TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES IN LANGUAGE 48

THE GRAMMAR OF CAUSATION AND INTERPERSONAL MANIPULATION

Edited by

MASAYOSHI SHIBATANI

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

The Grai ısation and Interpersonal Manipulation

Edited by Masayoshi Shibatani
Rice University/Kobe University

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam/Philadelphia

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The grammar of causation and Interpersonal Manipulation / Edited by Masayoshi Shibatani.
p. cm. (Typological Studies in Language, ISSN 0167–7373 ; v. 48)
Based on the 8th Biennal Rice Symposium on Linguistics held in 2000.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Causative (Linguistics)--Congresses. I. Shibatani, Masayoshi. II. Rice Symposium on Linguistics (8th : 2000) III. Series.

P292.G73 2002
415--dc21 2001058314
ISBN 90 272 2952 X (Eur.) / 1 58811 119 9 (US) (Hb; alk. paper)
ISBN 90 272 2953 8 (Eur.) / 1 58811 120 2 (US) (Pb; alk. paper)

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

To Jim Copeland

on the occasion of his retirement from
active teaching at Rice University in 2001

Preface

Just about a quarter-century ago, I had an opportunity to edit a collection of papers dealing with causative constructions. To my joy, *The Grammar of Causative Constructions* (Academic Press; 1976) continues to be a standard reference for the subject matter. Since then I had been drifting away from causatives to the wider (and wilder) terrain of voice phenomena for some time, and I was very pleased to be invited to the Rice University Symposium on Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation in Languages of Central and South America held April 6–9, 2000. Naturally, my interest in causatives was rekindled as I participated in this symposium, and I was more than happy to be invited to edit this volume.

A major difference I see between the two volumes is that we now have a wider and more far-reaching perspective on the grammar of causation. Thanks to a better understanding of how different constructions are positioned both synchronically (e.g., on a semantic map) and diachronically (e.g., by grammaticalization processes), we now have a more comprehensive, multidimensional picture of the form-meaning relationship countenanced by causative constructions of different types. The present volume also represents an effort to harness typological data from the field that has been almost entirely neglected in the past discussions of causative constructions, namely the indigenous languages of Central and South America.

The Eighth Biennial Rice Symposium on Linguistics, out of which this volume grew, was organized by the Department of Linguistics with generous support from the School of Humanities, the Dolores Welder Mitchell Trust, and the Center for the Study of Cultures at Rice University. We fondly dedicate this volume to the outgoing chair of the Department of Linguistics, James E. Copeland, who literally was the invisible hand in making the symposium possible.

Editing of this volume was completed during my tenure as a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford. The financial support provided by Center general funds is gratefully acknowledged.

Masayoshi Shibatani
Stanford, California

Appreciation

Philip W. Davis
Rice University

On behalf of the Department of Linguistics of Rice University, I would like to join the contributors of this volume in dedicating this volume to James Copeland on the occasion of his retirement from active teaching at Rice University in 2001. The 8th Biennial Symposium on Linguistics, out of which the present volume grew, was originally scheduled for spring 1999; but in April 1998, Jim had a life-threatening accident that forced its postponement to the year 2000. Responsibility for much of the implementation of the symposium then fell to Tom Givón, and although recovering, Jim was still unable to participate fully in the activities. He was missed.

Jim has long been a student of Uto-Aztecan languages, especially Tarahumara, and when he took responsibility for organizing the 8th symposium, it was conceived as representing a combination of interests: the indigenous languages spoken south of the United States with a focus on the broad grammatical presence of interpersonal manipulation. His first encounter with the Tarahumaras occurred when he was a young man traveling by train through the mountains and canyons of Mexico. The train passed through the area in which the Tarahumaras lived. Jim was fascinated, and he promised himself that he would someday come back to learn more about them.

Jim went on to receive his Ph.D. in 1965 in Germanic Linguistics from Cornell University. From the time of his appointment at Rice University in 1966, Jim worked untiringly, first to create an interdisciplinary undergraduate curriculum in linguistics, then to create a department of linguistics with its attendant graduate program. From 1989 until his retirement in 2001, Jim served as chair of the department.

In 1985, Jim returned to the Tarahumaras as a linguist, but because he was first interested in them as a people, his work has always transcended a narrow focus on the language. His research has been broadly based, reflecting a perspective which seeks to understand language as it is embedded in the lives of the speakers. Notable here is his study of what, at first inspection, appears to be rampant and

random variation in the morphophonemics and the phonology of the language. Jim attempts to understand the data as a patterned extension of the material and mental culture of the Tarahumaras.

The Department of Linguistics at Rice has always encouraged the humanistic approach, which has characterized Jim's own work. It has become the home for a variety of broadly-based approaches to linguistics, all united by their placing the speakers of language at the center.

Jim's dedication, vision, and personality have been important elements in shaping the department and its programs. Dedicating this volume to him can only in partial measure recognize his role in making the department what it has become.

Abbreviations

1	=	first person singular
2	=	second person singular
3	=	third person singular
1I	=	first person inclusive (plural)
3F	=	third person feminine/neuter
A	=	the more agent like argument of a transitive verb
A	=	set A person marker
ABL	=	Ablative
ABS	=	Absolutive
AC	=	active
ACC	=	accusative
ACT	=	action
AGT	=	agent
ADVZE	=	adverbializer
AG	=	agentive
ALL	=	allative
ANIM	=	animate
ANTIP	=	antipassive
AOR	=	aorist
APPL	=	applicative
ARR	=	arrival (with motion/locational verbs), finish a discourse span
ASP	=	aspect
ASSOC	=	associative
ATT	=	attenuative
AUG	=	augmentative
AUX	=	auxiliary
B	=	set B person marker
BEN	=	benefacticve
C	=	set C person marker
caus	=	lexical/derivational causative
CAUS	=	causative
CLEFT	=	cleft
COLL	=	collective
COMD	=	completive for dependent clauses
COMI	=	completive for independent clauses
COMP	=	comparative
COMPL	=	completive

CMPLZR = complementizer
CONJ = conjunction
CONT = continual; continuative
COP = copula
CSHIFT = category semantic shift
DAT = dative
DEFOBJ = definite object
DEM = demonstrative
DEP = departure (with noun/location verbs), start a discourse span
DES = desiderative
DET = detransitivizer
DETM = determinant
DIM = diminutive
DIR = directional
DIST = distant
DISTR = distributive
DNMZR = denominalizer
DP = direct physical
DTRNZ = detransitivizer
EMPH = emphatic
ERG = ergative
EXCL = exclusive
EV = evidential
F = feminine
FSSI = following event, same-subject, intransitive matrix predicate
FSST = following event, same-subject, transitive matrix predicate
FUT = future
GEN = genitive
GEN_A = generic agent
HAB = habitual
HSY = hearsay, long form
HSY2 = hearsay, short form
I = intransitive
IMP = imperative
IMPP = impersonal passive
IN = inactive
INC = incompeletive
INCD = incompletive for dependent clauses
INCEP = inceptive/inchoative
INCH = inchoative
INCL = inclusive
INC.I = incompletive for independent intransitive clauses
INC.T = incompletive for independent transitive clauses
IND = indicative
INF = infinitive

INST = instrumental
INT = interrogative
INTEN = intention
INTR = intransitive; intransitivizer
INV = inverse (for independent clauses)
INVD.C = inverse for dependent completive clauses
INVD.I = inverse for independent completive clauses
INV.LOCAL = inverse for local constructions
IRR = irrealis
IRRI = irrealis for independent clauses
IRRD = irrealis for dependent clauses
IRR.INV = irrealis plus inverse
HAB = habitual
ITERAT = itterative
LOC = locative
LOCAL = local marker (1:2) or (2:1)
LOC/ALL = locative/allative
NEG = negative
NF = nonfinite
M = masculine
MAL = malefactive
MNS = means
MODE = mode (neutralized realis/irrealis contrast)
NEG.HAB = negative habitual
N = neuter
NOM = nominative
NOMI = nominalizer
NPAST = nonpast
O = the less agent-like argument of a transitive verb; direct object
OBJ = object
OBL = oblique
PAST = past tense
PDS = previous event, different subject
PERDUR = perdurative
PERF = perfective; perfect
PL = plural
PO = primary object
POSS = possessor
PO>S/A = previous event, object-to-subject coreferentiality
PP1 = present participle
PP2 = past participle
PRES = present tense
PRG = progressive
PRIV = privative
PROG = progressive

PROP = proprietive
PROX = proximal
PSD = possessee suffix
PSN = possessee prefix
PSSI = previous event, same-subject, intransitive matrix subject
PSST = previous event, same-subject, transitive matrix subject
PST2 = 'yesterday' or 'a few days ago'
PST4 = 'far away' past
PTCP = participle
PURP = purpose/purposive
QUANT = quantifier
REAL = realis
RECIP = reciprocal
RED = reduplication
REF = reflexive
REL = relativizer
REM = remote past
REP = repetitive
RES = resolved perfective/perfect (do again, motion back to prior location, resolving once and for all, denouement perfective)
R.PST = recent past
S = intransitive subject
SAP = speech act participant (first and second person)
SAP.PL = plural for speech act participants
S_a = active intransitive subject
S_o = inactive intransitive subject
SBR = subject clitic of subordinate cluases
SDS = simultaneous event, different-subject
SG = singular
SSSI = simultaneous event, same-subject, intransitive matrix predicate
SSST = simultaneous event, same-subject, transitive matrix predicate
SUBJ = subject
T = transitive
TEMP = temporal
TR = transitive agreement
UNCERT = uncertainty
UNPOSS = unpossessed inalienable noun
VD = valency decrease
VOC = vocative
VOL = volitive
VR = verbalizer
> = subordinate-to-matrix-clause argument tracking (in switch reference/clause chaining markers)
\+ = combination of unglossed morphemes forming a word
= = clitic

Table of contents

Introduction*

Some basic issues in the grammar of causation

Masayoshi Shibatani
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences / Kobe University

The grammar of causation is one of the areas that have received intensive scrutiny over the past 30 years. For one thing, no grammatical description can be complete without a discussion of causative constructions, because every human language seems to possess a means of expressing the notion of causation, and this ubiquity, in turn, indicates the fundamental nature of this cognitive category. Such a basic category in human conceptualization is an ideal field of investigation for cross-linguistic comparison leading to the study of language universals and cross-linguistic variation. Grammarians have an intuitive understanding of what causation means, as causative expressions, encountered in one language after another, translate rather easily unlike such phenomena as 'topic/focus' constructions a là Philippine languages, the adversative passive in Japanese, and ethical datives in German or French. Despite these advantages and despite the intensive effort during the last three decades, a great deal about the grammar of causation still remains a mystery. The following chapters contain the most up-to-date efforts to unravel some of the mysteries. By way of introduction, the present chapter identifies a number of fundamental issues tackled by the contributions to this volume and some that still await further investigation.

1. Lexical and morphological matters

1.1 Lexical causatives

Languages vary considerably in the extent to which morphology is employed in expressing causative situations. In languages such as Turkish and Quechua a wide spectrum of event-types undergo morphology-based causativization processes;

e.g., Turkish *ol-dür* 'kill/cause to die', *kos-tur* 'cause to run', *ye-dir* 'feed/cause to eat', *oku-t* 'cause to read'. On the other hand, languages like English lack productive causative morphology and instead contain a large number of transitive verbs that are causative in meaning but that defy morphological identification of a causative element; e.g., *kill, open, widen, feed.* Even in languages like Turkish and Quechua, there are still a number of atomic lexical causatives; e.g., Turkish *kir-* 'break', *yirt-* 'split', *dil-* 'plant', *yak-* 'burn', *sakla-* 'hide', and *ac-* 'open'. One area of investigation open for further research is concerned with the nature of lexical causatives: 1) What kind of causative event is likely to be lexicalized as an atomic unit? 2) How are causative verbs related to other types of verbs semantically and morphologically?

The first question entails another: What kind of situation resists lexicalization and morphological causativization in general? Efforts to answer some aspects of both questions 1 and 2 have been mounted by Nedjalkov (1990) and Haspelmath (1987, 1993). Although these studies are concerned with the derivational relationship between inchoative expressions and causatives – what kinds of event enter into this derivational relationship and the direction of the derivations (causative→inchoative or inchoative→causative) – their findings yield clues for our questions. To say that the anticausative derivation (causative→inchoative) obtains, as in Turkish *kapa-* 'close (tr.)' and *kapa-n-* 'close (intr.)', is to say that lexical causatives exist. The other direction is a little trickier, in that some languages (e.g., Japanese) may allow both lexical and morphological causatives corresponding to some intransitive verbs. That is, presence of the causative derivation (inchoative→causative), as in Japanese *ori-* 'come down' and *ori-sase-* 'cause to come down', does not automatically lead to the absence of the relevant lexical causative – Japanese, for example, has a lexical form, *oros-* 'bring down', as well. Nevertheless, the causative derivation provides a hint that there may be no corresponding lexical causative.

Haspelmath's (1993) point that "a factor favoring the anticausative [derivation] is the probability of an outside force bringing about the event" (103) can be construed to mean that such an event is more likely to be lexicalized as an atomic causative verb. Similarly, the converse of the situation above – namely, that "the causative [derivation] is favored if the event is quite likely to happen even if no outside force is present" (103) – can be interpreted to mean that such an event **may** not be lexicalized as a causative verb. Haspelmath's cross-linguistic investigation reveals that events of 'splitting', 'closing', 'breaking', or 'opening', which are likely to be conceived as those requiring an outside force to happen, tend to involve anticausative derivation, indicating that these are likely to be lexicalized as causative verbs. On the other hand, events of 'boiling', 'freezing', 'drying', 'waking up', 'going out', 'sinking', and 'melting' favor causative derivation, pointing to the tendency for these events not to be lexicalized as causative verbs. What cannot be ignored in Haspelmath's study are the many instances of non-directed derivations

of these events that enter the inchoative/causative pairing. That is, inchoatives and causatives may have identical non-derived forms (a case of "labile" form), or they may each show a derivational status (a case of "equipolent" derivation). The former represents a case of lexicalized causative verbs. In other words, spontaneous events are equally susceptible to both inchoative and causative lexicalization. This tendency is indicated by the fact that if labile forms are found in a language, they are likely to cover the semantic domain of spontaneous events; e.g., English *boil, freeze, dry, sink* (see also the discussion of "internal vs. external causation" by Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: Chap. 3).

Haspelmath (1993) laments under-representation of the languages of the New World in his and Nedjalkov's study referred to above. This deficit has been made up to some extent by contributions by **Zavala** and by **Vázquez Soto** in this volume, who examine in some detail causative/non-causative verb correspondences in Olutec and Cora, respectively. A detailed examination of Olutec verbal derivation by **Zavala** largely supports Haspelmath's results in that events that are likely to happen without the presence of an external causer tend to be coded as basic inchoatives, which are submitted to causativization, whereas certain other events that could occur either with or without an external causer (e.g., 'breaking', 'folding', 'shaking') are lexicalized as labile inchoative/causative verbs. In Cora inchoatives derived from statives also function as causative, just like English labile verbs such as *widen* and *harden*.

Notice that in all these instances of lexical causatives, the causee plays a patient role. Thus, whereas inchoative verbs involve a patient undergoer as their protagonist, causatives involve an agentive causer and a patient causee as their protagonists, as shown by a pair such as *die* and *kill*. What we do not normally find lexicalized as causative are events involving two agentive protagonists. We are likely not to find a language in which causatives corresponding to verbs such as 'swim', 'sing', 'read', and 'kick' are lexicalized.[1] This restriction represents limitation on a cognitive unit that can be lexicalized. That is, the maximal event structure lexicalizable as an atomic unit can include at most one agent; e.g., an event structure consisting of more than one event-segment headed by an agent cannot be lexicalized. This strong constraint on lexicalization is seen to play some important role in the diachronic development of causative forms, as discussed by **Shibatani and Pardeshi**.

When linguists talk about causative verbs, they focus on those that convey events brought about by an external agent; e.g., 'kill', 'frighten'. When a conveyed event does not entail a change in the patient, as in the case of verbs such as 'hit' and 'thank', the verb is considered to be non-causative. A similar delimitation has often been applied to morphological and periphrastic causative constructions, such that whereas an expression 'John forced/persuaded Bill to leave' is considered causative, an expression 'John told Bill to leave' is not (see Shibatani 1976a). In the Leningrad/St. Petersburg School of typology, however, a somewhat more

inclusive framework has been adopted so as to include the latter type of "non-implicative" expression in the typological survey of causative constructions (see Xolodovič 1969). Indeed, a wider scope is called for if we are to understand historical developments of causative constructions, which may arise from non-implicative constructions (see **Maldonado and Nava** and other contributions to this volume).

The same can be said about lexical causatives. In order to better understand the nature of lexical causatives, it is important to study them in a larger context of interpersonal verbs. This is exactly what **Malle** does in his contribution, where he attempts an analysis and classification of interpersonal verbs in terms of folk theory of mind and behavior – intentionality and observability. This scheme opens up a new avenue to explore how causal relations are mapped onto syntax. Verbs can denote (1) causing events with a causer subject (e.g., A *killed* B), (2) resulting events with an affectee as a subject (e.g., A *feared* B), or (3) either (e.g., A *surprised* B/A *is surprised at* B). These patterns are predicted by **Malle**'s two rules of interpersonal episodes:

I. Behavioral events that are causing events must be publicly observable.
II. Behavioral events that are resulting events must be unintentional.

Actions, following rule I and violating II can only be causing events – (1) and (3). On the other hand, experiences, being unobservable and unintentional, violate I and fulfill II; accordingly, they can only be resulting events – (2) and (3). (See Croft 1991 for a similar attempt in accounting for the syntactic pattern of stimulus-experiencer verbs in terms of the direction of causal implications.)

1.2 Morphological causatives

Related to the question of what event types are likely to be lexicalized as atomic causative verbs is what event types are likely to be morphologically causativized. Before entering this discussion, I note one terminological issue. In the preceding section, I spoke of lexical causatives, pointing to their property of being morphologically unanalyzable, as in English verbs *kill* and *open*. Indeed, some linguists take this formal property to be a criterion for delineating lexical causatives, but some others use productivity as a criterion for distinguishing lexical causatives from morphological ones. In this essay, I follow the latter approach for the reasons debated by **Shibatani and Pardeshi**, who postulate a continuum from highly productive forms to irregular but morphologically analyzable ones, and to atomic lexical causatives. In the end the relevant question can be phrased as "What event types are more easily encoded as causative words?" where the term 'word' is to cover atomic lexical causatives and causatives derived by morphological processes of varying degrees of productivity.