Case marking, possession and syntactic hierarchies in Khakas causative constructions in comparison with other Turkic languages

Alexander Letuchiy

Russian State University for Humanities

Abstract

The present article deals with case-marking of arguments in Turkic causative constructions. I show that the rule proposed by Comrie (1976) "the causee occupies the highest vacant position" does not explain the case marking facts found in Khakas, Altai and Balkarian. In fact, other factors, such as word order, markedness/unmarkedness of the initial direct object and the lexical class of the causee are relevant. The lower the direct object is in definiteness and topicality, the higher the status of the causee– and the higher the chance it will get accusative marking. This conclusion is supported by data from Turkic reflexive constructions. In the conclusion I classify the factors of case-marking in Turkic causative constructions.

1.   Introduction

This paper offers an analysis of case marking in causative constructions derived from non-causative transitive constructions in Khakas and a comparison with analogous constructions in some other Turkic languages, including Balkar, Altai and Turkish. I will show that case marking in causative constructions in different Turkic languages depends on different factors, including communicative, semantic and syntactic ones.

Khakas is a language of the South Siberian subbranch of the North Eastern branch of the Turkic family spoken by more than 60 000 people in South Siberia (Russia). As in most Turkic languages, in Khakas a direct object can either take the accusative case marker or be unmarked (in which case it does not differ from the nominative). Usually it are non-referential, non-topical or indefinite objects that remain unmarked. This form is usually called "unmarked accusative".

In section 2, I discuss the problem of case marking in causative constructions and present Comrie's (1976) rule Paradigm Case. In section 3, instances of violation of this rule are examined and explained by different groups of factors. In section 4, distinctive syntactic properties of sentences with accusative causees are summarized. In section 5, I analyze rules of case marking in causative constructions with an omitted initial direct

object. Finally, in section 6, I draw conclusions about factors relevant for case marking in causative constructions in Turkic languages.

In this paper, data from the Sagay dialect of the Khakas language will be discussed. The data were collected in 2001 and 2002 in Kazanovka village (Khakasia Republic) during expeditions of the Russian State University for the Humanities. The Sagay data used in this paper were mainly collected from interviews with native speakers of Sagay, who often disagree. That is why I have tried to use only data confirmed by several informants. I have also used some examples from texts collected during the field trips in 2001–2002. However, these examples are not numerous, because causative derivates are rather infrequent in (these) texts. The examples are transliterated from the Khakas alphabet, which is based on Cyrillic script.

2.   Case marking in causative constructions

Case marking of the arguments in causative constructions has attracted the attention of linguists for the last decades (see, for example, the contributions in Shibatani (1976), and Xolodovič (1969)). The most important aspect of this problem is the case marking of the causee, i.e. the initial subject, which becomes an object when the causer occupies the subject position.

The meaning of a causative (derived) verb includes a combination of two predicates: 'Caus(ation)' and the basic predicate. Correspondingly, the subject of the initial verb (causee) has two sets of properties — properties of the patient of Caus and of the subject of the initial verb (which is often agentive) — at the same time.

On the one hand, the causee is the agent of the dependent predication, encoding the caused situation. On the other hand, it is the patient of the main predication, encoding the causation. The causee cannot be encoded as a subject. That is why a coding conflict between the causee and the initial object(s) of transitive verbs can arise. Kozinsky and Polinsky (1993: 180) showed that most languages tend to avoid coding conflicts. A coding conflict is "the absolute identity in the marking of two or more distinct grammatical, semantic or pragmatic functions by free or bound segmental elements and/or by suprasegmental elements" (Kozinsky and Polinsky 1993: 180).[1]

Most languages follow one of two main strategies for marking the causee: they either (i) follow syntactic rules, based on the valency structure of the initial verb or (ii) choose a way of marking the causee depending on its semantic properties, connected with the type of causation.

In many languages, the case marking of the causee is determined by the case marking of the arguments of the initial non-causative verb. These languages follow a well-known rule formulated in Comrie (1976):

Comrie's rule (Paradigm Case)
In the causative construction, the causee (the original subject) occupies the high-

est vacant position in the hierarchy Subject>Direct object (DO)>Indirect object (IO) (>Oblique object).

Comrie discusses many examples of languages in which case marking in causative constructions follows this rule (Italian, Hindi, Georgian, Turkish, etc.). In all these languages, the marking of the causee depends on the argument structure of the initial verb (intransitive, transitive or ditransitive). Considered a following examples from Turkish (Comrie 1976: 263, 268):

(1) *Mahmut oguz-u   kork-ut-uyor.*
     Mahmud Oguz-ACC (DO) fear-CAUS-PRS
     'Mahmud frightens Oguz.'

(2) *Dišči mektub-u   müdür-e   imzala-t-tı.*
     dentist letter-ACC (DO) boss-DAT (IO) sign-CAUS-PST
     'The dentist made the boss sign the letter.'

(3) *Dišči hasan-a   mektub-u   müdür tarafından göster-t-ti.*
     dentist Hasan-DAT (IO) letter-ACC (DO) boss   by (OBL)   show-CAUS-PST
     'The dentist made the boss show the letter to Hasan.'

In (1), the causee is marked with the accusative case, because the initial verb is intransitive and the position of the direct object is vacant. In (2), the causee receives the dative marking, because the direct object position is already occupied by the noun 'letter'. In (3) it is marked as a by-phrase, because the positions of both the direct and the indirect object are occupied.

In Turkish causative constructions derived from transitive verbs, the causee cannot take the position of the DO, even when the initial DO is omitted. All verbs have an inherent characteristic ("transitive" vs. "intransitive"), which does not depend on the overt presence of the arguments.

At the same time, there are many languages which do not obey any such syntactic rule. A number of these languages were analyzed by Cole (1983), who showed that in many languages (Hebrew, Hungarian, Kannada, etc.) the marking of the causee is determined by its role properties, which, in turn, depend on the semantics of the initial verb and on the semantic type of causation. For instance, in Hungarian, the causee of the sentence 'the man made the boy cough' can get different marking depending on the causation type: if the man ordered or asked the boy to cough, the NP 'boy' is not treated as a patient and is marked by the instrumental; if the man performed some action(s) that could cause the boy to cough, the boy is marked by the accusative (Hetzron 1976: 394; morphological glosses are mine):

(4) a. *Köhögtettem   a   gyerekkel.*
         cough.CAUS.1SG DET boy:INS
         'I had the boy cough.' (by asking him to do so)

b. *Köhögtettem   a   gyereket.*
cough.CAUS.1SG DET boy:ACC
'I induced the boy to cough.' (by my actions)

The authors of many typological works on causatives (see, for example, Kulikov 1994) suggest that case marking of the arguments in causative constructions can be determined either by strictly syntactic properties of the initial and derived verb (Turkish, Georgian etc.) or by their semantic properties such as causation type or inherent semantics of the initial verb (Hebrew, Hungarian etc.), or by their interaction. Yet there exists at least a theoretical possibility that it can be influenced by other groups of factors. Some data of Turkic languages seem to support this suggestion.

For instance, in Tuvinian (Kulikov 1998), case marking in causative constructions generally follows Comrie's rule. However, if the "initial" direct object of a causative derived from a transitive verb is unmarked for case, the causee can get accusative marking:

(5) *Ašak   Bayïr-nï   inek oorla-t-kan.*
old man:NOM Bayïr-ACC cow steal-CAUS-PST
'The old man made Bayïr steal a cow.'

Absence or presence of case marking in Tuvinian and other Turkic languages depends on pragmatic properties of the NP: unmarked forms are normally chosen for non-referential, indefinite or non-topical NPs (see, among others, Murav'jeva 1989; Kulikov 1998; this phenomenon was described from the turkological point of view in Baskakov 1975, Kornfilt 1987 a.o.). This means that in Tuvinian, case marking in causative constructions is influenced by pragmatic factors.

Below we shall try to single out the pragmatic factors influencing the syntax of causative constructions in Khakas and (in less detail) in two other Turkic languages, Altai and Balkar.[2]

3.   Case marking in Khakas, Altai and Balkar causative constructions

3.1 Case marking patterns

Causative derivates in Khakas are formed from most transitive and intransitive verbs. There are several causative suffixes (*-γys, -ir-, -kir, -t-, - tyr-*), the most productive suffix being *-tyr-* (*-dyr-/-tir-/-dir-*). In most cases each verb can combine only with one of these suffixes to build the causative form, but the causative form of the verb *is-* 'drink' can be built by means of suffixes *-tir, -ir* or *-irt*, the last of these being initially a combination of two causative suffixes. The contemporary language does not give any evidence that these variants of the causative form differ in their meaning or syntactic behaviour.

Khakas causative constructions show several patterns of case marking, where there are several case options for both the initial object and the causee. A problematic case in

Khakas is analogous to what Kulikov (1998) observed in Tuvinian. These are the constructions with causative verbs derived from basic transitive verbs where the initial DO remains unmarked for case. These constructions allow two alternative strategies: the causee can be marked either with the accusative case (as in example 6), or with the dative (7):

(6) *S'erg'ej maša-ny   kizi-ler syjlat-tyr-yan.*
     Sergey Masha-ACC person-PL treat-CAUS-PST
     'Sergey made Masha feed people.'

(7) *Iže-zi   pala-zy-na   vino is-tir-gen.*
     mother-3SG child-3SG-DAT wine drink-CAUS-PST
     'The mother made her child drink wine.'

Causees usually cannot be accusative when the initial DO is also overtly marked: a causative construction with two marked accusatives is in many cases ungrammatical, cf. (8):

(8) *Pastax toγass'y-zy-na/-*n   mašyna-ny šun-dur-š'e.*
     boss   worker-3SG-DAT/ACC car-ACC   wash-CAUS-PRS
     'The boss makes his worker wash the car.'

However, some informants consider such constructions possible, though highly improbable:

(9) [??]*Pastax toγasčy-zy-n   mašyna-ny šun-dur-yan.*
     boss   worker-3SG-ACC car-ACC   wash-CAUS-PST
     'The boss made the worker wash his car.'

This case marking pattern seems to result from a direct translation from Russian. Russian has no productive morphological causative, and the basic causative meaning is expressed in a biclausal construction where two accusative NPs are governed by two different verbs: the initial verb and the causative verb *zastavljat'* 'force, cause'.

Another marking pattern violating Comrie's rule is observed in (10):

(10) *Maša vas'a-ny   pu sok-taŋ is-tir-š'e.*
     Masha Vasja-ACC this juice-INS drink-CAUS-PRS
     'Masha gives Vasja this juice to drink.'

The object *sok* 'juice', initially accusative, receives the instrumental case, the causee accusative.[3] Instrumental marking is usually found in constructions with the so called *ingestive* verbs ('eat', 'drink', etc.).[4] So causative constructions with these verbs allow three marking patterns (cf. 10 and 11a,b):

(11) a. *Maša vas'a-ya sok iz-irt-č'e.*
         Masha Vasja-DAT juice drink-CAUS-PRS
         'Masha gives Vas'a juice to drink.'

    b. *Maša vas'a-ny   sok iz-irt-če.*
      Masha Vasja-ACC juice drink-CAUS-PRS
      'Masha gives Vas'a juice to drink.'

The "instrumental" marking pattern is probably another result of Russian influence. In Russian, an inanimate object of the verbs *kormit'* 'feed' and *poit'* 'make drink' is marked by the instrumental case:

(12) a. *Ja   je-m   mjas-o.*
          I.NOM eat-PRS.1SG meat-ACC
          'I am eating meat.'
      b. *Mam-a   korm-it   menja mjas-om.*
          mother-NOM feed-3SG I.ACC meat-INS
          'My mother feeds me meat.'

Resulting from Russian influence, this marking pattern is nevertheless motivated by role properties of the instrumental object, which combines the feature of a prototypical patient (being affected in course of the action) and those of an instrument.

So the Khakas causative constructions derived from transitive verbs show five marking patterns, as is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Patterns of causative construction in Khakas

	Causee	Initial do	Example
1.	Dat	Acc	(8)
2.	Dat	unmarked	(11a)
3.	Acc	unmarked	(11b)
4.	Acc	Acc	(9)
5.	Acc	Instr	(10)

Note: Unproductive patterns are shaded.

Pattern 5 is limited to ingestive verbs. Pattern 4 is extremely rare and perhaps a calque of the case marking pattern in corresponding Russian sentences. The opposition between accusative and unmarked forms of the object (1 vs. 2 and 3 vs. 4) is not confined to causative constructions and is not directly connected with any of its properties (Murav'jeva 1989; Kuznecova 2002). I will mainly concentrate on the factors determining the choice between accusative and dative marking of the causee both when the direct object is accusative and when it remains unmarked (pattern 1 vs. 4 and 2 vs. 3).

Pattern 2 is more widespread than pattern 3: there are native speakers who only admit 2, but no speakers who admit only 3. At the same time, in some examples pattern 3 seems to be judged more appropriate than pattern 2.

3.2   Factors relevant for causee case marking in causative constructions

3.2.1   *Case marking of initial objects*

When the initial object is unmarked, the causee is either dative or accusative (patterns 2 and 3). When the initial object is marked with the accusative morpheme, the causee is normally dative (pattern 1; exceptions are very rare).

In studies of Turkic languages, variants of marking the initial objects and properties of unmarked objects have been among the most discuss problems. As regards the Khakas language, properties of the unmarked object are discussed in Kuznecova (2002).

Pattern 1 follows Comrie's rule. The interpretation of two other cases depends on whether we treat unmarked patients as full-fledged direct objects or as a kind of incorporated object (as suggested in Murav'jeva 1989), or at least not proper direct objects. This second approach looks attractive because the unmarked objects in Khakas do not show the full range of syntactic properties of direct objects.

In passive constructions derived from causative verbs, the opposition of patterns 1 vs. 2 and 3 is not present: the causee is always dative, cf. (13) and (14):

(13)   *Čaj vas'a-neŋ xys-xa   iz-irt-il'-š'e.*
       tea Vasja-INS girl-DAT drink-CAUS-PASS-PRS
       'Tea is given to the girl (to drink) by Vasja.'

(14)   **Čaj vas'a-neŋ xys-ty   iz-ir-t-il'-š'e.*
       tea Vasja-INS girl-ACC drink-CAUS-PASS-PRS

This means that constructions following pattern 3 cannot be passivized. A possible explanation is that unmarked NPs are not proper direct objects. That is why they cannot be raised to the subject position.[5] Murav'jeva (1989: 98) argued that in some Turkic languages (for example in Turkish and Tuvinian) unmarked NPs in many respects show a lower degree of independence than marked ones. For instance, unlike marked objects, they cannot be separated from the verb.

On the other hand, promoted subjects of passive constructions are highly topical, which should be incompatible with the indefinite, rhematic, non-referential status of unmarked objects. Besides, a passive construction derived from a causative construction of pattern 3 (accusative — unmarked) would be transitive, whereas other passive constructions in Khakas are normally intransitive.

If unmarked objects are not proper direct objects, the syntactic position of a direct object remains vacant and can be occupied by the causee, as in pattern 3. However, this interpretation still suggests that we should describe the factors influencing the choice between patterns 2 and 3, both possible with unmarked, i.e. non-referential, non-topical, indefinite, arguments.

3.2.2   *Formal class of the causee*

The choice between patterns 2 and 3 depends in part on whether the causee is expressed by a pronoun or an NP headed by a noun. Pronominal causees are marked with the

accusative marker more frequently than other NP types:

(15) a. *Iže-zi   vas'a-ɣa/²-ny   süt iz-ir-š'e.*
         mother-3sg Vasja-DAT/-ACC milk drink-CAUS-PRS
         'His mother makes Vasja drink milk.'

     b. *Iže-zi   a-ɣa/-ny   süt iz-ir-š'e.*
         mother-3sg he-DAT/he-ACC milk drink-CAUS-PRS
         'His mother makes him drink milk.'

On the other hand, if the causee is an NP headed by a possessive noun (=noun marked with a possessive suffix), accusative marking is highly improbable:

(16) a. *Maša ajdo-ɣa/-ny   xys ödis-tir-š'e.*
         Masha Ajdo-DAT/-ACC girl accompany-CAUS-PRS
         'Masha tells Ajdo to take a girl home.'

     b. *Maša xaryndaz-y-na/²-n   xys ödis-tir-š'e.*
         Masha brother-3sg-DAT/-ACC girl accompany-CAUS-PRS
         'Masha tells her brother to take a girl home.'

Three NP types form the hierarchy *pronoun > proper noun > possessive noun*. NPs higher in the hierarchy are more readily marked by the accusative case when used as a causee in a construction with a causative verb derived from an underlying transitive verb. Non-possessive common nouns usually behave like proper nouns — that is, they are marked by the accusative case more readily than possessive nouns and less readily than pronouns –although this must be further investigated: case marking of common nouns, of course depends on their pragmatic properties.

This formal hierarchy correlates with the opposition of "above-mentioned vs. not mentioned objects". Anaphoric pronouns by definition have their antecedents in the previous context. Possessive noun phrases, on the other hand, I believe, tend to introduce objects which are mentioned for the first time. However, these objects are referentially accessible for the addressee. For instance, in (16b), Masha's brother is already in a sense known to the addressee because the addressee knows Masha.

The accusative marking in the position of the causee is accessible to the phrases which belong to lexical categories which have typical pragmatic properties of accusative causees (for example, pronouns are topical and above-mentioned). My data suggest that the accusative marking is characteristic of causees, which either are anaphoric, as pronouns are, or have been mentioned themselves.

Possessive and non-possessive nouns also have different pragmatic properties. Possessive nominal phrases are often referentially accessible through their possessors, even if the possessee has not been mentioned before.

We conclude that in Khakas, case marking of the causee is sensitive to its pragmatic properties: it distinguishes objects that have been mentioned before from the ones that have not.[6] Possessive objects, which are often introduced by their possessors, are normally expected to be mentioned only once (because in all other cases only their

posssessor needs to be expressed), so possessive causees are mostly marked with the dative case.

3.2.3 *Word order*

Some Khakas informants prefer to mark the causee by the accusative when the initial object and the causee are not adjacent to each other:

(17) a. *Paba-zy   vas'a-ny/*ɣa   küs-neŋ xyz-y-na*
father-3sg Vasja-ACC/*DAT force-INS girl-3sg-DAT
pčik-ter ys-tyr-ɣan.
letter-PL send-CAUS-PST
'Father forced Vasja to send letters to his girlfriend.'
b. *Paba-zy   dima:/*dima-ny   süt iz-ir-š'e.*
father-3sg Dima.DAT/*Dima-ACC milk drink-CAUS-PRS
'Father makes Dima drink milk.'

In Khakas, word order seems to be less important for case marking than pragmatic features of the causee and the initial direct object or transitivity. The only exception are constructions with unmarked objects, as these objects prefer the position immediately before the verb.

It is possible that the fact that the initial verb in (17) has a dative argument 'girlfriend' is also relevant for the case marking of the causee, but the role of this factor has to be investigated further.

Word order is more important in Balkar and Altai. Altai causative constructions differ from Khakas ones in a significant way: in Altai the causee tends to stay before the initial object and is more frequently marked with the accusative when it is separated from the verb by two or more NPs, cf. theAltai examples in (18) and (19):

(18) a. *Bir banga varenje ij-gen   učun*
one jar   jam   send-PST for
*vova-**ny** vas'a ja:nak-ka   byjan aj-tyrt-kan.*
Vova-ACC Vasja grandmother-DAT thank send-CAUS-PST
'Vasja made Vova thank their grandmother, because she sent them a jar of jam.'
b. *Bir banga varenje ij-gen   učun*
one jar   jam   send-PST for
vas'a vova-ga   ja:nak-ka   byjan aj-tyrt-kan.
Vasja Vova-DAT grandmother-DAT thank send-CAUS-PST
'Vasja made Vova thank their grandmother, because she sent them a jar of jam.'

Word order is also relevant in the constructions with a second causative:

(19) *Vas'a ja:na-zy-**n**   ajylčy-lar-*γa *kyzyl araky ič-ir-t-ken.*
Vasja grandma-3SG-ACC guest-PL-DAT red   vodka drink-CAUS-CAUS-PST
'Vasja told his grandma to give guests wine to drink.'

The initial direct object (*kyzyl araky* 'wine') is unmarked for case. The first causee *ajylčy-lar-ya* 'guests',[7] which is placed to the left of the direct object, has dative marking. The second causee *ja:na-zy-n* 'grandmother' (Acc) is near a dative NP and is marked with accusative case.

The same situation holds in Balkar:

(20) *Vova ynna-ny   qonaq-la-**ya** vino ič-tir-gendi.*
Vova grandma-ACC guest-PL-DAT wine drink-CAUS-PST
'Vova ordered his grandma to give guests wine to drink.'

Some Altai speakers, probably imitating the Russian pattern, mark the initial object with the instrumental case (especially when it is definite). In this situation the case of the first causee depends on its linear position: when the causee is before the instrumental object, it is accusative; when it occupies the position before the accusative or unmarked initial object, it is dative. For example, in (19) the first causee (*ajylčy-lar* 'guest-PL') is dative, because it is followed by the initial object (although it is unmarked). The second causee (*ja:na-zy* 'grandmother-3SG') is accusative. In (21), the first causee occupies the position before the instrumental object and gets the accusative marking. The second causee is marked with the dative morpheme:

(21) *Vas'a ja:na-zy-**na**   ajylčy-lar-ny kyzyl araky-la   ič-ir-t-ken.*
Vasja grandma-3SG-DAT guest-PL-ACC red   vodka-INS drink-CAUS-CAUS-PST
'Vasja ordered his grandma to give guests wine to drink.'

This dependence between word order and case marking means that in the Altai language causative sentences are different from non-causative simple sentences (perhaps they have some properties of biclausal constructions, though this requires a more detailed analysis). A causative verb behaves differently from any non-causative verb — as it can have three objects, two of which can be direct objects. The three objects of a causative verb are connected less strongly than objects in simple clauses and do not influence each other's case marking: the first and the third object (according to the linear word order) are not connected, so the initial object *kyzyl araky* 'wine' in (19) does not prevent the second causee *ja:na* 'grandmother' from getting the accusative marking.

Two non-related accusative NPs governed by one verb are not usual in languages with developed case systems. In Altai, non-causative verbs cannot have two direct objects. This means that the causative verbs constitute a special syntactic class, and the clauses headed by these verbs show properties, which are not characteristic for "normal" monopredicative sentences — an accusative or unmarked argument (*kyzyl araky* 'wine' in example 19) is governed by the initial verb *ičir* 'give to drink'), and the unmarked accusative argument (*ja:nazyn* 'grandmother') is governed by the matrix predi-

cate CAUS. It would be interesting to find out whether Altai causative constructions really have properties of biclausal constructions.

3.2.4 *Declension type of the initial object*

Khakas has two types of nominal declension: (1) a standard declension and (2) a possessive declension (declension of nouns with possessive markers). The accusative forms of these two types of nouns are different. Some speakers allow two accusatives when the initial object and the causee belong to different declension types.[8]

(22) a. *Pastax toyasčy-zy-n   mašyna-ny š'un-dur-yan.*
          boss   worker-3SG-ACC car-ACC   wash-CAUS-PST
          'The boss made his worker wash the car.'
      b. *Pastax *toyasčy-ny mašyna-ny š'un-dur-yan.*
          boss   worker-ACC car-ACC   wash-CAUS-PST
          'The boss made the worker wash the car.'

This factor, not really important in Khakas, is more important in Altai, where possessive nouns are also marked with a different declension from other nouns: if the initial object is possessive, the causee much more readily gets accusative marking. Consider (23) and (24) from Altai:

(23) *Ene-zi   peťa-ny/ᵗga   kol-dor-y-n   jun-durt-at.*
      mother-3SG Petja-ACC/ᵗDAT hand-PL-3SG-ACC wash-CAUS-PRS
      'The mother makes Petja wash his hands.'

(24) *Erten tura   vova peťa-ga/ᵗny   üzüm-der-di jun-durt-ty.*
      early morning Vova Petja-dat/ᵗacc grape-PL-ACC wash-CAUS-PST.
      '(Everyone went to picnic.) In the morning Vova made Petja wash the grapes.'

These facts together with the facts about occurrence before an accusative or instrumental object discussed in section 3.2.3 show rather clearly that in Altai the formal properties of the initial object, the causee and the construction as a whole are generally very relevant.

This way of marking is probably connected with the fact that in Turkic languages nouns with possessive affixes of the third person cannot be unmarked for case when used as a direct object. Possessive forms (like *kol-dor-yn* 'hands'), marked with the accusative suffix, do not have an unmarked counterpart (in this respect they differ from non-possessive nouns). In a clause like (23), two accusative forms belong to different formal classes, which probably makes accusative marking of both the initial object and the causee more acceptable.

The difference between constructions with non-possessive and possessive initial objects is that in the former the causee can be marked with the accusative case, because unmarked objects do not have all the syntactic properties of full-fledged direct objects. In the latter we have no reason to assume that possessive objects do not have all the

syntactic properties of direct objects — they differ from "normal", non-possessive direct objects only by their morphology.

The sections 3.2.3. and 3.2.4 show that in Altai (in fact, also in Balkar), the accusative marking of the causee is the most natural. Only in special cases must the causee be marked with the dative case.

4.   Constructions with accusative causees

In section 3 it was shown that case marking of the causee (accusative vs. dative) in Khakas causative constructions depends not only on the transitivity/intransitivity of the initial verb, but also on a number of other factors: i) low/high topicality of the causee; ii) formal/lexical class of the causee (pronoun ~ noun ~ possessive noun); iii) word order; iv) declension type of the causee and the initial object.

Sentences with accusative causees show some special referential and syntactic features, which are clearly induced by pragmatic properties of these causees (topicality, definiteness).

Specific pragmatic features of the causee, which lead to marking with accusative case, therefore influence syntactic properties of the sentence and the causee. In this section we describe some of these syntactic properties.

4.1   Control of reflexive pronouns and possessive affixes

Khakas has a reflexive pronoun *pozy* 'self'. The genitive case of this pronoun is used as a reflexive possessive pronoun. Possessive affixes can also function as possessive reflexive pronouns, i.e., they can be coreferent to some core arguments within a clause.

Accusative causees tend to control both reflexive pronouns and reflexive possessive affixes, which is not characteristic of dative causees, cf. (25a) and (25b):

(25)   a.   *Ajdo vas'a-ny   poz-y-n   xyr-yn-dyr-š'a.*
             Ajdo Vasja-ACC self-3SG-ACC shave-REFL-CAUS-PRS
             'Ajdo$_i$ makes Vasja$_j$ shave himself$_j$.'
       b.   *Ajdo vas'a-ɣa   poz-y-n   xyr-yn-dyr-š'a.*
             Ajdo Vasja-DAT self-3SG-ACC shave-REFL-CAUS-PRS
             'Ajdo$_i$ makes Vasja$_j$ shave him$_i$.'

In (25a), the reflexive pronoun in the position of a DO is controlled by the accusative cause and in (25b) by the subject/causer. (26) shows similar examples with the reflexive pronoun in an attributive position:

(26) a. *E:-zi   ol kize: poz-y-nyŋ   tura-zy-n*
         owner-3sg this person.dat self-3sg-gen house-3sg-acc
         saja-tyr-š'a.
         take apart-caus-prs
         'The housekeeper$_i$ asks this man$_j$ to take apart his$_i$ house.'
     b. *E:-zi   ol kizi-ni   poz-y-nyŋ   tura-zy-n*
         owner-3sg this person-acc self-3sg-gen house-3sg-acc
         saja-tyr-š'a.
         take_apart-caus-prs
         'The housekeeper$_i$ asks this man$_j$ to take apart his$_j$ house.'

In (27b), the accusative causee controls the third person possessive affix *-ni/-n* (cf. 27a where the same affix is controlled by the causer):

(27) a. *E:-zi ol kize: tura-zy-n saja-tyr-š'a.*
         owner-3sg this person.dat house-3sg-acc take apart-caus-prs
         'The housekeeper$_i$ asks this man$_j$ to take apart his$_i$ house.'
     b. *E:-zi   ol kizi-ni   tura-zy-n   saja-tyr-š'a.*
         owner-3sg this person-acc house-3sg-acc take apart-caus-prs
         'The housekeeper$_i$ asks this man$_j$ to take apart his$_j$ house.'

The difference in control properties of accusative and dative causees cannot be reduced to a binary opposition: in sentences with accusative causees, reflexives are either controlled by the causee only or it can be controlled by the causee or the causer; in sentences with dative causees, the control belongs either to the causer only or to both the causer and the causee. However, in neither case do dative causees show more control possibilities than accusative causees.

4.2 The meaning of the verb form and the order of derivational affixes

In most verb stems in Turkic languages, the derivational affixes are situated in iconic order: if affix A is closer to the stem than affix B, then B modifies the meaning of the stem modified by A. For example, in the prototypical case, kick-recip-caus means 'cause (somebody) to kick each other' and kick-caus-recip means 'cause each other to kick smb.'.

 This tendency is often violated in Khakas causative constructions. For example, the combination *xyr-yn-dyr-* 'shave-refl-caus' is expected to mean 'cause smb. to shave himself', but in example (28) it actually means 'cause smb. to shave the causer':

(28) *Ajdo vas'a-ɣa   poz-y-n   xyr-yn-dyr-š'a.*
      Ajdo Vasja-dat self-3sg-acc shave-refl-caus-prs
      'Ajdo$_i$ makes Vasja$_j$ shave him$_i$.'

In sentences with dative causees, the reflexive pronoun *pozy* 'self' is normally controlled by the sentence subject. In (28) we face a conflict of two control strategies: the reflexive

pronoun *pozyn* refers to the subject *Ajdo,* while the reflexive marker *-yn-* should refer to the causee *Vasja* (subject of the initial predication). Examples like (28) show that the rules of reflexive pronoun control are stronger.

The above-mentioned violations of the iconicity principle occur in sentences with dative causees, for which, as we have shown, control of reflexives is not characteristic. Native speakers who allow dative causees only, admit both meanings: 'A causes B to shave B' and 'A causes B to shave A', and their interpretation of the sentence does not depend on the order of the derivational markers:

(29) a. *Ajdo vas'a-ɣa   saɣyl-y-n   xyr-yn-dyr-ɣan.*
          Ajdo Vasja-DAT beard-3SG-ACC shave-REFL-CAUS-PST
          'Ajdo$_i$ caused Vasja$_j$ to shave his$_{i/j}$ beard.'
     b. *Ajdo vas'a-ɣa   poz-y-n   xyr-yn-dyr-ɣan.*
          Ajdo Vasja-DAT self-3SG-ACC shave-REFL-CAUS-PST
          'Ajdo$_i$ caused Vasja$_j$ to shave him$_{i/j}$.'

Pragmatic factors which are relevant for the syntax of the causative constructions are evidently stronger than strict rules regulating the order of the affixes.

4.3   Initial unmarked object in sentences with accusative causees

Murav'jeva (1989: 98) showed that the features of the unmarked forms in Turkish are much less autonomous than marked ones — for instance, they are not able to change their position and they have to occupy the position immediately before the predicate. However, this is not the case in Khakas: they can be separated from the verb by an adjective phrase, or by a nominal phrase.

Position of the unmarked accusative form can be flexible or rigid — it depends on the case of the causee. As illustrated in (30), in constructions with accusative causees the word order is more rigid

(30) a. *Pastax toɣasčy-ɣa pol šun-dur-š'e.*
          boss   worker-DAT floor wash-CAUS-PRS
     b. *Pastax pol   toɣasčy-ɣa šun-dur-š'e.*
          boss   floor worker-DAT wash-CAUS-PRS
     c. *Pastax toɣasčy-ny pol šun-dur-š'e.*
          boss   worker-ACC floor wash-CAUS-PRS
     d. **Pastax pol   toɣasčy-ny šun-dur-š'e.*
          boss   floor worker-ACC wash-CAUS-PRS
          'The boss makes the worker wash the floor.'

In (30a) and (30b), where the causee (*toɣasčy* 'worker') is marked with the dative case, the unmarked initial direct object can change its position: the causee can stand before the verb and the initial direct object before the causee. This is impossible in (30c) and (30d), where the causee is accusative: in this case, the initial object invariably occupies

the position right before the verb. Of course, these four variants of the sentence can also differ in their pragmatic properties; here we analyze only their grammatical acceptability.

If the causee is marked by the accusative marker, the initial object is less autonomous from the verb and does not behave like a canonical direct object. A natural hypothesis is that accusative marking means that the causee, not the initial object, becomes the direct object, and the initial object must have non-argument status, which is also natural because it is not marked for case, while proper arguments tend to be marked for case.

4.4 Summary of the properties of sentences with accusative causees

The phenomena that have been discussed in sections 4.1–4.3 show that causative constructions with accusative causees form an autonomous class of constructions, which differ from simple sentences. Perhaps it means that the causative construction with an accusative causee is a biclausal structure: the initial object and the verb form a clause, separate from the clause, in which the subject and the cause occur (the structure is (S CauseeAcc (Initial object Verb)), opposed to (S CauseeDat Initial object Verb) in sentences with dative causees). Though each clause has to have its own predicate, the question about the predicate of the external clause remains open — perhaps the predicate 'CAUS' belongs to the "big" clause.

If this is the case, the phenomena, discussed in 4.1–4.3 are explained by the following rule: arguments of the embedded predicate cannot move over the boundary between the two clauses: (S CauseeAcc (Initial object Verb)) vs.(S CauseeDat Initial object Verb) (cf. 3.3.).

As was shown in 3.1–3.2, accusative causees tend to control reflexive pronouns and suffixes, which is also not characteristic for dative causees. It makes accusative causees similar to subjects and partially proves biclausal properties of constructions with accusative causees. Though not only subjects but also topics control reflexives, the word order shows that our examples have something to do with subject properties of accusative causees.

At the same time the properties of constructions with accusative causees may be connected with the properties of the causee itself (cf. section 3): high topicality of accusative causees seems to make them possible antecedents of reflexives.
Interestingly, we see that some properties of the causee (e.g. topical/non-topical) correlate with the properties of initial direct objects (an autonomous object vs. a non-independent argument with a rigid position before the verb).

In Table 2, the main features of the constructions with accusative and dative causees are summarized.

We have compared the three most common case marking patterns in causative constructions and can conclude that speakers of Khakas follow one of two strategies of case marking choice. For certain speakers, case marking in a causative construction is fully determined by the syntactic properties of the corresponding non-causative construc-

Table 2. Features of constructions with accusative and dative causees

	Construction with an accusative causee	Construction with a dative causee
Causee	Topical, definite	Non-topical, indefinite
Construction	Biclausal/not prototypically monoclausal	Monoclausal
Initial direct object	Non-autonomous	Autonomous
Word order	Rigid	Free

tion. With causatives derived from transitive verbs, these speakers invariably mark the causee with the dative case (case marking patterns 1 and 2). This is a syntactically-oriented strategy, which follows the predictions made in Comrie 1976.

There is another group of speakers, who, when choosing the case marking pattern in a causative construction, also take into account different pragmatic factors (see section 3). This strategy can be called pragmatically-oriented. The pragmatically-oriented strategy does not treat causative constructions as a result of a syntactic derivation: on the contrary, case marking in causative constructions is based on properties of the derived constructions. Following this strategy, a speaker uses pattern 3 and even pattern 4 (ACC–ACC).

5.   Causative constructions without direct objects

In sections 3 and 4 we observed that case marking of the causee in Khakas causative constructions depends on the argument structure of the initial verb and certain properties of the arguments of the causative verb, the causee and the direct object.

In this section, I am going to have a look at causative constructions where the initial direct object is not overtly present. Two types of causative constructions will be discussed here: causative constructions in the passive usage (these constructions are syntactically intransitive), and causative constructions with an omitted initial object.

5.1   Causatives in passive usages

The passive/causative polysemy, which is quite common typologically (cf., for instance, Nedjalkov and Sil'nickij 1969; Baskakov 1975; Shibatani 1985; Galiamina 2001), is also widespread in Turkic languages, cf. examples from Tofalar (31) and Khakas (32):

(31)   (Galiamina 2001:187; Nedjalkov and Sil'nickij 1969)
   Men bo   emshee   emne-dir-men.
   I   this doctor.DAT treat-CAUS-FUT.1SG
   'I will be treated by this doctor.'

(32) *Paba-m   xyr-tyr-šʼa   parikmaxer-ya.*
      father-1SG shave-CAUS-PRS hairdresser-DAT
      'My father has a shave by the hairdresser.'

Diachronically, this type of passive construction can go back to the full variant of the causative construction with reflexive-causative (reflexive-permissive) meaning: 'X lets Y to beat X' → 'X is beaten by Y' (see, e.g. Haspelmath 1990); however, the diachrony of this construction remains rather unclear.

In the "passive causative" construction the agent/causee is always in the dative case, cf. (32) above and (33):

(33) **Paba-m   xyr-tyr-šʼa   parikmaxer-dy.*
      father-1SG shave-CAUS-PRS hairdresser-ACC
      'My father has a shave by the hairdresser.'

At the same time, in the parallel construction with a reflexive pronoun in the direct object position, the causee can be accusative, though this marking is rather marginal:

(34) *Paba-m   poz-y-n   xyr-tyr-šʼa   parikmaxer-dy.*
      father-1SG self-3SG-ACC shave-CAUS-PRS hairdresser-ACC
      'My father makes the hairdresser shave him.'

Therefore, the causee in the "passive causative" construction cannot take the accusative case, while this does not hold for the causee in the canonical causative construction, which is exemplified by (34).

This observation is not surprising, since the dative marking is generally much more acceptable for the demoted subject of a passive construction than accusative marking.

5.2   DO-omission in sentences with causative meaning

In colloquial speech, non-elliptical causative constructions (with all arguments present) are not very common. Frequently, either the causee or the initial direct object is omitted.

We could expect that in sentences with omitted objects causees will be more easily marked with the accusative case than in their full counterparts. However, this is not the case in Turkish, cf. (35):

(35) *Dün   o   bana   o.kadar ye-dir-di*
      yesterday (s)he I.DAT/*ACC so.much eat-CAUS-PST
      ki   yürü-ye-me-di-m.
      that walk-can-NEG-PST-1SG
      'Yesterday she fed me so much that I couldn't walk.'

The verb *ye* 'eat' is transitive, therefore, according to Comrie's rule., the causee should be marked with the dative. This is what we also observe in example (35) where the direct

object is not present. Direct object omission, which is possible only under certain pragmatic conditions (an omitted argument is supposed to be either well known or non-important), does not influence case marking in Turkish. This conforms with the fact that case marking in Turkish causative constructions (as shown in Comrie 1976) is consistently syntactic: it obeys Comrie's rule and is not influenced by any pragmatic properties of the arguments or by word order — in Turkish causative constructions derived from transitive verbs, the causee is almost always marked with the dative case.

According to (Islamov et al. 1967: 156), the situation in Kazakh is the same:

(36)   *Muyalim oqušy-ya   žaz-dyr-dy.*
       teacher   student-DAT write-CAUS-PST
       'The teacher made the student write.' (the initial DO of the verb *žaz* is omitted)

In sections 3 and 4 I tried to show that in Khakas the pragmatic properties of the initial direct object and the causee are relevant for case marking in causative constructions. However, in clauses with DO-omission in Khakas the causee must be marked with the dative:

(37)   *Iže-zi   a-ya: iz-irt-ken.*
       mother-3SG (s)he-DAT drink-CAUS-PST
       'His/her mother gave him/her (something) to drink.'

Examples like (37) show that case marking of the causee depends on the lexical class of the verb. The semantics of the verb *is-* 'drink' requires the patient to be present, although not obligatorily expressed in the sentence. On the other hand, the verb *sarna* 'sing' does not obligatorily presuppose that the object is present — we can use this verb to describe a process, not meaning any particular song. Not surprisingly, in sentences like (38) the causee is marked with the accusative case, as it would be with an intransitive verb — it is not even clear whether omission of an initial object has taken place or the verb *sarna* is really intransitive in (38):

(38)   *Ol pale-ny   klas-te   sarna-tyr-š'a.*
       he child-ACC class-LOC sing-CAUS-PRS
       'He makes the child sing in the classroom.'

According to Rassadin (1978), in Tofalar, unlike in Turkish, Kazakh and Khakas, the causee of the verb *čy-irt* 'feed' can be marked with the accusative case if the initial object is omitted.

(38)   *Sen a:lEčžy-ny čy-irt.*
       you guest-ACC eat-CAUS
       'You, feed your guest.'

Case marking in sentences with initial object omission shows us that when the initial object is omitted, the causee should be marked with dative case in a language where Comrie's rule is obeyed consistently (cf. Turkish), but prototypically takes accusative

case if there are violations of Comrie's rule in causative constructions with expressed direct objects. In the latter case certain properties of the particular sentence (e.g. referentiality of the arguments) play a role, so it is not surprising that an omitted object is not relevant — as it does not occur in the sentence.

In this section we have mainly examined examples of omission of non-referential object. We do not exclude that constructions with omission of a referential above-mentioned or topical object can behave in a different way.

6.   Conclusions

In the previous sections we observed that in Khakas and some other Turkic languages to Comrie's rule is often violated. More than that, these violations are systematic and obey their own rules. Table 3 summarizes the main factors influencing case marking in causative constructions in five languages.

Table 3. Factors affecting case marking in causative constructions

Language	Factors relevant for case marking
Turkish	Argument structure of the verb; transitivity
Tuvinian	Argument structure of the verb; pragmatic properties of the initial object (definiteness)
Khakas	Argument structure of the verb, pragmatic properties of the initial object, lexical class and pragmatic properties of the causee
Altai, Balkar	Word order, case of the initial object

There are at least two tendencies that can be observed in the languages discussed. On the one hand, in causative constructions derived from transitive verbs, causees, according to their semantic properties, may be more similar to patients than to agents. It is not surprising that many languages develop variants of case marking where causees are marked with the accusative, like prototypical patients (as was mentioned above, in Altai and Balkar, the accusative marking is the most neutral for a causee). On the other hand, the two objects of a causative verb tend to receive different case marking in order to avoid a coding conflict. For native speakers the properties of the causee are relevant, and case marking depends on definiteness, topicality, referentiality and other properties; for direct objects, for example, it is possible to choose between the marked and unmarked form depending on referentiality and topicality.

These tendencies reflect a general rule. Causative constructions in Turkic languages tend to behave like all standard, non-derived constructions: the role of the direct object is given to an NP in accordance with the properties of the relevant arguments of the causative verb, and not according to the properties of the verb that the causative is derived from.

At the same time, in Balkar, Altai, Khakas and Tuvinian languages (see section 3), causative constructions allow two direct objects governed by one verb, while this is impossible with non-causative verbs.

In section 4, I have shown that causative constructions with an accusative causee show some features which distinguish them from other monoclausal constructions (see 3.4) — in the future I hope to analyze them further in order to find out whether such causative constructions can be truly called biclausal.

Further, it is possible to make a conclusion about properties of case marking in the examined languages. Although case marking of the causee and the initial DO in Turkic languages depends on the argument structure of the initial verb, in some of them case marking can also be conditioned by semantic and/or pragmatic factors. It is crucially important to note the Altai case, where the word order (adjacency of the causee to the initial object) influences the case of the causee. In general, case marking depends on pragmatic properties — cf. differences between marked accusative (definite, thematic objects) and unmarked accusative.

Case marking in Turkic causative constructions can be influenced by many factors of different types including morphological, syntactic and semantic factors. Comrie's rule, implies that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the participants of the situation on the semantic level (and arguments of the basic verb) and the syntactic arguments of the causative verb: if the situation has two participants — an agent and a patient — on the semantic level, they must become the subject and the direct object on the syntactic level and the causee of the causative construction must be marked with the dative case.

However, there are many examples violating this correspondence between the participants of the situation on the semantic level and syntactic arguments, where two or more factors influencing case marking (pragmatic properties of arguments, word order and so on), can contradict each other — in this case one of the factors can play the most important role. In such cases it is really important where the rule works: in the lexicon, where the number of arguments is fixed, or in the sentence itself, where nominal phrases can be omitted or change their places.

For example, in Khakas, accusative marking of the causee in causative constructions formed from transitive verbs is possible, because referential and pragmatic properties of the causee and the initial object are relevant. This means that not only the number of semantic participants of the basic verb plays a role, but also their properties in the particular construction. Semantic and syntactic properties of the initial verb are not enough for predicting the case marking of the causee; it can depend on much more concrete factors, connected with the particular situation, described by an instance of the verb form and the relevant context.

Abbreviations

1 1st person, 2 2nd person, 3 3rd person, CAUS causative, DAT dative case, PST past tense, LOC locative case, PRS present tense, FUT future tense, SG singular, ACC accusative case, PL plural, NEG negation, POT potential, RFL reflexive, INS instrumental case.

Acknowledgements

Notes

1.   The problem of coding conflict distinguishes the causative derivation from some other ones, such as benefactive. The benefactive derivation includes an argument with the particular syntactic role of indirect object, though this derivation can be prohibited when an indirect object is present in the initial clause.

2.   All examples from Khakas, Altai and Balkar are my field data. I am grateful to all my language consultants, especially to B. Ooržak, A. Tazranova, M. Bujmistrova, M. Maynagaševa.

3.   This phenomenon is even more widespread in Balkar and Altai languages, cf. (i):

(i)   *vasʼa ja:na-zy-na   ajylčy-lar-ny kyzyl araky-la   ič-ir-t-ken.*
Vasja grandma-3SG-ACC guest-PL-ACC red   vodka-INS drink-CAUS-CAUS-PST
'Vasja ordered his grandma to give guests red wine to drink.'

The form *soktaŋ* in this example cannot be understood as ablative/instrumental with a partitive reading, because the instrumental in Khakas cannot express this meaning.

4.   The group of ingestive verbs "have in common a semantic feature of taking something into the body or mind …" (Shibatani 2002: 94), see also (Masica 1976).

5.   This also means that sentences like (13) correspond to non-passive causative constructions following pattern 1 (not 2).

6.   The behavior of the causees in Altai and Khakas can be compared to the distinction between demonstrative pronouns and articles. In Khakas, accusative causees behave like NPs with demonstrative pronouns (like *this*), which are used when the object has been mentioned before. In Altai, according to case marking in causative constructions, their behaviour is rather similar to definite articles, which often mark known but not mentioned objects.

7.   In Altai, markedness of the initial object is not relevant for the case marking in causative constructions.

8.   Other speakers do not allow two marked accusatives in a causative construction in any case.

References

Baskakov, N. A. (ed.). 1975. *Grammatika Xakasskogo Jazyka.* [Grammar of Khakas]. Moscow: Nauka.

Cole, P. 1983. "The grammatical role of the causee in universal grammar". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49: 115–33.

Comrie, B. 1976. "The syntax of causative constructions: Cross-language similarities and divergences". *In Syntax and Semantics. Volume 6. The Grammar of Causative Constructions*, M. Shibatani (ed.), 261–312. San Diego and London: Academic Press.

Galiamina, Ju. 2001. "Akcessivno-recessivnaja polisemija pokazatelej zaloga i aktantnoj derivacii" [Accessive-recessive polysemy of voice and valency changing categories]. In *Glagoľnyje Kategorii* [Verbal categories], V. A. Plungian (ed.), 178–97. Moscow: Russkie slovari.

Haspelmath, M. 1990. "The grammaticization of passive morphology". In *Studies in Language* 14 (1): 25–71.

Hetzron R. 1976. "On the Hungarian causative verb and its syntax". *Syntax and Semantics. Volume 6. The Grammar of Causative Constructions*, M. Shibatani (ed.), 371–98. San Diego and London: Academic Press.

Islamov, A., Tursunov, D. and Hasanov, B. 1967. *Sopostaviteľnaja grammatika russkogo i kazakhskogo jazykov.* [Contrastive grammar of Kazakh and Russian]. Alma-Ata: Nauka.

Kornfilt, J. 1987. "Turkish and the Turkic languages". In *The World's Major Languages*, B. Comrie (ed.), 619–44. London and Sydney: Croom Helm.

Kozinsky, I. and Polinsky, M. 1993. "Causee and patient in the causative of transitive: Coding conflict or doubling of grammatical relations"? In *Causatives and transitivity*, B. Comrie and M. Polinsky (eds), 177–241. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kulikov, L. I. 1994. "Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij v sovremennyx sintaksičeskix teorijax: Opyt rešenija odnoj lingvističeskoj metazadači". [Typology of causative constructions and contemporary syntactic theories: a solution of one meta-linguistic problem]. In *Znak* [Sign] *(in memory of A. N. Žurinskij)*. Moscow: Russkij učebnyj centr.

Kulikov, L. I. 1998. "Causative constructions in Tuvinian: Towards a typology of transitivity". In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.

Kuznecova, Ju. 2002. "Nemarkirovannyj akkuzativ v xakasskom jazyke". [Unmarked accusative in Khakas]. Unpublished manuscript.

Masica, C. 1976. *Defining Linguistic Area: South Asia*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Murav'jeva, I. A. 1989. "K postrojeniju obščej modeli inkorporacii". [Towards a general model of incorporation]. In *Problemy Semantičeskoy i Sintaksičeskoy Tipologii* [Problems of semantic and syntactic typology], V. I. Podlesskaya and L. I. Kulikov. (eds), 83–103. Moscow: Nauka.

Nedjalkov, V. P. and Siľnickij, G. G. 1969. "Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij: morfologičeskij i leksičeskij kauzativy". [Typology of causative constructions: morphological and lexical causatives]. In *Tipologija Kauzativnyx Konstrukcij* [Typology of causative constructions], A. A. Xolodovich (ed.), 5–19. Leningrad: Nauka.

Nedjalkov, V. P. and Siľnickij, G. G. 1973. "Typologie der kausativen Konstruktionen". *Folia Linguistica* 6 (3/4): 273–90.

Rassadin, V. I. 1978. *Morfologija Tofalarskogo Jazyka v Sravniteľnom Osveščenii.* [Morphology of Tofalar in a comparative perspective]. Moskva: Nauka.

Shibatani, M. (ed.). 1976. *The Grammar of Causative Constructions.* [Syntax and semantics, vol. VI]. New York: Academic Press.

Shibatani, M. 1985. "Passives and related constructions: A prototype analysis". *Language* 61: 821–48.

Shibatani, M. and Pardeshi, P. 2002. "The causative continuum". In *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation*, M. Shibatani (ed.), 85–126. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Xolodovič, A. A. (ed.). 1969. *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstruckcij* [A typology of causative constructions]. Leningrad: Nauka.

1st proofs