A ROLE OR REFERENCE DOMINATED LANGUAGE? (CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN KARTVELIAN)

Nina R. Sumbatova
Research Assistant
Institute of Oriental Studies
USSR, 103031 Moscow, Rozhdestvenka, 12

1. Introduction.

The opposition of reference vs. role dominated languages was primarily proposed by R. Van Valin and W. Foley (1980, 1984). A language is said to be role-dominated if oppositions of basic semantic roles are directly expressed in its surface structure. Otherwise the language turns out to be reference-dominated. To identify a language as a reference vs. role dominated one a number of tests including relativization, conjunction reduction, etc. can be used. In this paper I will argue that causativization may be viewed as an additional test of this kind. The paper is organized as follows: in the second section the application of the opposition of reference vs. role domination to the syntax of causative constructions is sketched; in the third and main section the syntax of causative constructions in Kartvelian is discussed: after a short summary of the causatives in Georgian, case-marking patterns of causative verbs in Svan are presented. In the last section the data of Svan are given an interpretation in terms of **Role and Reference** Grammar.

2. Role vs. reference domination in causativization.

Causativization has often been described as a kind of verbal derivation which consists in embedding the "original" clause in the position of the second argument of the predicate CAUS, the first argument of CAUS being a NP referring to as **causer**. Case-marking of the causative verb is therefore presented as determined by that of the original non-causative verb.

One of the most popular and explanatory theories claiming to formulate universal rules of causative derivation was proposed by B. Comrie (1976). Comrie's hypothesis, based on a hierarchy of syntactic positions (the Case Hierarchy: subject < direct object < indirect object < oblique objects), claims that "in the most

typical case, the embedded subject is demoted stepwise down the hierarchy until it can slip into an empty position. Thus, the embedded subject of the causative of an intransitive verb always turns up as a direct object, that of the causative of a transitive verb with much greater than chance frequency as an indirect object, while the subject of the causative of a transitive verb with an indirect object often turns up as one of the other oblique constituents" (Comrie 1976: 306). See the following examples from Soyot belonging to the Turkic language family (these examples as well as the data of the Lentekh dialect of Svan are kindly presented by L. I. Kulikov):

(1) *ool* *dongan*
boy: NOM freeze: PAST
"The boy froze"
--> *ašak* *ool-du* *don-ur-gan*
old man: NOM boy-ACC freeze-CAUS-PAST
"The old man made the boy(DO) freeze"

(2) *ašak* *ool-du* *etteen*
old man: NOM boy-ACC hit: PAST
"The old man hit the boy"
--> *Bajyr* *ašak-ka* *ool-du* *ette-t-ken*
Bajyr: NOM old man-DAT boy-ACC hit-CAUS-PAST
"Bajyr made the old man hit the boy"

(3) *Bajyr* *Saryg-ool-ga* *bižek-ti* *bergen*
Bajyr: NOM Saryg-ool-DAT knife-ACC give: PAST
"Bajyr gave Saryg-ool a knife"
--> *ašak Bajyr-dan Saryg-ool-ga bižek-ti* *ber-gis-ken*
old man: NOM Bajyr-ABL Saryg-ool-DAT knife-ACC give-CAUS-PAST
"The old man made Bajyr give a knife to Saryg-ool"

Comrie's rule (sometimes with certain modifications) adequately describes the syntactic process of causativization in a large number of languages including Romance, Turkic, Finno-Ugric, etc. Below the languages of this group are referred to as "Comrie's languages".

But there exists another group of languages where case-marking in causative constructions may be determined by the semantic type of causation (direct/indirect, volitional / non-volitional, permissive/factitive, etc.) as in Kannada:

(4) *Nānu snānavannu māḍide*
I bath: ACC do: PAST
'I bathed'

(5) *Avanu nanage snānavannu māḍisidam*
He me: DAT bath: ACC do: CAUS. PAST
'He bathed me'

(6) *Avanu nanninda snānavannu mādisidam*
He me: INSTR bath: ACC do: CAUS. PAST
'He caused me to bathe'
(Cole 1983: 120-121)

The examples above clearly demonstrate that the case-marking in causative constructions is "split" according to the semantics of causation: dative affix is used when the causee is viewed as nonagentive while instrumental case indicates a higher degree of agentivity.

Similar examples may be drawn from many other languages (Quechua, Kannada and other Dravidian, Hebrew, Japanese, etc., see Cole 1983); semantic types of causation opposed in a particular language may be considerably different, but it seems to be true that in this group of languages (which I shall call "Cole's languages") it is always semantic role of the causee that determines its case-marking in the causative sentence.

As far as I know, all attempts to spread a universal theory over both types of causative constructions mentioned above have failed at least up to now, and this is because the factors determining syntactical properties of causative constructions in these groups of languages are principally different: in the case of Comrie's languages case-marking of the causee is determined by the valency (roughly speaking, by transitivity/ intransitivity) of the verb the causative is derived from; for Cole's languages, it depends on the causee's semantic role (agentivity) in causative situation. It seems to be evident that there is an engaging parallelism between the opposition of two major types of causative constructions and the opposition of reference vs. role domination: Cole's languages tend to code the semantic role of at least one argument of the causative verb (the causee) directly in their surface structure, so they show an evidence for role domination. It is clear that the languages of this group may differ as to whether semantic roles of arguments other than the causee are expressed overtly; as to the size and productivity of the group of verbs with variable case-marking; as to the number and membership of semantic roles opposed in causative constructions, etc. That means that role vs. reference domination of even a particular type of syntactic constructions is a scale rather than a binary opposition.

3. Causative constructions in Kartvelian.

3.1. Georgian

As to causative constructions in Georgian, there exists already a tradition of analysing them in terms of relational grammar (Harris 1981). The causativization in Georgian places the original subject of an intransitive in the syntactic position of a direct object, while the subject of a transitive goes into the position of a dative object (see Gecadze, Nedjalkov, and Xolodovič 1969; Comrie 1976).

The process of causativization in Georgian follows Comrie's hypothesis with the only violation concerning bitransitives: the "initial" subject of a bitransitive verb does not become an oblique NP as predicted by Comrie's rule, but usurps the occupied position of the indirect (dative) object causing the original indirect object being demoted to the status of an oblique NP (marked by the postposition *tvis* "for"), cf. Gecadze, Nedjalkov, and Xolodovič 1969: 146.

Nevertheless, case-marking in Georgian causative constructions is adequately explained in terms of syntactic relations. The same applies to a part of Svan dialects, see examples (7), (8), (9) from Lentekh:

(7) *mare-d žangan*
man: ERG stand up: AOR
"The man stood up"
--> *eže-m žanagene mare*
he-ERG stand up: CAUS: AOR man: NOM
"He made the man(DO) stand up"

(8) *dena-d čwak'är k'or*
girl-ERG open: AOR door: NOM
"The girl opened the door"
--> *dede-d katak'ärne dena-s k'or*
mother-ERG open: CAUS: AOR girl-DAT door: NOM
"The mother made the girl(IO) open the door"

(9) *dena-d kalaxwem mare-s diar*
girl-ERG give: AOR man-DAT bread: NOM
"The girl gave bread to the man"
--> *eže-m kalaxawodnune dena-s diar mare-š-t'*
he-ERG give: CAUS: AOR girl-DAT bread: NOM man-GEN-for
"He caused the girl(IO) to give bread to the man"

Both Georgian and the Lentekh dialect of Svan do not show any evidence for role domination in the syntax of causative constructions.

3.2. Svan

In this section the data on causative constructions in the Upper-Bal dialect of Svan are

presented. For the presentation to be clear it is necessary to sketch some basic facts of case-marking and verbal classification in Svan.

The traditional grammar of Svan (Topuria 1985) follows the Georgian grammar in distinguishing three series of "tenses" (tense-aspect-mood categories) and four verb classes defined on both syntactic and morphological criteria. As to the series of tenses, the second series is regarded here as the basic one, since the case-marking with the first and the third series verb predicates can be predicted by the case-marking due to the second series. Traditionally, Ser. 2 is considered to show ergative marking pattern. Our further presentation is mainly limited by Ser. 2 pattern, the examples are given in the aorist tense which belongs to Ser. 2.

There exist three types of core arguments of the clause which may occur only once in a clause, control verb-agreement, and always stand in one of the three "core" cases - nominative, ergative (resp. "narrative" in the traditional grammar), or dative. The verbal classes are defined according to the valency of their members: Class 1 (transitives) consists of verbs which receive in Ser. 2 a subject in ergative case and a direct object in nominative; Class 2 verbs (active intransitives) take in Ser. 2 an argument in ergative (and no NP in nominative); Class 3 verbs ("Medial" verbs, here referred to as passive intransitives) take an argument in nominative; the non-productive Class 4 consists mainly of affective verbs which are not very important for the further presentation and are not payed any special attention below. In all classes there exist verbs taking also an argument in dative; these are bitransitives and intransitives with indirect objects.

The morphological causatives are derived productively from all verbs of Classes 1 and 2 and marked by a causative suffix or a combination of two causative suffixes (*-un, -äwn, -unäwn*). As to the Class 3, its members rather rarely have morphological causatives of this type, though many of them have transitive counterparts belonging to the Class 1, cf. *idgäri* 'dies' (Class 3) - *adgäri* 'kills' (Class 1). Further, speaking of causative verbs we mean primarily morphological causatives derived by means of suffixes *-un, -äwn, -unäwn*.

The causative constructions in Upper-Bal Svan show essential differences with those in Georgian and Lentekh. The first thing to be noted is the strong tendency to mark the causee by **dative**, irrespectively

of the valence of the underlying verb. For transitive verbs the dative marking of the causee is quite usual. For intransitives it is a violation of Comrie's hypothesis: although the position of a direct object is still vacant, the position of an indirect object is preferred by the causee. Cf.:

(10) *limšie* "to work" (Class 2, active intransitive; below the verbs are given in the form of "masdar", i.e. verbal noun):

māre-d *čwadməšie*
man-ERG work: AOR
"The man has worked"

--> *pat'ron-d* *laxməšiāwne* *māre-s*
patron-ERG work: CAUS: AOR man-DAT
"The patron has made the man work"

(11) *lič'me* "to mow" (Class 1, transitive):

mū-d *čwadč'eme balax*
father-ERG mow: AOR grass: NOM
"The father has mowed the grass"

--> *mū-d* *čwatč'emnāwne gezal-s balax*
father-ERG mow: CAUS: AOR son-DAT grass: NOM
"The father has made the son mow the grass"

(12) *lisgdi* "to look" (Class 3, passive intransitive):

č'q'int' *kaloxsgida* *dīna-s*
boy: NOM look: AOR girl-DAT
"The boy looked at the girl"

--> *apxneg-d* *laxsgidnāwne* *č'q'int'-s* *dīna*
friend-ERG look: CAUS: AOR boy-DAT girl: NOM
"The friend showed the girl to the boy"

The following simple rule may be formulated:

(13) **the causee in causative constructions is coded as a dative object.**

Generally speaking, this rule is applicable to verbs of all classes. But there exist a number of exceptions which probably will require a reformulation of (13).

The first group of exceptions is formed by active intransitive verbs whose causative derivatives show two models of their case-marking: (i) the causee marked as a dative object in accordance with the rule (13); (ii) the causee marked as a direct object (nominative in Ser. 2) as predicted by Comrie's hypothesis:

(14) *lizelāl* "to walk":

bepšw-d *kādzelāle*
child-ERG walk: AOR
"The child walked"

--> (14a) *di-d* *kātzelālne* *bepšw-s*
mother-ERG walk: CAUS: AOR child-DAT
"The mother caused the child to walk"

--> (14b) *di-d* *kātzelālne* *bepšw*
mother-ERG walk:CAUS:AOR child:NOM
"The mother led the child"

In (14) the case of the causee *bepšw* "child" depends on the type of situation described by the causative sentence: if, for example, a mother is leading a small child by hand, *the child* is normally treated as a patient, so the corresponding NP occupies the position of a direct object (nominative in Ser.2); if she causes him to walk, say, by just ordering him to do this, *the child* is regarded as an addressee and becomes an indirect object. There exist a number of similar examples with other verbs of motion (*līt'w* "to run away", *lisk'ne* "to jump", *ligūlawāl* "to stroll, walk"). For all these verbs the difference in case-marking is determined by the semantic type of causation: the so-called direct causation (causee being immediately manipulated by the causer) implies nominative marking of the causee, as in (14b); the indirect causation implies its dative marking (14a). The type of causation determines the difference in semantic roles of the causee in causative clause: in case of direct causation the causee is patient-like, in case of indirect causation it retains to a remarkable degree its agentive properties and may be characterized as an addressee or a second agent.

This situation, which may be described as an evidence for role domination in causative clause syntax, is not typologically rare or strange for it has much in common with the facts of Cole's languages we have mentioned in the section 2. But there is an important difference with the causative constructions in Svan: in causative clause semantic role may be a factor in determining case-marking of arguments other than the causee. I will try to demonstrate it below.

While examining the rule (13) one surely will note that some problems are bound to arise when trying to apply this rule to the verbs that already govern a dative object. This remark concerns primarily three groups of verbs:

(i) bitransitives;
(ii) active intransitives taking indirect objects;
(iii) passive intransitives taking indirect objects (which also often derive morphological causatives).

As far as bitransitive verbs are concerned, the situation is very much the same as in Georgian: the causee becomes a new indirect object according to the rule (13); the original indirect object is marked as an oblique NP (usually by the transformative case or the

postposition *-d* "for"):

(15) *māre-d žaxpiśg čāž-s häɣwir*
man-ERG take off: AOR horse-DAT saddle: NOM
"The man took off the saddle from the horse"
--> *äbreg-d čwaxpišgwnāwne māre-s čāž-d häɣwir*
robber-ERG take off: CAUS: AOR man-DAT horse-TRANS saddle: NOM
"The robber made the man take off the saddle from the horse"

Intransitive verbs with dative objects show three models of case-marking in causative constructions. The first model is observed in case of direct or assistive causation, as in (12) above and (16) below:

(16) *gezal-d loxmaržwe di-s*
son-ERG help: AOR mother-DAT
"The child has helped the mother"
--> *mū-d laxmuržāwne gezal di-s*
father-ERG help: CAUS: AOR son: NOM mother-DAT
"The father and the son helped the mother"
(lit. "The father helped the son to help the mother").

It is just the same situation as presented above in (14): causee is marked as a direct object (the original indirect object is not moved).

Yet there exists for the causee a possibility to become a new dative object in accordance with (13). What is then the new syntactic position of the former indirect object? Generally speaking, it depends on the semantics of the verb and sometimes on the animacy/personality of the original dative object. Theoretically, the original indirect object can be moved in two directions: 1) it may be promoted to the syntactic position of a direct object; this is the case in (17) and (18):

(17) *libde* "to pull" (active intransitive):
č'q'int'-d oxbid daqəl-s
boy-ERG pull: AOR goat-DAT
"The boy pulled the goat"
--> *məldəɣ-d oxbidne č'q'int'-s daqəl*
shepherd pull: CAUS: AOR boy-DAT goat: NOM
"The shepherd made the boy pull the goat"

(18) *lipdäl* "to touch" (passive intransitive):
č'q'int' laxpedän läjr-s
boy: NOM touch: AOR book-DAT
"The boy touched the book"
--> (18a) *Zurab-d laxpedälne č'q'int'-s läjr*
Zurab-ERG touch: CAUS: AOR boy-DAT book: NOM
"Zurab made the boy touch the book" ;

2) the original indirect object may be demoted and become an oblique marked by the transformative case or the postposition *-d* "for" as in (18b) (synonymous with

(18a)) and (19):

(18b) *Zurab-d laxpedālne č'q'int'-s läjr-d*
Zurab-ERG touch: CAUS: AOR boy-DAT book-TRANS

(19) *liqwämjel* "to thank" (active intransitive)
Dato-d kalaxqwämjäle di-s
Dato-ERG thank: AOR mother-DAT
"Dato thanked the mother"

--> *mū-d kalaxqwamjälne Dato-s dijäš-d*
father-ERG thank: CAUS: AOR Dato-DAT mother: GEN-for
"The father made Dato thank his mother"

We have observed that the model of case-marking of the causative is sometimes obviously determined by the semantic type of causation: in case of direct or assistive causation causee tends to be coded as a direct object (nominative case in Ser. 2). Otherwise the choice of case-marking pattern is based on semantic properties of the dative object of the original verb: in case when it shows a set of patient properties (as in (12), (17), (18a)) it may become a new direct object of the causative clause; otherwise it is marked as an oblique NP (cf. (15), (18b)).

4. Interpretation

It was already mentioned that the most attractive way of describing causative constructions in a Kartvelian language is the one passed by B. Comrie, A. Harris and others who have succeeded in describing them in terms of syntactic roles and presented them therefore as syntactic derivatives of the corresponding non-causative sentences. In the section 3 it was shown that Comrie's rule of causative clause formation (Comrie 1976) can not be applied to Svan: the fact is that the syntax of causative constructions in Svan is not totally determined by the syntactic properties of the verb the morphological causative is derived from, as it is in Georgian, - at least because one and the same verb allows sometimes two or even three models of case-marking in causative constructions. This variability ordinarily comes from the tendency of expressing overtly some kinds of role oppositions: on the one hand, the general tendency of the causee being marked as a dative object is violated in case of direct or assistive causation; on the other hand, case-marking of an original dative object depends on its role properties in causative sentence.

These observations cause to suggest that a 'role' approach (for example as proposed by P. Cole) will turn out to be more adequate. Cole's Agentivity Hypothesis explains the variability of case-marking of the causee in Svan causative constructions, but unfortunately it

does not provide any explanation of variable case-marking of other NP's, first of all indirect objects.

I would like to propose an interpretation of the facts adduced above in terms of a slightly modificated version of **Role and Reference** Grammar (Foley, Van Valin 1984). The RRG operates with two basic semantic roles, 'macroroles' (Actor and Undergoer), which are ascribed to noun phrases according to the semantics of the verb they are dominated by and the 'perspective' of the speaker. The Actor is "the argument of a predicate which expresses the participant which performs, effects, instigates, or controls the situation denoted by the predicate", the Undergoer "expresses the participant which does not perform, initiate, or control any situation, but is affected by it in some way" (Foley, Van Valin 1984: 29).

As to Svan, it is clearly evident that there are three types of NP's which belong to the core of the sentence: the subjects marked by the ergative case in Ser. 2, the direct objects marked by nominative and the indirect objects marked by dative. That is why I would introduce for Svan an additional macrorole - that of an **Addressee**. The prototypical Addressee is, like the Actor, animate and even human. It occupies the middle of Van Valin & Foley's semantic role hierarchy with the 'core' roles of Experiencer, Addressee, Recipient, etc. It does not perform, initiate or control the situation denoted by the predicate; it is in some way involved into it but not directly manipulated by the Actor.

Operating with three basic roles one could formulate the rules of causative constructions' syntax in a very simple form:

(20) **the Actor (= the Causer) is always marked by the ergative case in Ser. 2;**
the Undergoer is marked by nominative;
the Addressee is marked by dative.

Most usually, the causee is treated by the speakers as an Addressee and coded by dative. The rule (13) in the section 3.2 describes this most common situation. In case of direct or, surprisingly enough, assistive causation, the causee may become an Undergoer, if of course there is no better candidate (see examples (7), (14b), (16)). If there are two candidates for the position of an Addressee (the embedded Addressee, i.e. the argument of the embedded verb viewed as an Addressee, and the causee), the choice depends on the semantics of the verb (see (17-19)) and sometimes on the personality/animacy of the candidates, cf. the following sentences with the

active intransitive verb *liɣēlwe* 'to wait' construed with a dative object:

(21) *mū-d žaxɣēlwāwne miča gezal di-s*
father-ERG wait-CAUS-AOR his son-NOM mother-DAT
'The father made his son wait for the mother'

(22) *mū-d žaxɣēlwāwne miča gezal-s sädil*
father-ERG wait-CAUS-AOR his son-NOM dinner-NOM
'The father made his son wait for dinner'

If a NP regarded as an Addressee in a non-causative sentence has some properties of an Undergoer (and if there is no better candidate) it may become an Undergoer as in (17), (18a).

When formulating the rule of case-marking in Svan causative constructions, I did not use the concepts of syntactic relations or roles. However, it does not mean that syntactic roles are of no use in Svan grammar. In particular, they are useful when we deal with the rules of verb-agreement etc., so we cannot sketch the grammar in terms of only semantic macroroles. But what we surely can affirm is that Svan shows more role domination than Georgian - the syntax of causative constructions is an evidence for it (besides, causative construction in Svan show more role domination than e.g. those in Cole's languages mentioned above). This argument is not the only one, for variable case-marking exists also with a number of non-causative verbs:

(23a) *eǯa-s x-aqwšune* (prefix *x-* shows agreement with a dative object)
'he (DAT) coughs' (accidentally, because of an illness)

(23b) *eǯa aqwšune*
'he (NOM) coughs' (deliberately, say, in order to attract one's attention)

In the (23a) the only argument of the verb (an Experiencer) is treated as an Addressee; in (23b) the situation described by the same verbal lexeme allows to treat this NP as an Actor (= nominative in the Ser.1).

Svan is important for the distinction between reference VS. role dominated languages because it implies some modifications of the classification in question. The data above demonstrate that this opposition is more complicated. Like ergativity (cf. split ergativity as described by Dixon (1979)), role (as well as reference) domination may be distributed among different parts of syntax non-proportionally. More specifically, causative constructions may be governed to a certain degree by role criteria, whereas other types of constructions may not. The possibilities of this distribution need further investigation.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABL - ablative
AOR - aorist
CAUS - causative
DAT - dative
DO - direct object
ERG - ergative
GEN - genitive
INSTR - instrumental
IO - indirect object
NOM - nominative
NP - noun phrase

REFERENCES

Cole, P. (1983) 'The grammatical role of the causee in universal grammar.' **International Journal of American Linguistics** Vol 49, No 2, 115 - 133.

Comrie, B. (1976) 'The syntax of causative constructions: Cross-language similarities and divergences.' In M. Shibatani (ed) **The grammar of causative constructions** (Syntax and Semantics Vol 6), 261 - 312.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1979) 'Ergativity.' **Language** Vol 55, No 1, 59 - 138.

Foley, W. A. and R. D. Van Valin (1980) 'Role and Reference Grammar.' In E. Moravcsik (ed) **Current approaches to syntax** (Syntax and Semantics Vol 13), 329 - 352.

Foley, W. A. and R. D. Van Valin (1984) **Functional syntax and universal grammar.** Cambridge University Press.

Gecadze, I. O., V. P. Nedjalkov, and A. A. Xolodovič (1969) 'Morfologičeskij kauzativ v gruzinskom jazyke.' In A. A. Xolodovic (ed), **Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij: Morfologičeskij kauzativ.** Nauka, Leningrad, 131 - 152.

Harris, A. (1981) **Georgian syntax: A study in relational grammar.** Cambridge University Press.

Topuria, V. T. (1985) 'Svanskij jazyk.' **Ežegodnik iberijsko-kavkazskogo jazykoznanija** T. XII, 100 - 147.