linguistics* 9. 209-383.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2009. On the form of complex predicates: Demystifying serial verbs. In Johannes Helmbrecht, Yoko Nishina, Yong-Min Shin, Stravos Skopeteas and Elisabeth Verhoeven (eds.), *Form and function in language research: papers in honour of Christian Lehmann*, 255-282. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Song, Jae Jung. 2013. *Causatives and causation: A universal-typological perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Stahlke, Herbert. 1970. Serial verbs. *Studies in African Linguistics* 1(1), 60–99.
- Stewart, Osamuyimen T. 1998. *The serial verb construction parameter*. McGill University PhD thesis.
- van der Veen, Pytsje. 1998. *Serial verb constructions in Akan with some extensions to some other Languages*. University of Groningen MA thesis.