

SALOS lectures

1

SEPPÖ KITTILÄ
SALOS SUMMER SCHOOL,
1.-7.8.2016

The outline of the lectures

2

1. Introduction to valency change: Differential argument marking
2. Introduction to valency change: decreasing and increasing valency
3. Causatives: Introduction and formal aspects
4. Causatives: Semantics
5. Causatives that are not $n+1$

Semantics of causatives

3

Preliminaries

4

1. The nature of causation may be different (as is the case with direct and indirect causation)
2. Certain semantic aspects associated with causation (in some cases including the type of causation) also contribute to the coding of causatives.

Types of causation

5

∞ Physical vs. manipulative causation: does causation require physical contact or not. For example (Yimas):

(63) *Na-na-tar/tmi-kwalca-t*

3SG.A-1SG.O-CAUS/CAUS-rise-PERF 'She woke me up'

- In the first case, the causation is physical (and someone is waken up, e.g., by shaking), while in the second causation is manipulative (e.g., by shouting).

Types of causation

6

✎ Manipulative causation can further be subdivided based on the directness of causation; we can speak of causatives and permissives. In the first case, the causation is more direct and the Causee has less freedom to decide whether to act or not. An example on the next slide.

Example

7

Quechua

(64a) *nuqa fan-ta rumi-ta apa-ŋi-ni*
1SGA Juan-ACC rock-ACC carry-CAUS-1SGA

‘I made Juan carry the rock’

(64b) *nuqa fan-wan rumita apaŋini*
1SGA Juan-INSTR

‘I had Juan carry the rock’

- Accusative codes more direct manipulative causation than the instrumental.

Other features

∞ Dixon (2000) lists 9 features that are relevant to the coding of causation (admitting that his list may not be exhaustive):

1. State vs. action
2. Transitivity
3. Control (by the Causee)
4. Volitionality (by the Causee)

Other features

9

5. Affectedness (is the Causee partially or completely affected).
6. Directness (does the Causer direct his/her actions directly at the Causee or not)
7. Intentionality (is the Causer's action volitional or not)
8. Naturalness (does the causation follow naturally)
9. Involvement (is the Causer involved in the event him/herself)

State vs. action

10

- ✧ In Bahasa Indonesia and Malay, causative suffix *-kan* appears on static verbs, while action verbs are causativized periphrastically (*suruh* 'order' tai *buat/bikin* 'make').
- ✧ In Finnish, there are differences between unaccusative and unergative verbs (Causee in the accusative or in the partitive)

Finnish

11

(65a) *eversti sula-tt-i lume-n*
colonel melt-CAUS-3SG.PST snow-ACC
'The colonel melted the snow' (unaccusative)

(65b) *eversti juoksu-tt-i sotila-i-ta*
colonel run-CAUS-3SG.PST soldier-PL-PRT
'The colonel made the soldiers run'

State vs. action

12

✎ The differences in causativization between unaccusative and unergative verbs is easily accounted for by the presence/absence of agent; unaccusative verbs lack an agent altogether, while unergative verbs already have an agent, and the introduced causer deprives the original S of its some agentive features.

Transitivity

13

- ❧ For Dixon, transitivity basically refers to the number of arguments; intransitive, transitive and ditransitive verbs are causativized differently.
- ❧ In some languages (such as Kayardild), only intransitive verbs may be causativized.
- ❧ In others, intransitive verbs are causativized morphologically, others periphrastically (e.g., Maori and Ambae, Abkhaz).
- ❧ In Turkish and Bote, the coding of the Causee varies according to transitivity.

Transitivity

14

- ✎ There are no languages in which only ditransitive verbs may be causativized, while intransitive verbs never allow causativization.
- ✎ However, mere number of arguments is not relevant, since in most languages weather verbs cannot be causativized.

Transitivity

15

- ⌘ Also semantic transitivity is relevant here.
- ⌘ For example, in Sinhala, Causee is typically coded by the postposition *lawaa*, or they appear in the dative with the postposition *kiyāla*. With the verb 'eat', dative alone codes the Causee (in Finnish similar variation is attested between adessive and allative).
- ⌘ In general, the verb 'eat' is causativized differently from other transitive verbs (see Næss 2007).

Example (Berber)

16

(66a) *y-ttcuwqqzinaysum*

3M.SG-eatdog:CSTmeat

'The dog ate the meat'

(66b) *y-ss-ttcwryazaysum*

3.M.SG-CAUS-eat.PFVman:CSTmeat

i-wqqzin

DAT-dog:CST

'The man fed meat to the dog'

(66c) **y-ss-wtwmddakkwl-inwmuccaryaz*

3.M.SG-CAUS-hit.PFV 3M.SGfriend:CST-mycatman

(My friend made the man hit the cat)

In Berber, 'eat' is one of the few transitive verbs that can be causativized.

Rationale

18

- ❧ Formal restrictions are (naturally) explained best by formal properties of languages; some languages place restrictions on the number of arguments.
- ❧ Semantic variation, in turn, is best accounted for by, e.g., the fact that Causee needs to have some semantic features (e.g., if it needs to be active, it cannot be inanimate). Also the agency associated with the original S/A is relevant.

Control

19

- ✎ For Dixon, control refers to the control exercised by the Causee.
- ✎ For example, Creek has two causative affixes; *-ic* is used when the Causee has no control (e.g., feed the baby), while *-ipa* implies control (e.g., make baby eat) kanssa Causeella on kontrollia ('laittaa vauva syömään').
- ✎ In languages such as Korean and Japanese, Causee must have control, which confines causativization to animate Causees.

Control

20

☞ Also the (potential) control by the causer is relevant; we cannot control weather phenomena in any way, which excludes the causativization of weather verbs in many languages (in Finnish, this is possible morphologically, but with semantic differences).

Volitionality

21

- ⌘ Does the Causee act willingly or not (also volitionality/intentionality by the Causer is relevant).
- ⌘ This corresponds to some extent to the differences between English *make* and *let*; in the latter case the Causer rather allows a certain event to happen, while it is up to the Causee whether it will actually occur.

Example

22

Tangkhul Naga

(68a) *cannə merilici-tuŋtələy*

John Mary CAUS-get down

'John got Mary to get down' (willingly)

(68b) *i-nəa-liconrəmci*

1SG-NOM3SG-ACC luggage that

khuy-ŋəsək-sá-y

take-CAUS-EVID-NON.FUT

'I made him/her take that luggage' (unwillingly)

Affectedness

- ✎ To what extent does the event affect the Causee (is it totally or partially affected)
- ✎ Is not very relevant across languages, but an example is attested in Tariana, where the affix *-i+ta* implies total affectedness (you completely destroyed my house), while *-i* is used, if affectedness is less total (you dropped some pieces of wood).
- ✎ In some languages (such as Chichewa), causatives may express intensification.

Affectedness (anecdote)

24

☞ Finnish: some children (including both of my own) at the early stages of language acquisition used the incorrect form *rikottaa* (break.CAUS) instead of *rikkoa* (break) when referring to breaking (does this underline the high degree of affectedness, or what is the reason for this?)

Directness of causation

25

- As has been noted earlier, directness of causation directly affects its coding in many languages. Consider:
- Therefore it is a good first approximation to define **direct causation** as a situation involving an agentive causer and a patientive causee and **indirect causation** as one involving two agentive participants, one an agentive causer and the other an agentive causee. (Shibatani & Pardeshi 2001).

Directness of causation

26

- ✎ In the first case, directness means how directly the agent targets his/her action at the patient/causee and how directly this affects the state of the patient/causee.
- ✎ For example, in 'John killed Bill with a knife', the causation is very direct, while in 'John killed Bill, because he was unable to rescue him from drowning', the causation is less direct.
- ✎ In the second case, the differences in directness follow from how effective the manipulation is (discussion will follow later).

Directness of causation: 'case study'

27

John killed Bill (with a knife)

John killed Bill (by giving him peanuts)

John killed Bill (because he didn't call 112)

John killed Bill (because he was unable to rescue him from drowning)

John killed Bill (because he broke all cell phones nearby and no one was able to call for help)

John killed Bill (by giving the ambulance wrong directions by mistake)

John killed Bill (by recommending that he goes to Kenya for a safari, where he got malaria)

Example (marathi)

28

(69a) *kap DewaaL-l-e*

Clothes.Ndry-PERF-N

'The clothes dried'

(69b) *Raam-nekap Dewaal-aw-l-e*

Ram-ERGclothes.Ndry-CAUS-PERF-N

'Ram dried the clothes'

(69c) *Mikap DewaaL-u di-l-e*

Iclothes.Ndry-PARTIC give-PERF-N

'I let the clothes dry'

Another example (repeated)

29

Yimas

(70) *Na-na-tar/tmi-kwalca-t*

3SG.A-1SG.O-CAUS/CAUS-rise-PERF

'She woke me up'

With *-tar*, causation is physical, while in the case of *-tmi*, it is less direct (waking up, e.g., by yelling).

Causatives vs. permissives

30

- ❧ The indirect causation in the spirit of Shibatani and Pardeshi can be subdivided according to how directly the Causer acts the causee to act.
- ❧ We can speak of causatives and permissives, of which the first refers to more direct of instances of causation. In the latter case, the Causer rather allows the event happen, and the Causee decides whether s/he does what is possible.

Example (Tukang Besi)

31

(71a) *no-wilanaana*

3R-goNOMchild

‘The child goes’

(71b) *no-**pa**-wilateanabouijambata*

3R-CAUS-goCOREfatherOBLjetty

naana

NOMchild

‘The father send the child to the jetty’

(71c) *ku-**hepe**-wila(naiaku)diana*

1SG-REQ-go(NOM1SG)OBLchild

‘I ask the child to go’

Example 2

32

Finnish

(72a) *pakot-i-n* *häne-t* *menemään*

force-PST-1SG 3SG-ACC₁ go.INF₃

'I made him/her go'

(72b) *anno-i-n* *häne-n* *mennä*

give/let-PST-1SG 3SG-ACC₂ go.INF₁

'I let him/her go'

Intentionality

33

- ⌘ Does the causer act intentionally or not (and does s/he control the event?)
- ⌘ In typical causation, the causer acts intentionally, but s/he can be responsible for an event unintentionally as well.
- ⌘ Intentionality may correlate with directness (intentional causation is usually direct), but this is not necessary.
- ⌘ Intentionality affects the coding of causatives in many languages (see, e.g., Kittilä 2005, Fauconnier 2012, 2013).

Example

34

Tarascan

(73a) *Valeria umi-rhu-**ku**-s-Ø-ti*

V. Suffocate-top-CAUS-PERF-PRES-IND.3

chríri-ni

fire-OBJ

'Valeria suffocated the fire' (unintentionally)

(73b) *Valeria umi-rhu-**ta**-s-Ø-ti*

V. Suffocate-top-CAUS-PERF-PRES-IND.3

chríri-ni

fire-OBJ

'Valeria suffocated the fire (intentionally)

Example 2

35

Kammu (Svantesson 1983: 103f)

(74a) *tráakháan*

buffalodie

‘The buffalo died’

(74b) *kəəp-háantráak*

3SG.MCAUS-diebuffalo

‘He slaughtered the buffalo’

(74c) *kəətòkháanmúuc*

3SG.MCAUSdieant

‘He happened to kill an ant’

Example 3

36

Mangap-Mbula (Bugenhagen 1995: 175)

(75a) *aŋ-kaagakataama*

1SG-opendoor

‘I opened the door’

(75b) *aŋ-**pa**-kaagakataama*

1SG-CAUS-opendoor

‘I managed to get the door open’

In this case, causativization is associated with transitivity decrease (see also later).

Naturalness

37

- ⌘ How naturally the denoted event follows from causation, or does it require special effort (the causer's control and the causee's volitionality are relevant here)?
- ⌘ For example, morphological causativization implies natural causation, while periphrastic causation may mean that more force is needed (e.g., he got/forced me to drink wine).
- ⌘ English (and also Finnish) *I walked the dog* vs. *I made the dog walk* is a further example of this.

Involvement

38

- ✎ Refers to whether the Causer him/herself is involved in the event
- ✎ Does not affect causatives in very many languages, but it is relevant, e.g., in Nomatsiguenga:

Example

39

Nomatsiguenga

(76a)*y-**ogi**-monti-ë-ri*

3SG.M-CAUS-cross.river-NFUT-3SG.M

i-tomi

3SG.M.son

'He made his son cross the river (he told him to)'

(76a)*y-monti-a-**hag**-ë-rii-tomi*

3SG.M-cross.river-EPEN-CAUSNFUT-3SG.M

'He made his son cross the river (he helped him across)'

Final words

40

✂ As noted also earlier, it is in order to note explicitly that Dixon is also himself very aware of the fact that his list may not be exhaustive. But at least it is a good start!