



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Daria V. Barylnikova

QUASI-CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN MEHWEB

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LINGUISTICS

WP BRP 26/LNG/2015

Quasi-Causative Constructions in Mehweb²

This paper investigates causative constructions in Mehweb, a lect of the Dargwa group of the East Caucasian (Nakh-Daghestanian) language family. In Mehweb, it is possible to build a causative construction by using a causative predicate and the predicate of caused action. Originally such verbs conveyed the meaning of physical causation of motion and left the causee on its own. Constructions of this kind do not qualify as canonical analytic (periphrastic) causatives, because they are not fully grammaticalized. I describe them as quasi-causatives. Usually, either a morphological or periphrastic causative marker is used in one utterance. Mehweb shows some evidence for double causative marking by combining a separate verbal form as the main causative predicate with a dependent verbal form which is marked with a morphological causative affix, producing only one causative meaning.

Key Words: causative, periphrastic causative construction, double causative, Mehweb, Dargwa, East Caucasian languages

JEL classification code: Z19

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics. School of Linguistics.
E-mail: dbarylukova@hotmail.com

² I would like to express her gratitude to all Mehweb consultants, who agreed to help in this research. I also thank Nina Dobrushina, Michael Daniel and Dmitri Ganenkov for their priceless counsel throughout the whole work.

1. Introduction

According to Comrie (1989: 165–166), Nedjalkov and Silnitsky (1973), and Kulikov (2001), the causative construction is a linguistic expression which denotes a complex situation consisting of two component events: (1) the event that causes another event to happen; and (2) the result of that causation. In other words, the first situation refers to the causer's action and the second explains the effect of that causation on the causee's state.

Causativization is a valency-increasing derivation which is applied to the basic, or plain, structure of the clause. In the resulting construction, the causer corresponds to the subject, the causee is shifted to the position of direct object (or, more generally, to a non-subject position). The set of semantic roles does not necessarily remain the same (this is exactly what makes the causative a voice in the broader sense). It means that with a new argument added, we have to redistribute the roles taking into account how these participants semantically relate to each other. The general scheme of the causative derivation always implies a participant that is treated as a causer (someone or something that spreads his/her/its control over the situation and 'pushes the button'). At the same time, there must be someone who is forced to execute the intended commission of the causer. With originally transitive predicates (or intransitive predicates with an indirect object), there is another participant who does not interact with the causer directly and does not play a role in the redistribution of grammatical relations. Such a participant retains the marking that it had in the original sentence. The following English examples illustrate these options.

- (0) a. *Professor made his student work hard.* (originally intransitive)
b. *Professor made his student drop a course this semester.* (originally transitive)
c. *Professor made his student laugh at his joke.* (originally intransitive with an indirect object)

This paper is a study of causative constructions in Mehweb, a lect of the Dargwa group of the East Caucasian (Nakh-Dagestanian) family. Mehweb is a one-village language spoken in the Gunib (also spelt Ghunib) district of the Republic of Daghestan in the Caucasus. The total number of speakers is about 1,000. The previous studies on Mehweb include Magometov (1957) and Sumbatova (ms). The data discussed in this paper was collected during a field trip in summer 2015.³

³ This study (research grant No 15-05-002) was supported by The National Research University–Higher School of Economics' Academic Fund Program in 2015.

As described in Ageeva (2014), the morphological causative is widely spread in Mehweb. The aim of the current research is to identify and investigate other means of building constructions with causative semantics, for instance, with causative verbs (which function as a separate cause predicate in the construction). In order to examine this functional domain, I propose the following research questions.

- 1) Are there any grammaticalization effects in constructions with causative verbs?
- 2) What are the central meanings these constructions express?
- 3) Are there any syntactic constraints on building a periphrastic causative, and what is the syntactic structure of such constructions?
- 4) Is there any difference between constructions with animate and inanimate causees?

The paper is divided into five sections. Each section presents the results of several tests which were applied in order to diagnose whether these constructions are periphrastic causatives or lexically dependent constructions. Section 2 observes the possible ways of expressing the causative meaning, including synthetic and suppletive causatives. Section 3 introduces lexical verbs participating in what I call quasi-causative constructions. Section 4 looks at the syntax of such constructions in more detail, in particular, what types of verbs are allowed to be used with a causative verb. In Section 5, some aspects of building negative clauses are outlined. Finally, Section 6 shows that Mehweb has a typologically unusual double causative construction.

The examples include the original Cyrillic script, a Roman transcription, based on IPA (second line), a morphological gloss and an English translation.

2. The expression of causative meaning in Mehweb

The formation of causative constructions do not follow a single formal strategy. Generally, there are three possible ways of expressing causative meaning in a language: synthetic (morphological), analytic (periphrastic) and suppletive (lexical) causatives.

2.1. Synthetic causative

Synthetic causatives are formed by adding an affix to the verbal base. Cross-linguistically, this is one of the most common features to be discussed in the literature. Synthetic means of expressing causation usually produce monoclausal structures, since there is no extra predicate added to the syntactic structure. In Mehweb, the causative affix *-aq-* is used; it has an allomorph *-aχaq-* with a very limited distribution. The affix can be added to both perfective and imperfective verb bases. Consider an example:

- (1) *Анварлини* *Расул абайзе* *бархъле* *бургъахъиб*
anwal-li-ni *rasul abaj-ze* *b-arch-le* *b-urh-aq-ib*
 Anwar-OBL-ERG Rasul mother-INTER N-straight-ADV N-tell.PFV-CAUS-AOR
 ‘Anwar made Rasul tell mother the truth.’

This particular way of derivation is highly productive in Mehweb. All kinds of verbs may add the affix. A discussion of morphological causative is presented in Ageeva (2014).

2.2. Suppletive causative

Suppletive causatives are ‘covert’ causatives (Kulikov, 2001), since they are built through suppletion and do not have an otherwise overt marking. Suppletive causatives imply causation on a lexical level. The English pair like *kill/die* is commonly treated as an example of lexical causativization. In Mehweb, the pair *CL-aʔbʔaʔs* ‘to kill’ and *CL-ebkʔes* ‘to die’ is also an example of lexical causativization.

3. Causative by lexical verbs

In Mehweb, it is possible to express causative meaning analytically with the following verbs:⁴

- *iʔes* ‘drive.IPFV’ – *aʔas* ‘drive.PFV’
- *CL-irqes* ‘leave.IPFV’ – *CL-aqas* ‘leave.PFV’
- *CL-iqʔes* ‘do.IPFV’ – *CL-aqʔes* ‘do.PFV’

Compare two causative constructions in (2). (2a) repeated here from section 2.1., illustrates the synthetic causative expression. (2b) has the same meaning, but is formed in a different way, since two verbs are used here. The main predicate is a verb from the list above (*aʔib* ‘drove’), and its dependent argument is the verb of caused action (*CL-urhes* ‘to tell’).

- (2) a. *Анварлини* *Расул абайзе* *бархъле* *бургъахъиб.*
anwal-li-ni *rasul abaj-ze* *barxle* *b-urh-aq-ib*
 Anwar-OBL-ERG Rasul mother-INTER straight N-tell.PFV-CAUS-AOR
- b. *Анварлини* *Расул абайзе* *бархъле* *бургъес* *аʔиб.*
anwal-li-ni *rasul abaj-ze* *barxle* *b-urh-es* *aʔ-ib*
 Anwar-OBL-ERG Rasul mother-INTER straight N-tell.PFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR
 ‘Anwar made Rasul tell mother the truth.’

⁴ Further, verbal forms from the list will be cited with the perfective stem.

The lexical meaning of the verbs *aʔas* ‘drive’ and *CL-aqas* ‘leave’ are connected to physical movement and, in particular, caused motion. Basically, the verb *aʔas* ‘drive’ describes an action when a herd is driven away from its usual place. The verb *CL-aqas* ‘leave’ expresses leaving an object in any place.

Here are a few examples of non-causative usage of these lexemes.

- (3) *Адайни аьиб маза зӀяйне.*
adaɟ-ni aʔ-ib maza ʔajne
 father-ERG drive.PFV-AOR ram yard

‘Father drove ram into the yard.’

- (4) *Адайни бахьиб иниц устуйчѐб.*
adaɟ-ni b-aq-ib inc ustu.j-če-b
 father-ERG N-leave.PFV-AOR apple table.OBL-SUP-N(ESS)

‘Father left an apple on the table.’

According to Song (2001), analytic causatives include two predicates. One is the **predicate of cause**, namely a verb that expresses causative influence. It has two important functions: (1) to introduce a new argument (the causer), and (2) to establish the new position of the causee. The other predicate which functions as a lexical argument to the predicate of cause is called the **predicate of effect**. It fills the slot established by the predicate of cause. For instance, in *The concierge made lobby boy carry the bags on his own* the predicate of cause is the verb *made* and *carry* is the predicate of effect. This terminology is used below.

Further I will discuss the constructions in Mehweb which are built by means of cause and effect predicates. However, there are some difficulties with identifying a grammaticalization pattern which should be a base for analytic causatives. Constructions with cause predicates discussed in this particular survey could be also described as lexical constructions which do not require any grammaticalization and, hence, may be considered as contextually dependent material. In order to avoid ungrounded statements, I call these constructions quasi-causative and I hope to continue the research in order to confirm or disprove the ideas presented here.

3.1. The structure of the quasi-causative construction

The syntactic structure of causative constructions requires using a finite predicate of cause and a non-finite predicate of effect. Predicates of cause function as predicates of a simple transitive sentence, having a subject (the causer) in ergative case and a direct object (the causee) in the nominative case. The effect predicates are represented by infinitives, either perfective or

imperfective (see (5a)–(5b)). Other verbal forms are considered to be ungrammatical (examples (5c)–(5e) with aorist, imperfective and past participle forms, respectively).

- (5) a. *Адајни* *кунг* *уриши* *белчџес* *аџиб.*
adaј-ni *kung* *urši* ***b-elč'-es*** *aʔ-ib*
 father.OBL-ERG book son/boy **N-read.PFV-INF** drive.PFV-AOR
 ‘Father made his son read [once] the book.’
- b. *Адајни* *кунг* *уриши* *лучџес* *аџиб.*
adaј-ni *kung* *urši* ***luč'-es*** *aʔ-ib*
 father.OBL-ERG book son/boy **read.IPFV-INF** drive.PFV-AOR
 ‘Father made his son read [for years] the book.’
- c. **Адајни* *кунг* *уриши* *белчџун* *аџиб.*
adaј-ni *kung* *urši* ***b-elč'-un*** *aʔ-ib*
 father.OBL-ERG book son/boy **N-read.PFV-AOR** drive.PFV-AOR
 ‘Father made his son read [once] the book.’
- d. **Адајни* *кунг* *уриши* *лучџиб* *аџиб.*
adaј-ni *kung* *urši* ***luč'-ib*** *aʔ-ib*
 father.OBL-ERG book son/boy **read.IPFV-IPFT** drive.PFV-AOR
 ‘Father made his son read [for years] the book.’
- e. **Адајни* *кунг* *уриши* *белчџиле* *аџиб.*
adaј-ni *kung* *urši* ***b-elč'-ile*** *aʔ-ib*
 father.OBL-ERG book son/boy **N-read.PFV-PST.CVB** drive.PFV-AOR
 ‘Father made his son read [once] the book.’

The word order is not strict, but there is a preference for SOV. The finite verb is in the final position, while the dependent infinitive precedes it. These two forms cannot be separated by an additional syntactic phrase, for instance, a temporal adverb (see (6c)).

- (6) a. *Абайни* *Расул* *къар* *ишхъес* *иъан* [*гъар* *бархџи*].
abaj-ni *rasul* *q'ar* ***išq-es*** ***iʔ-an*** [*har* *barħi*]
 mother.OBL-ERG Rasul grass mow.IPFV-INF drive.IPFV-PRS every day
- b. [*Гъар* *бархџи*] *абайни* *Расул* *къар* *ишхъес* *иъан.*
 [*har* *barħi*] *abaj-ni* *rasul* *q'ar* ***išq-es*** ***iʔ-an***
 every day mother.OBL-ERG Rasul grass mow.IPFV-INF drive.IPFV-PRS
- c. **Абайни* *Расул* *къар* *ишхъес* [*гъар* *бархџи*] *иъан.*
abaj-ni *rasul* *q'ar* ***išq-es*** [*harbarħi*] ***iʔ-an***
 mother.OBL-ERG Rasul grass mow.IPFV-INF every day drive.IPFV-PRS
 ‘Mother makes Rasul mow the lawn every day.’

The scope of the temporal phrase is strongly context-dependent. There are cases when the temporal or adverbial phrase belongs to the first predication, and others when it belongs to the second one. Consider the next example:

- (7) *Адайни* *урши* *аьиб* *гьар* *бархлу*
adaj-ni *urši* *aʔ-ib* *har* *barħi*
 father.OBL-ERG son/boy drive.PFV-AOR every day

машина *асес* / *исес.*
mašina *as-es* / *is-es*
 car buy.PFV-INF / buy.IPFV-INF

‘Every day father made his son buy/keep buying a car.’

What is important in (7) is that even if the cause predicate is in its perfective aspect, there are no restrictions on the aspect of the effect predicate. In (7) we may have both aspectual forms in the dependent clause, whereas the main clause contains a perfective form of the verb *aʔas* ‘drive’. The same tendency is observed in constructions with an imperfective cause predicate, where either imperfective or perfective effect predicate is allowed.

Causative semantics are divided into two major subtypes: (a) something is made/urged to be done/happen (factitive causative), and (b) something that is not prevented from being done (permissive causative). The first meaning is associated with the verb *aʔas* ‘drive’. The second meaning is associated with the verb *CL-aqas* ‘leave’.

3.2. The use of *aʔas* ‘drive’

Factitive causatives are formed by means of the verb *aʔas* ‘drive’. The causee should necessarily be an animate object. Inanimate objects are incompatible with the semantics of coercion, can not be urged to do something. The causer is marked with the ergative, while the causee carries the nominative. Consider examples (8)–(10):

- (8) *Патиматини* *Анвар* *укъес* *аьиб.*
pat’imat-ni *anwar* *uq’-es* *aʔ-ib*
 Patimat.OBL-ERG Anwar M.go.PFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR

‘Patimat made Anwar go away.’

- (9) *Узилини* *рузи* *дисес* *аьиб.*
uzi-li-ni *ruzi* *d-is-es* *aʔ-ib*
 brother-OBL-ERG sister F-cry.IPFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR

‘Brother made his sister cry.’

- (10) **Анварлини* *инци* *берхлес* *аъиб.*
anwal-li-ni *inc'* *b-erħ-es* *aʔ-ib*
 Anwar-OBL-ERG apple N-rot.IPFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR

‘Anwar made the apple rot.’

The causer is typically represented by an animate agent. However, in some cases it is possible to have an inanimate causer. These contexts may be related to personification; cf.:

- (11) *Изайни* *абайла* *беч* *улчлес* *аъиб.*
iza-j-ni *abaj-la* *beč'* *ulč'-es* *aʔ-ib*
 illness-OBL-ERG mother.OBL-GEN head be.bald.IPFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR

‘The illness made mother bald.’

In this particular example illness is presented as something physically real which functions as a living creature. Consultants allow such use of this verb, however, they do not produce this sentence as the first answer to the elicitation task. They tend to accept a sentence already built according to main rules of grammar. In any case, it is important to note that there are no strict constraints on grammatical animacy of the causer.

3.3. Permissive causative with *CL-aqas* ‘leave’

In the permissive construction, the causer permits rather than causes the causee to bring about the caused event. In Mehweb, it is usually expressed by means of the verb *CL-aqas* ‘leave’. The causer carries ergative marking, while the causee is in the nominative.

One of the main contexts for permissive is a positive respond to request. For instance, in (12), it presupposes that, before kissing Patimat, Anwar actually inquired about this particular action.

- (12) *Патиматини* *Анвар* *вахъиб* *ума* *дакъас.*
pat'imat-ini *anwar* *w-aq-ib* *uta* *d-aq'-as*
 Patimat Anwar M-leave.PFV-AOR kiss NPL-do.PFV-INF

‘Patimat let Anwar kiss her.’

On the other hand, there may be no inquiries or requests, and the causer is introduced as an independent agent. Inanimate causees are widespread in such contexts. Consider some examples:

- (13) *Расуйни* *улкълагъа* *абхъес* *бахъиб.*
rasuj-ni *ulq'laha* *abx-es* *b-aq-ib*
 Rasul.OBL-ERG window open.PFV-INF N-leave.PFV-AOR

‘Rasul let the window open.’

- (14) *Расуйни* *шин рурхъес* *дахъиб.*
rasuj-ni *šin rurq-es* *d-aq-ib*
 Rasul.OBL-ERG water flow.IPFV-INF NPL-do.PFV-AOR

‘Rasul let the water flow.’

There are some types of predicates that denote life or natural processes. For instance, verbs like *ulč’es* ‘to become bald’, *miʔawas* ‘to freeze’, *CL-ic’es* ‘to melt’ in so-called quasi-causative constructions usually are found in combination with the cause predicate *CL-aqas* ‘leave’.

Consider the following examples:

- (15) *Анварлини* *диъ миъавас* *бахъиб* / **аъиб.*
anwal-li-ni *diʔ miʔaw-as* *b-aq-ib* / *aʔ-ib*
 Anwar-OBL-ERG meat freeze.PFV-INF N-leave.PFV-AOR / drive.PFV-AOR

‘Anwar froze the meat’

- (16) *Анварлини* *кIвама* *бацIес* *бахъиб* /
anwal-li-ni *kʷama* *b-acʹ-es* *b-aq-ib* /
 Anwar-OBL-ERG butter N-melt.PFV-INF N-leave.PFV-AOR /

**аъиб*

aʔ-ib

drive.PFV-AOR

‘Anwar melted butter’

The permissive constructions in Mehweb are closely connected to the original meaning of the word *CL-aqas* ‘leave’. The causer literally leaves the causee on its own without taking any part in changing its state. The examples above illustrate such use. It is especially relevant when the causer is an inanimate object (compare (13)–(16)). However, in cases where it is clearly a person (such as in (12)), the permissive causation is evident. The permissive is then understood in a metaphorical sense ‘leaving on it be’ and not preventing the action from happening. The construction with the verb *CL-aqas* ‘leave’ may be interpreted as one of the available quasi-causative constructions with permissive causation.

3.4. Adjectival causative

Adjectives may form causatives by means of ‘do’-periphrasis, adding the verb *CL-aq’as* ‘do’ (as in (17b)). Note that the adjective itself lacks the attributive affix in such causative constructions, cf. (17b) and (17c).

- (17) a. *Муса* *зубал.*
tusa *zuba-l*
 Musa blind-ATR

‘Musa is blind.’

- b. *Хайни* *муса* *зуба* *вакъиб.*
χaj-ni *tusa* *zuba* *w-aq'-ib*
 khan.OBL-ERG Musa blind M-do.PFV-AOR

‘Khan blinded Musa.’

- c. **Хайни* *муса* *зубал* *вакъиб.*
χaj-ni *tusa* *zuba-l* *w-aq'-ib*
 khan.OBL-ERG Musa blind-ATR M-do.PFV-AOR

‘Khan blinded Musa.’

4. The syntax of causatives

4.1. Biclausality

While morphological causative constructions are monoclausal, periphrastic causatives are often biclausal. It means that they have a main clause that introduces a causer, a causative predicate and a dependent clause that describes the caused event. In Mehweb the dependent clause is headed by an infinitive (see (19)).

- (19) [*Анварлини* *Расул* *абайзе* [*бархъле* *буръес*]
 [*anwal-li-ni* *rasul* *abaj-ze* [*barxle* *b-urh-es*]
 Anwar-OBL-ERG Rasul mother.OBL-INTER truth N-tell.PFV-INF

аъиб].
aʔ-ib
 drive.PFV-AOR
 ‘Anwar made Rasul tell mother the truth.’

In order to prove that there are two syntactic clauses in quasi-causative constructions, I used the following tests.

The first test deals with the case marking of the causer. In (20), two participants are presented. The causer’s case depends on the predicate of cause. In the example, the agentive arguments of the predicate of cause and of the predicate of effect behave differently. The causer is marked with the ergative, and no other participant is. While the verb *aʔib* ‘drove’ takes the causer in the ergative, the verb *CL-erh^{wes}* ‘to cut’ also requires an ergative agent. But in a context like ‘Rasul made his brother cut the ram’ it is impossible to mark the causee with the ergative (and thus to have both the causer and the causee marked equally). In other words, the main verb

corresponds to the most structurally close participant in the absolutive. It is impossible to have two absolutive arguments in one clause.

- (20) a. *Расуьни* *узи* *маза бергъвес* *аьиб.*
rasuj-ni *uzi* *maza b-erh^w-es* *aʔ-ib*
 Rasul.OBL-ERG son/boy ram N-slaughter.PFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR
- b. **Расуьни* *узини* *маза бергъвес* *аьиб.*
rasuj-ni *uzi-ni* *maza b-erh^w-es* *aʔ-ib*
 Rasul.OBL-ERG son/boy-ERG ram N-slaughter.PFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR
- ‘Rasul made his son cut the ram.’

The second test deals with the agreement in class. The class affix on the verb is controlled by the nominative participant. If there was only one clause, then it would be possible for a verbal form which is marked with a noun class marker to agree in class with the sole absolutive argument. In (21), the predicate of cause agrees with the absolutive argument (i.e. the causee) in the upper clause, whereas the predicate of effect agrees in class with the other absolutive argument, the last element in the structure. Formally, the verb agrees in noun class with the absolutive participant of its clause. As we can see, the change of nominal classes in the opposite direction (the predicate of cause agrees with *kung* ‘book’, while the predicate of effect does with *urši* ‘boy’) is unacceptable.

- (21) a. *Адаьни* *уриши* *кунг* *белчIес*
adaj-ni *urši* *kung* *b-elč¹-es*
 father.OBL-ERG son/boy book N-read.PFV-INF
- иьуве* *лев* / **леб.*
iʔ-uwe *le-w* / *le-b*
 drive.IPFV-CONV COP-M / COP-N
- ‘Father made his son read the book.’

In (21), we observe the behaviour of the copula segment. It is ungrammatical to put neuter nominal class agreement of the absolutive participant from the second predication (*kung* ‘book’) on the copula. It only allows the masculine marker which is for the absolutive participant from the first predication (*urši* ‘son/boy’). Hence, it is clear that the quasi-causative construction is biclausal.

4.2. Types of predicates of effect

The predicate of effect fills the valency of the causative verb. In all quasi-causative constructions the causer gets ergative marking, while the causee appears in the absolutive case. All other arguments keep their case marking the same. In the next subsections different possible

types of effect predicates with a verb *aʔas* ‘drive’ with the factitive meaning are presented. The verb *CL-aqas* ‘leave’ behaves in exactly the same way.

4.2.1. A-intransitive verbs

Intransitive verbs are more frequently causativised. An agentive intransitive verb takes one lexical subject in the absolutive case and often represents an action, as *duc’ uqes* ‘to run’ in (22).

- (22) a. *Анвар* *дущI* *ухъун.*
anwar *duc’* *uq-un*
 Anwar running M.go.PFV-AOR
 ‘Anwar ran.’
- b. *Учителъни* *Анвар* *дущI* *ухъес* *аъиб.*
učite-j-ni *anwar* *duc’* *uq-es* *aʔ-ib*
 teacher-OBL-ERG Anwar running M.go.PFV-AOR drive.PFV-AOR
 ‘The teacher made Anwar run.’

4.2.2. P-intransitive verbs

Patientive verbs take non-subject arguments (usually patient) as their lexical subject. The essential difference between A- and P-intransitive verbs is the degree of participation of the lexical subject. While the A-intransitive main argument controls the action that he/she does, P-intransitive’s subject is less responsible for a situation. P-intransitive predicates are closely related to uncontrolled actions, as it is shown in (23):

- (23) a. *Инци* *берхIуб.*
inc’ *b-erħ-ib*
 apple N-rot.PFV-AOR
 ‘The apple has rotted.’
- b. *Анварлини* *инци* *берхIес* *бахъиб.*
anwal-li-ni *inc’* *b-erħ-es* *b-aq-ib*
 Anwar-OBL-ERG apple N-rot.PFV-INF N-leave.PFV-AOR
 ‘Anwar let the apple rot.’

4.2.3. *Experiential verbs*

Experiential verbs require special case marking for their subject. In Mehweb, they are coded with the interlative case (as it is shown in (24a)). In constructions with the verb *CL-iges* ‘want’ the subject requires the dative.

- (24) a. *Дурсилизе* *урши хъумартур.*
dursi-li-ze *urši qumart-ur*
 girl-OBL-INTER(LAT) boy forget.PFV-AOR
 ‘The girl forgot the boy.’

However, when the causativization is applied, the potential causee switches its case from interlative to absolutive, according to the general scheme of quasi-causative construction.

- (24) b. *Адайни* *дурси* / **дурсилизе* *урши*
ada.j-ni *dursi* / *dursi-li-ze* *urši*
 father.OBL-ERG girl / girl-OBL-INTER(LAT) boy

хъумартес *аъиб.*
qumart-es *aʔ-ib*
 forget.PFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR
 ‘Father made his daughter forget the boy.’

Note that the morphological causative marker is used in constructions with experiential effect predicates and the causee retains its interlative case. Consider an example from Ageeva (2014:8):

- (25) a. *Ализе* *хабар аръиб.*
ʔali-ze *xabar arʔ-ib*
 Ali-INTER(LAT) tale hear.PFV-AOR
 ‘Ali heard a tale.’
 b. *Патиматини* *Ализе* *хабар аръахъиб.*
patʔimati-ni *ʔali-ze* *xabar arʔ-aq-ib*
 Patimat.OBL-ERG Ali-INTER(LAT) tale hear.PFV-CAUS-AOR
 ‘Patimat told Ali a tale.’

In (24b), the original interlative marking on the causee is ungrammatical.

4.2.4. *Transitive verbs*

In transitive constructions, in comparison with the previous verbal types important changes in case marking are observed. The subject of a transitive verb takes the ergative case, while the direct object takes the absolutive.

- (26) a. *Узилини* *маза* *бергъун.*
uzi-li-ni *maza* *b-erh-un*
son/boy-OBL-ERG ram N-slaughter.PFV-AOR

‘His son slaughtered the ram.’

In derived periphrastic causatives, the causer takes ergative leaving the absolutive slot to the causee (26b). Having two ergative arguments in one utterance is not allowed (26c).

- (26) b. *Расуйни* *узи* *маза* *бергъвес* *аъиб.*
rasuj-ni *uzi* *maza* *b-erh^w-es* *aʔ-ib*
Rasul.OBL-ERG son/boy ram N-cut.PFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR

- c. **Расуйни* *узи-ни* *маза* *бергъвес* *аъиб.*
rasuj-ni *uzi-ni* *maza* *b-erh^w-es* *aʔ-ib*
Rasul.OBL-ERG son/boy-ERG ram N-cut.PFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR

‘Rasul made his brother cut the ram.’

4.2.5. Ditransitive verbs

Ditransitive verbs take three arguments that correspond to subject, direct and indirect objects. The same scheme applies here.

- (27) a. *Уршилини* *абайзе* *арц* *губ.*
urši-li-ni *abaj-ze* *arc* *g-ib*
son/boy-OBL-ERG mother.OBL-INTER(LAT) money give.PFV-AOR

‘The boy gave his mother the money’

- b. *Анварлини* *урши* *абайзе* *арц* *гес* *аъиб.*
anwal-li-ni *urši* *abaj-ze* *arc* *g-es* *aʔ-ib*
Anwar-OBL-ERG son/boy mother-INTER(LAT) money give.PFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR

‘Anwar made his son give his mother the money.’

As discussed earlier, there are no individual rules for each type of the predicate. We see the same scheme, when the causativization introduces a typical transitive construction with the causer in ergative and the causee in absolutive.

5. Negation

Constructions with negation are one of the possible tests to examine the degree of grammaticalization of quasi-causative constructions. The negation in constructions with *aʔas*

‘drive’ is only allowed on the matrix predicate, that is, the predicate of cause. The dependent predicate cannot take the negation prefix *ħa-*.

- (28) a. *Абайни* *Расул къар* *ишхъес* *аъиб* *зъар* *бархІи.*
abaj-ni *rasul q'ar* *išq-es* *aʔ-ib* *har* *barħi*
 mother.OBL-ERG Rasul grass mow.IPFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR every day

‘Mother made Rasul mow the lawn every day.’

- b. *Абайни* *Расул къар* *ишхъес* ***ħIaъиб*** *зъар* *бархІи.*
abajni *rasul q'ar* *išqes* ***ħ-aʔ-ib*** *har* *barħi*
 mother.OBL-ERG Rasul grass mow.IPFV-INF NEG-drive.PFV-AOR every day

- c. **Абайни* *Расул къар* ***ħIaишхъес*** *аъиб* *зъар* *бархІи.*
abaj-ni *rasul q'ar* ***ħa-šqes*** *aʔib* *har* *barħi*
 mother.OBL-ERG Rasul grass NEG-mow.IPFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR every day

- d. **Абайни* *Расул къар* ***ħIaишхъес*** ***ħIaъиб*** *зъар*
abaj-ni *rasul q'ar* ***ħašqes*** ***ħ-aʔ-ib*** *har*
 mother.OBL-ERG Rasul grass NEG-mow.IPFV-INF NEG-drive.PFV-AOR every
бархІи.
barħi
 day

‘Mother does not make Rasul mow the lawn every day.’

The examples like (28c) and (28d) are considered ungrammatical by consultants no matter what meaning is implied (whether the negation scopes over the embedded predicate or the matrix verb). Another example shows the same tendency.

- (29) a. *Учителтини* *нуша* *мехІвела* *мезисум*
učitel-ti-ni *niša* *meħ^we-la* *mezisum*
 teacher-PL-ERG we Mehweb-GEN language

бухІакъас *ħIaъиб.*
b-uħa^q-as *ħ-aʔ-ib*
 N-talk.IPFV-INF NEG-drive.PFV-AOR

‘Teachers do not make us speak Mehweb [at school].’

- b. **Учителтини* *нуша* *мехІвела* *мезисум*
učitel-ti-ni *niša* *meħ^we-la* *mezisum*
 teacher-PL-ERG we Mehweb-GEN language

<i>хIабухIакъас</i>	<i>аъиб.</i>
<i>ħa-b-uħa'q'-as</i>	<i>aʔ-ib</i>
NEG-HPL-talk.IPFV-INF	drive.PFV-AOR

‘Teachers make us not to speak Mehweb [at school].’

On the other hand, in constructions with *CL-aqas* ‘leave’ it is possible to use a negative prefix on a predicate of effect.

(30)	<i>Адайни</i>	<i>урши</i>	<i>зул</i>	<i>как</i>
	<i>adaĵ-ni</i>	<i>urši</i>	<i>zul</i>	<i>kak</i>
	father-ERG	son/boy	in.the.morning	pray

<i>хIабикъес</i>	<i>вахъиб.</i>
<i>ħa-b-iq'-es</i>	<i>w-aq-ib</i>
NEG-N-do.IPFV-INF	M-leave.PFV-AOR

‘Father let his son not to do the morning pray.’

(31)	<i>Адайни</i>	<i>урши</i>	<i>зул</i>	<i>как</i>
	<i>adaĵ-ni</i>	<i>urši</i>	<i>zul</i>	<i>kak</i>
	father-ERG	son/boy	in.the.morning	pray

<i>бикъес</i>	<i>хIахъиб.</i>
<i>b-iq'-es</i>	<i>ħa-aq-ib</i>
N-do.IPFV-INF	NEG-leave.PFV-AOR

‘Father did not let his son do the morning pray.’

The next pair of examples illustrates the same observation.

(32)	<i>Абайни</i>	<i>урши</i>	<i>хIахъиб</i>	<i>ушкуйхе</i>
	<i>abaj-ni</i>	<i>urši</i>	<i>ħ-aq-ib</i>	<i>uškuj-ħe</i>
	mother.OBL-ERG	son/boy	NEG-leave.PFV-AOR	school.OBL-IN(ESS)

<i>ашес.</i>
<i>aš-es</i>
M.go.IPFV-INF

‘Mother does not let her son go to school.’

(33)	<i>Абайни</i>	<i>урши</i>	<i>вахъиб</i>	<i>ушкуйхе</i>	<i>хIашес.</i>
	<i>abaj-ni</i>	<i>urši</i>	<i>w-aq-ib</i>	<i>uškuj-ħe</i>	<i>ħa-š-es</i>
	mother.OBL-ERG	son/boy	M-leave.PFV-AOR	school.OBL-IN(ESS)	NEG-M.go.IPFV-INF

‘Mother let her son not to go to school.’

Here we deal with a less bound type of construction. The examples above show the possibility of putting a negative prefix on either the causative or effect predicate. It is, on the

other hand, considered ungrammatical to build a negative form from the infinitive dependent of the verb *aʔas* ‘drive’. The verb *CL-aqas* ‘leave’ seems to be less grammaticalized than *aʔas* ‘drive’.

6. Double causative

Both morphological and analytic causative may co-occur. In other words, if a construction already contains a predicate of cause (i.e. *aʔas* ‘drive’ or *CL-aqas* ‘leave’), the predicate of effect can be additionally marked with a causative affix *-aq-*. In (34a) and (34b), the morphological marker is optional and may be dropped, while the analytic causative predicate remains in the sentence and the meaning of the whole does not change.

- (34) a. *Адајни урши кунг белчІахъес аъиб.*
adaǰ-ni urši kung b-elč'-aq-es aʔ-ib
 father-ERG son/boy book N-read.PFV-CAUS-INF drive.PFV-AOR
 ‘Father made his son read a book’

- b. *Адајни урши кунг белчІес аъиб.*
adaǰ-ni urši kung b-elč'-es aʔ-ib
 father-ERG son/boy book N-read.PFV-INF drive.PFV-AOR
 ‘Father made his son read a book.’

Constructions with an inanimate causee show similar phenomenon.

- (35) a. *Анварлини инцІ берхІахъас бахъиб.*
anwal-li-ni inc' b-erħ-aq-as b-aq-ib
 Anwar-OBL-ERG apple N-rot.PFV-CAUS-INF N-let.PFV-AOR
 ‘Anwar let an apple rot.’

- b. *Анварлини инцІ берхІес бахъиб.*
anwal-li-ni inc' b-erħ-es b-aq-ib
 Anwar-OBL-ERG apple N-rot.PFV-INF N-let.PFV-AOR
 ‘Anwar let an apple rot.’

The examples above illustrate analytic double causative. Ageeva (2014:10) points out that it is possible to build double morphological causative by additional causative affix (cf. *barʔaqaqib* ‘freeze’). The meaning remains the same, with no clear distinction from a ‘single’ morphological causative. Here we have a similar phenomenon under the guise of periphrasis. Constructions with double causative marking are quite familiar to native speakers and are produced spontaneously during elicitation. Using redundant double marking is not limited by any

semantic feature. Consultants easily derive double causatives from all quasi-causative constructions discussed previously in this paper.

7. Conclusions

To sum up, quasi-causative (or so-called periphrastic causative) constructions co-exist in Mehweb with synthetic causatives. The difference in meaning between analytic and morphological markers was not revealed. However, there are some limitations on the structure of quasi-causative constructions.

First, it is important to define the semantic division of labour between the causative predicates. Factitive causativization is expressed by means of the verb *aʔas* ‘drive’. The permissive meaning is expressed by *CL-aqas* ‘leave’. Both predicates introduce an infinitive verbal form, which expresses the predicate of effect. In some adjectival causativization contexts it is possible to use *CL-aqʼas* ‘do’ in combination with adjectives.

Second, still there some peculiarities of cause predicates’ behaviour. The verb *aʔas* ‘drive’ allows only animate causees, while *CL-aqas* ‘leave’ can take both animate and inanimate causees.

The negation is another reason to distinguish between the two predicates. In both constructions, it is grammatical to attach the negation marker to the matrix predicate. However, the verb *CL-aqas* ‘leave’ also allows applying negation to the dependent clause.

These differences are briefly summarized in Table 1.

	causer		causee		negation	
	animate	inanimate	animate	inanimate	on matrix predicate	on dependent predicate
<i>aʔas</i> ‘make.PFV’	✓	✓ (personification)	✓		✓	
<i>(b)aqas</i> ‘leave/let.PFV’	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓

Tab. 1. Summary of the causative predicates.

Third, it does not matter what syntactic type the predicate of effect is. Verbs of all morphosyntactic classes are allowed.

Fourth, case marking follows a scheme that is identical for all periphrastic causative constructions. In particular, the causer always is marked by the ergative, and the causee is

assigned the absolutive. The rest of arguments keep their original marking. It does not matter whether the predicate of effect requires non-canonical case marking (for instance, the interlative for experiential verbs), the causee would always be in the absolutive. On the contrary, if a morphological causative marker is used in constructions with experiential effect predicate, the causee will keep the non-canonical subject marking (dative or interlative, depending on the verb).

Fifth, causative constructions in Mehweb may combine morphological and analytic causative in one construction. Apparently, the meaning of such constructions does not differ from the usual causative construction with either only synthetic or only analytic form. Causative doubling seems to be simply redundant.

Native speakers tend to use morphological causatives on a more regular basis than periphrastic causatives. Yet, periphrastic causatives form fully grammatical utterances. The constraints in their syntactic structure illustrate that analytic formation of causative is more complex than morphological derivation. In morphology we are faced with regularity and productivity, apparently, without any exceptions.

Although quasi-causative constructions resemble periphrastic ones, the tests discussed in the paper did reveal some ambiguous evidence and divergences between constructions under consideration. On the one hand, the lexical shift that cause predicates underwent mostly reflects a change in meaning, not in their grammatical behaviour. On the other hand, the results of the negation test showed that the factitive quasi-causative construction is not fully compositional. It is not possible to apply negation to the dependent verb form in constructions with the verb *aʔas* 'drive', while *CL-aqas* 'leave' allows negative infinitive in the dependent clause.

The biclausality test revealed expected results. Usually, analytic causatives form two predications. In this study, I applied several tests to investigate whether it is also true in Mehweb. It was shown that constructions with quasi-causative constructions actually form the main and the dependent clause just as analytic causative constructions should do. However, it is not clear from testing results whether the quasi-causative constructions are indeed grammaticalized. Since there is no clear decision on that problem, I hope to investigate this issue thoroughly in the future.

8. Literature

- Comrie 1989 – Comrie, B 1989, *Language universals and linguistic typology*, Chicago.
- Kozhukhar 2014 – Kozhukhar, A 2014, “The pronoun *sawi* and its functions in Dargwa Mehweb”, *Working papers by NRU HSE, series WP BRP "Linguistics"*, no. 14.
- Kozhukhar, Baryl'nikova 2013 – Kozhukhar, A & Baryl'nikova, D 2013, “Multilingualism in Daghestan”, *Working papers by Izdatelski dom NIU VSHE, series WP BRP "Linguistics"*, no. 4.
- Kulikov 2001 – Kulikov, LI 2001, *Causatives*, in M Haspelmath et al. (eds), *Language typology and language universals. An international handbook*, vol. 2. Walter de Gruyter, pp. 886-898.
- Magometov 1982 – Magometov, AA 1982, *Megebskij dialect darginskogo jazyka*, Tbilisi.
- Nedjalkov, Silnitsky 1973 – Nedjalkov, V & Silnitsky, G 1973, *The Typology of Morphological and Lexical Causatives*, in F Kiefer (ed.), *Trends in Soviet Theoretical Linguistics*, Reidel, pp. 1-32.
- Nedjalkov, Litvinov 1995 – Nedjalkov, V & Litvinov, V 1995, *The St Petersburg/Leningrad Typology Group*, in M Shibatani & T Bynon (eds.), *Approaches to language typology*, Oxford, pp. 215-271.
- Song 2001 – Song, JJ 2001, *Linguistic Typology: Morphology and Syntax*, Harlow.
- Ageeva 2014 – Ageeva, EV 2014, *Kauzativy v megebskom*, in Devjatkina, EM & Ganenkov, DS & Mazurova, JuV i dr. (eds.), *Problemy jazyka: Sbornik naučnyh statej po materialam Tret'ej konferencii-školy 'Problemy jazyka: vzglad molodyh učenyh'*. Institut jazykoznanija RAN, pp. 4-11.

9. List of abbreviations

AOR	aorist
ATR	attributive
CAUS	causative
COP	copula
CL	class marker
ERG	ergative
F	class of women
HPL	plural agreement class for humans
IN	localization ‘inside’
INF	infinitive
IPFV	imperfective stem
IPFT	imperfect
INTER	localization ‘between’
M	class of men
N	class of objects
NEG	negation
NPL	plural agreement class for non-humans
OBL	oblique
PFV	perfective stem
PL	plural
PRS	present tense
PTCP	participle
SUPER	localization ‘on’

Daria V. Barylnikova.

National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia), Faculty of Humanities, School of Linguistics. Student;

E-mail: dbarylnikova@hotmail.com

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

© Barylnikova, 2015