

Typology of ‘morphological’ causatives: A syntactic account

This paper discusses the typology of causativization, in particular, the strategies of deriving the ‘morphological’ causatives in Hungarian (1), Korean (2), and Japanese (3).

- (1) János el olvas-tat-ta a könyv-et Mari-val.
 John PRT read-CAUS-3SG.PST the book-ACC Mary-INST
- (2) John-i Mary-eykey chayk-ul ilk-hi-ess-ta.
 John-NOM Mary-DAT book-ACC read-CAUS-PST-DECL
- (3) John-ga Mary-ni hon-o yom-ase-ta.
 John-NOM Mary-DAT book-ACC read-CAUS-PST

The causative constructions in (1–3) are different from unaccusative-transitive alternations in that they are productive (at least to some extent), and use regular morphology. Yet, the causatives in these languages also show different properties. For instance, an unaccusative verb cannot be causativized in Hungarian (4a); but it can be causativized in Korean (4b) and Japanese (4c). Also, the negation marker can only scope over the causative morpheme in Hungarian (5a) and Korean (5b); but in Japanese it can either follow the causative morpheme (5c) or come between the verb and the causative morpheme (5d).

- (4) a. *Mari meg hal-tat-ja János-t.
 Mari.NOM PRT die-CAUS-3SG.PRS John-ACC
 b. Mary-ka John-ul cwuk-i-ess-ta.
 Mary-NOM John-ACC die-CAUS-PST-DECL
 c. Mary-ga John-o sin-ase-ta.
 Mary-NOM John-ACC die-CAUS-PST
- (5) a. *Mari meg e-nem-tet-te János-t.
 Mari.NOM PRT eat-NEG-CAUS-3SG.PST John-ACC
 b. *Mary-ka John-ul mek-ci anh-ki-ess-ta.
 Mary-NOM John-ACC eat-CONN NEG-CAUS-PST-DECL
 c. Mary-ga John-o tabe-sase-nakat-ta.
 Mary-NOM John-ACC eat-CAUS-NEG-PST
 d. Mary-ga John-o tabe-naku-sase-ta.
 Mary-NOM John-ACC eat-NEG-CAUS-PST

In this paper, we propose that the different properties illustrated above follow from the cross-linguistic differences of the functional head CAUS (Pylkkänen, 2008). In particular, we claim that the causative morphemes, *-tAt* in Hungarian, *-i* in Korean, and *-(s)ase* in Japanese, are all phonetic realizations of CAUS, and that CAUS in each language selects for phrases of different size and type: in Hungarian, the causative head selects for active VoiceP; in Korean, it selects for either active or non-active VoiceP; and in Japanese, it selects for TP.

First, the fact that the causative head in Hungarian, *-tAt*, can only select for active VoiceP explains its inability to attach to unaccusative verbs. Active VoiceP is responsible for introducing an external argument (Kratzer, 1996), thus Hungarian CAUS can only select for verbs with external arguments, such as unergatives or transitives. However, whether or not its external argument is actually projected is irrelevant. When the external argument of VoiceP is not saturated, CAUS can saturate it by existentially binding it, along the lines of the Pass(ive) head in Bruening (2013). This accounts for a sentence like (6), where the external argument of the verb is understood as $\exists x$. The semantics of Hungarian CAUS is proposed to be (7).

- (6) János fel olvas-tat-ta a könyv-et, de nem tud-om ki-vel.
 John.NOM PRT read-CAUS-PST the book-ACC, but NEG know-1SG who-INSTR
 ‘John caused the book to be read aloud, but I don’t know who read it.’

(7) Hungarian CAUS = $\lambda f_{((e),st)} \lambda x \lambda e. \exists e'. (\exists y). f(e', y)) \& \text{Causer}(e, x) \& \text{Cause}(e', e)$

The causative morpheme in Korean, *-i*, is similar to its Hungarian counterpart in the sense that it categorically selects VoiceP, but it is different from the Hungarian CAUS in two ways: (i) Hungarian CAUS is restricted to take only active VoiceP, but Korean CAUS not only selects active VoiceP but also nonactive VoiceP, i.e., its selectional properties are not sensitive to the

type of Voice. This is supported by the fact that Korean *-i* can take either a transitive (2) or an unaccusative verb (4b); (ii) CAUS in Korean always takes a complement of type $\langle s,t \rangle$ unlike its Hungarian counterpart, because in Korean, CAUS cannot saturate the external argument of its VoiceP by existential quantification (8). The infelicity of (8) shows that the agent argument of ‘read’ cannot be existentially bound. Otherwise, (8) would be felicitous like the Hungarian example (6). The denotation of Korean CAUS is shown in (9).

- (8) # John-i chayk-ul ilk-hi-ess-ciman, na-nun nwu-ka ku chayk-ul
 John-NOM book-ACC read-CAUS-PST-but 1SG-TOP who-NOM the book-ACC
 ilk-ess-nunci molu-n-ta.
 read-PST-CONN not.know-PRS-DECL

‘John caused the book to be read, but I don’t know who read it.’

- (9) Korean CAUS = $\lambda f_{\langle s,t \rangle} \lambda x \lambda e \exists e'. f(e')$ & Causer(e,x) & Cause(e',e)

Lastly, we propose that the complement of CAUS in Japanese causatives is larger than VoiceP, i.e. it is a full TP, and that English causatives (10) have an analogous structure. In fact, Korean and Hungarian CAUS may also select for a full TP, resulting in the so-called “periphrastic” causatives that pattern with Japanese causatives and English.

- (10) John had Mary watch the TV.
 (11) John-i Mary-eykey TV-lul po-key ha-yess-ta.
 John-NOM Mary-DAT TV-ACC see-CONN do-PST-DECL
 (12) János enged-te Mari-nak néz-ni a tévé-t.
 John.NOM let-3SG.PST Mari-DAT watch-INF the TV-ACC

In these cases, causativization is fully productive, as it can take passives, actives, unaccusatives, as well as transitives and unergatives. The negation marker can modify either the causing event or the caused event, and the causee can never be existentially quantified. We take these common properties to be an indication that there is another layer between the CAUS projection and VoiceP, i.e. non-finite TP. Since in this case, CAUS selects directly for TP, and not VoiceP, there is no requirement for specific types of VoiceP (active or non-active). Also, assuming that NegP comes below TP, it follows that in these TP-selecting constructions, the negation marker can come either between the main verb and the causative marker or above the causative marker; while it only scopes over the causative morpheme when it selects for VoiceP. Lastly, it also follows from this analysis that TP-level causatives (including the one in Hungarian) do not allow the passive-like interpretation: when CAUS takes TP, the T head can only take a complement of type $\langle s,t \rangle$, which does not need further saturation.

In conclusion, we argue that the typological differences of ‘morphological’ causatives can be accounted for with a purely syntactic account without resorting to any lexical operations, like in a split-lexicalist account. An example of such account is proposed by Horváth and Siloni (2011), where Hungarian causatives are “lexical”, whereas Japanese ones are “syntactic”. However, this cannot be simply the case, since Korean causatives would be both “lexical” and “syntactic” as some of their properties pattern with Hungarian causatives, while others with Japanese causatives. Korean causatives clearly show that the binary distinction between lexical and syntactic causatives is untenable. Our syntactic account, on the other hand, allows for finer distinctions. Our proposal also differs from Pylkkänen’s (2008) syntactic typology of causatives in that (i) it includes TP as a possible complement of CAUS, and (ii) the semantics of CAUS may vary between languages with respect to whether or not it can existentially saturate the external argument of Voice.

References • Bruening, B. (2013). *By-phrases in passives and nominals*. *Syntax* 16(1), 1–41. • Horváth, J. and T. Siloni (2011). Causatives across components. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29(3), 657–704. • Kratzer, A. (1996). Severing the external argument from its verb. In J. Rooryck and L. Zaring (Eds.), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, pp. 109–137. Dordrecht: Kluwer. • Pylkkänen, L. (2008). *Introducing Arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.