The Morpheme That Wouldn't Go Away

Miriam Butt
UMIST
mutt@ccl.umist.ac.uk

Linguistics Department Seminar Series
University of Manchester
March 11, 2003

1 Some Basic Facts

- **Geography:** Urdu and Hindi are South Asian languages spoken primarily in Pakistan and India, but also world-wide due to the South Asian diaspora.

- **Comparison:** Urdu and Hindi differ in vocabulary but are structurally almost identical (though there is considerable dialectal variation within both).

- **Case:** Fairly rich case marking which interacts with both syntax and semantics, including an ergative (associated with perfect morphology and agentive subjects). Nominative is unmarked.

- **Subject and object agreement.** Verbs do not agree with overtly marked nouns. Object agreement results if subject agreement is blocked. Default agreement results if both subject and object agreement are blocked.

- **Word Order:** Unmarked SOV, relatively free word order and rampant pro-drop.

2 Double Causatives in Hindi?

There are two causative morphemes in Urdu/Hindi: *-a-* and *-va-*.

(1) a. makan   ban-a
       house.M.Sg.Nom be made-Perf.M.Sg
       'The house was built.'
       'Das Haus entstand.'

   b. anjʊm=ne   makan   ban-**a**-ya
      Anjum.F=Erg house.M.Sg.Nom be made-Caus-Perf.M.Sg
      'Anjum built a house.'

   c. anjʊm=ne   (mazdurõ=se)   makan   ban-**va**-ya
      Anjum.F=Erg laborer.M.Pl=Inst house.M.Sg.Nom be made-Caus-Perf.M.Sg
      'Anjum had a house built (by the laborers).'

Another way of causitivizing/transitivizing: "strenghthening" the root
(e.g., *mar* 'die'/*mar* 'hit', *kaṭ* 'be cut'/*kaṭ* 'cut', *dɪkʰ* 'appear'/*dekʰ* 'see').

(2) a. saddaf   nɪkl-i
       Saddaf.F.Nom emerge-Perf.F.Sg
       'Saddaf came out.'

   b. anjʊm=ne   saddaf=ko   nikal-a
      Anjum.F=Erg Saddaf.F=Acc emerge.**Caus**-Perf.M.Sg
      'Anjum extracted Saddaf.'

   c. anjʊm=ne   (adnan=se)   saddaf=ko   nikəl-**va**-ya
      Anjum.F=Erg Adnan.M=Inst Saddaf.F=Acc emerge-**Caus**-Perf.M.Sg
      'Anjum had Saddaf extracted (by Adnan).'

Kachru (1980:54–55) under the assumption of a basic transformational approach posits t
levels of causation—these each increase the valency of the predication by one.

(3)   broken   broken+Caus1   broken+Caus2
       broken Z   cause X [broken Z]   cause X [cause Y [broken Z]]

       eat   eat+Caus1   eat+Caus2
       Y eat Z   cause X [Y eat Z]   cause W [cause X [Y eat Z]]

Caus1 corresponds to *-a-* (or "strenghtening") and Caus2 to *-va-*.

- (4b) represents the first level of causation (simple causation), where the causee appe in the accusative.

- (4c) shows an example of the second causative, where an additional causer is introdu and the second causee appears in the instrumental.

(4) a. rita=ne   angur   kʰa-e
       Rita=Erg grape.M.Nom eat-Perf.M.Pl
       'Rita ate some grapes.'

   b. rita=ne   sima=ko angur   kʰɪl-**a**-e
      Rita=Erg Sima=Acc grape.M.Nom eat-**Caus**-Perf.M.Pl
      'Rita fed Sima some grapes.'

   c. kala=ne   rita=se   sima=ko angur   kʰɪl-**va**-e
      Kala=Erg Rita=Inst Sima=Acc grape.M.Nom eat-**Caus**-Perf.M.Pl
      'Kala made Rita feed Sima some grapes.'

Historical Evidence

- Masica (1991:318–320) concurs with this analysis.

- He posits the historical development of a *Second Causative* via a doubling of two causatives.

- The function of this Second Causative *-va* is seen as enabling "the formation of (functional) indirect causatives from secondary transitives made with the First Causative (Hindi *ʊṭʰa-/ ʊṭʰva-* 'lift/have lifted by someone')."

Questions:

1. Why is the causee in (5) not accusative?

2. Why is the instrumental causee in (5) optional?

   (5) a. makan   ban-a
       house.M.Sg.Nom be made-Perf.M.Sg
       'The house was built.'
       'Das Haus entstand.'
   b. anjʊm=ne   makan   ban-**a**-ya
       Anjum.F=Erg house.M.Sg.Nom be made-Caus-Perf.M.Sg
       'Anjum built a house.'
   c. anjʊm=ne   (mazdurõ=se)   makan   ban-**va**-ya
       Anjum.F=Erg laborer.M.Pl=Inst house.M.Sg.Nom be made-Caus-Perf.M.Sg
       'Anjum had a house built (by laborers).'

3. Why does one not seem to get double causative marking on the verb?

   (6) *ban* 'be made' ⟶*ban-a* 'make' ⟶*ban-va/*ban-a-va* 'cause to make'
       nɪkl 'emerge' ⟶*nɪkal* 'extract' ⟶*nɪkəl-va/ *nɪkal-va* 'cause to extract'

Answer: The above scenario is not quite correct.

- Different Lexical Semantic Classes give rise to differing causation patterns.

- Some argument alternations are conditioned by semantic parameters of "affectedness" and "control".

- The historical evidence does not support a layering of causatives.

- Instead, the overall patterns of causativization appear to have been relatively stable over the ages—though the modern languages differ in the individual strategies of encoding the underlying basic pattern.

3 Pertinacity

The Urdu causative morphemes can be traced back in an unbroken line to Old Indo-Ary

A (Rough) Time Line

A. Old Indo-Aryan
   1200 BCE — 600 BCE (Vedic)
   600 BCE — 200 BCE (Epic and Classical Sanskrit)

B. Middle Indo-Aryan (Aśokan inscriptions, Pāli, different Prākrits, Apabhraṃśa—Ava
   200 BCE — 1100 CE

C. New Indo-Aryan (Bengali, Hindi, Urdu, Marathi, Punjabi, Gujarati, etc.)
   1100 CE — Present

3.1 Vedic

- In Vedic the morpheme *-aya* has a clear causativizing function.

- However, it is generally referred to as a transitivizing morpheme (e.g., Jamison 19 Hock 1981) because it mainly seems to causativize intransitives.

   (7)
Intransitive	Causative
varṣati 'he rains'	varṣayati 'he makes him rain'
gacchati 'he goes'	gamayati 'he makes him go'
roditi 'he cries'	rodayati 'he makes him cry'

   [Thieme 1927:18]

- With underlying transitives, there seems to have been little or no change in meani

   (8)
Transitive	Causative
dabhnoti 'he damages somebody'	dambhayati 'he damages somebody'
mārṣti 'he cleans somebody'	marjayati 'he cleans somebody'

   [Thieme 1927:19]

   (9) a. indraḥ   ... ajanat ... sūryam
       Indra.Nom   begot   sun.Acc
       'Indra begot the sun.'   (Ṛgveda III.31.15, from Jamison 1976)
   b. indraḥ   ... ajanayat sūryam
       Indra.Nom   begot.Caus sun.Acc
       'Indra begot the sun.'   (Ṛgveda II.19.3, from Jamison 1976)

- The origin of Vedic *-aya-* is unclear (though PIE *eje/ejo).

3.2   Sanskrit

With respect to Sanskrit we are in the fortunate position that an elegant and compact grammar exists: Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī (ca. 6th century BCE).

- Pāṇini analyzes the underlying causative morpheme as an /i/.

  Rule 3,1,26: hetumat-i ca
  '-i' is affixed to roots when one wishes to express that the action denoted by the root was caused by another person.

- Generally the root was "strenghthened" (e.g., vowel lengthening).

- This causative morpheme was followed by an *-a*, an augment for active verbs.

- In certain phonological environments (described in detail by Pāṇini), the *-i-* ⟶ *-y-*.

- In addition roots ending in *-ā* plus a class of listed verbs required a *-p-*, which sometimes turned into a *-v-* (Prākrit).

- The combined effect of these processes were two basic surface morphemes for the causative: *-aya-* and *-paya*.

- These could be attached to any verb class and generally had a genuine causativizing function (more on this later).

3.3   Middle Indo-Aryan

In Middle Indo-Aryan, both allomorphs of the causative continued to be used (Pischel 1900, Woolner 1917). **But:**

- *-aya* ⟶ *-e* (Skt. hāsyati ⟶ Prākrit hāseī 'make laugh')

- *-paya* ⟶ *-ve* (Skt. nirvāpayati ⟶ Prākrit ṇivvāvedi).

The use of *-ve* was predominant and therefore was taken to be spreading.

3.4   Variation in the Modern Languages

Claim: Both of these causative allomorphs have been retained in modern Urdu/Hindi.

Not all of the modern Indo-Aryan languages retained both:

- Bengali has *-ā-* (Chatterji 1926:§759 claims this comes from MIA *-āve-/-āva-*).

- Marathi lost the *-aya-* entirely and now uses a causative in *-w-*, derived from the MIA *-ve-* form.

Observation: Given that the causative morpheme consists of just one vowel, it would have been reasonable to assume that this morpheme fall prey to general erosion. However, this has not happened. Why?

4   Historical Stability: The Role of Lexical Semantic

- Causativization patterns come in differing flavors: case marking and interpretat differs according to the lexical semantics of the verb that is being causativized.

- These patterns appear to have been carried down the millenia.

4.1   Sanskrit

Pāṇini very carefully differentiates between several differing verb classes and makes sure list all exceptions to a pattern.

- Default Pattern for Causativization:

  - A nominative causer is added.

  - The former agent/causee surfaces as an instrumental adjunct.

- Verbs of Motion, Verbs of Perception, Ingestives, Verbs with sounds as an object a intransitives in general behave differently (Rule 1,4,52).

  - A nominative causer is added.

  - The former agent/causee surfaces as an accusative patient (object).

  (10) a. yajñadatto   devadattam   grāman   gamayati
       Yajnadatta.Nom Devadatta.Acc village.Acc go.Caus.Ind.Pres.3.Sg
       'Yajnadatta makes Devadatta go to the village.'

  b. yajñadatto   devadattam   dharmam   bodhayati
     Yajnadatta.Nom Devadatta.Acc law.Acc   know.Caus.Ind.Pres.3.Sg
     'Yajnadatta makes Devadatta understand the law.'

- The verbs *hṛ* 'take' and *kṛ* 'do' allow for an option (Rule 1,4,53):

  - **Either** the causee may be an accusative patient.

  - **Or** the causee may surface as an instrumental agent.

  (11) a. yajñadatto   devadattam   kaṭam   kārayati
       Yajnadatta.Nom Devadatta.**Acc** mat.Acc do.Caus.Ind.Pres.3.Sg
       'Yajnadatta makes Devadatta make a mat.'

  b. yajñadatto   devadattena   kaṭam   kārayati
     Yajnadatta.Nom Devadatta.**Inst** mat.Acc do.Caus.Ind.Pres.3.Sg
     'Yajnadatta has a mat be made by Devadatta.'

  - This usage is an innovation in Sanskrit for these verbs.

4.2   Vedic

A closer examination of Vedic causativization actually reveals much of the same pattern.

- Jamison (1976:130) notes that several different kinds of verbs behave like "intransitives" and therefore do show up with the semantics of causativization.

  - Verbs of Motion (go, ascend)

    (12) enam   ... gamaya antam
         Pron.3.Sg.**Acc**   go.**Caus** end.Acc
         'Make him go to the end.'
         (Atharva Veda XII.3.34, from Jamison 1976)

  - Verbs of Perception (see, hear)

    (13) sam īkṣayasva gāyato   nabhāṃsi
         perceive.Caus singers.**Acc** clouds.Acc
         'Make the singers perceive the clouds.'
         (Atharva Veda IV.15.3, from Jamison 1976)

  - Ingestives (drink)

    (14) yajatrān   ... pāyayā   ... madhūni
         awesome ones.**Acc**   drink.Caus   sweet drinks.Acc
         'Make the awesome ones drink the sweet drinks.'
         (Ṛgveda III.57.5, from Jamison 1976)

  - Verbs of Enjoyment (enjoy)

The same classes of verbs allowed accusative causees in Sanskrit.

4.3   Modern Urdu/Hindi

Saksena (1980, 1982) points out that the causativization patterns do not conform to the rather neat picture of double causativization painted by Kachru in (3).

Saksena's classifications show that the modern language exhibits the same sensitivity to lexical semantic verb classes that was seen in OIA.

- As in Sanskrit, the default pattern for transitives is an instrumental causee.

  (15) a. anjʊm=ne   paoda   kaṭ-a
          Anjum.F=Erg plant.M.Nom cut-Perf.M.Sg
          'Anjum cut a/the plant.'

      b. anjʊm=ne   saddaf=se/*ko   paoda   kaṭ-a-ya
          Anjum.F=Erg Saddaf.F=**Inst**/Acc plant.M.Nom cut-**Caus**-Perf.M.Sg
          'Anjum had Saddaf cut a/the plant.'

- Again, Verbs of Motion, Ingestives, Verbs of Perception (see) and Verbs with sou
  as objects (hear) are special: they take an accusative causee.

  (16) a. saddaf   bʰag-i
          Saddaf.F.Nom run-Perf.F.Sg
          'Saddaf ran.'

      b. anjʊm=ne   saddaf=ko   bʰag-**a**-ya
          Anjum.F=Erg Saddaf.F=**Acc** run-**Caus**-Perf.M.Sg
          'Anjum chased Saddaf away (made her run).'

  (17) a. saddaf=ne   kʰana   kʰa-ya
          Saddaf.F=Erg food.M.Nom eat-Perf.M.Sg
          'Saddaf ate food.'

      b. anjʊm=ne   saddaf=ko/*se   kʰana   kʰɪl-**a**-ya
          Anjum.F=Erg Saddaf.F=**Acc**/Inst food.M.Nom eat-**Caus**-Perf.M.Sg
          'Anjum made Saddaf eat food (gave Saddaf food to eat).'

- Finally, as in Sanskrit, there are a few verbs which allow an alternation between strumental and accusative causees (e.g., taste, read, write, sing).

  (18) a. saddaf=ne   masala   cakʰ-a
          Saddaf.F=Erg spice.M.Nom taste-Perf.M.Sg
          'Saddaf tasted the seasoning.'

      b. anjʊm=ne   saddaf=ko   masala   cakʰ-va-ya
          Anjum.F=Erg Saddaf.F=**Acc** spice.M.Nom taste-**Caus**-Perf.M.Sg
          'Anjum had Saddaf taste the seasoning.'

      c. anjʊm=ne   saddaf=se   masala   cakʰ-va-ya
          Anjum.F=Erg Saddaf.F=**Inst** spice.M.Nom taste-=bf Caus-Perf.M.Sg
          'Anjum had the seasoning tasted by Saddaf.'

5   Direct vs. Indirect Causativization

- Saksena (1980, 1982) proposes the following distinction for modern Hindi:

  - direct causation (-a- morpheme)
  - indirect causation (-va- morpheme)

- This interacts with a general pattern of case alternations on objects:

  - affected/specific objects are marked with accusative ko (Butt 1993)
  - non-specific objects are nominative, non-affected causees are instrumental

- Most verbs appear with either *-a-* or *-va-*, but no step-wise increase in valency.

  (19) a. mã͠ĩ=ne laṛke=ko   paṛʰ-a-ya
       I=Erg   boy.Obl=Acc study-**Caus**-Perf.M.3.Sg
       'I taught the boy.'   (Saksena 1982:57)

  b. mã͠ĩ=ne laṛke=ko   paṛʰ-va-ya
     I=Erg   boy.Obl=Acc study-**Caus**-Perf.M.3.Sg
     'I had the boy study.'   (Saksena 1982:57)

Thus, two interacting semantic factors are at issue: affectedness and direct vs. indirect involvement.

(20)

	Causation	
Affectedness	+involved causer	−involved causer
+affected causee	Acc with *-a*	Acc with *-va*
−affected causee	Inst with *-a*	Inst with *-va*
	(based on Saksena 1982:86)	

This is again an old pattern in the language.

5.1 Old Indo-Aryan

5.1.1 Object Alternations

- The general trend with object alternations as governed by affectedness (and telicity) is an old part of the language.

  It is probably the case that the alternation between AC [accusative case] and GC [genitive case] with verbs of consumption originally signalled a semantic difference. A food or drink in AC [accusative case] was entirely consumed, while only part of one in the genitive was.
  [Jamison (1976:131,135)]

  (21) a. pibā   somam
       drink.Imp soma.**Acc**
       'Drink soma.'   (Ṛgveda VIII.36.1, from Jamison 1976)

  b. pibā   somasya
     drink.Imp soma.**Gen**
     'Drink (of) soma.'   (Ṛgveda VIII.37.1, from Jamison 1976)

5.1.2 Direct vs. Indirect Causation

- Hock (1981): instrumental-accusative causee alternations could already be found Vedic (but rarely) for those verbs that allowed an accusative causee (cf. Thieme 192

- Hock (1981:24–25) further points towards Speijer (1886:§49) for classical Sanskrit

  If one wants to say *he causes me to do something, it is by his impulse I act*, there is room for the type [accusative causee], but if it be meant *he gets soemthing done by me, I am only the agent or instrument through which he acts*, the instrumental is on its place. [Speijer (1886:§49)]

  (22) a. mantrapūtam   carum   rājñīm   prāśayat
       consecrated.Acc porridge.Acc queen.Sg.**Acc** eat.Caus.Impf.3.Sg

       munisattamaḥ
       best-of-ascetic.Nom
       'the best of ascetics made the queen eat a consecrated porridge.'   (Sanskr
       (Kathaāsaritsāgar 9.10)

  b. tām   śvabhiḥ   khādayet   rājā
     Demon.F.Sg.Acc dog.Pl.**Inst** eat.Caus.Opt.3.Sg king.Nom
     'Her the king should order to be devoured by dogs.'   (Sanskr
     (Mahābhārata 8.371)

5.1.3 Crosslinguistic Comparison

Compare the Indo-Aryan pattern of causative alternations with data from Romance (Fren and Bantu (Chicheŵa), cf. Alsina and Joshi (1991).

(23) a. Jean a   fait manger des gâteaux aux   enfants.
     Jean has made eat   the cakes   to the children
     'Jean made the children eat the cakes.'   (Fren

  b. Jean a   fait manger des gâteaux par les enfants.
     Jean has made eat   the cakes   by the children
     'Jean had the cakes eaten by the children.'   (Fren

(24) a. Nŭngu   i-na-phík-ítsa   kadzīdzi maûngu
     porcupine SUBJ-PAST-cook-CAUS owl   pumpkins
     'The porcupine made the owl cook the pumpkins.   (Chichew

  b. Nŭngu   i-na-phík-ítsa   maûngu kwá kádzīdzi
     porcupine SUBJ-PAST-cook-CAUS pumpkins by owl
     'The porcupine had the pumpkins cooked by the owl.   (Chichew

Old and Modern Indo-Aryan thus confirm to a pattern found generally across languages

The pattern is so general, it has persisted over thousands of years.

6 Variation and Change

6.1 Synchronic Variation

The differentiated case marking on causees yields robust semantic contrasts (in line with other semantic case alternations in the language, cf. Butt and King 2002a,b).

The *-a-* vs. *-va* contrast, however, is not as robust.

(25) a. mãĩ=ne laṛke=ko   masṭar-ji=se   paṛʰ-**a**-ya
       I=Erg boy.Obl=Acc teacher-Resp=Inst study-Caus-Perf.M.3.Sg
       'I had the boy taught by the teacher.'   (Urdu)

   b. mãĩ=ne laṛke=ko   masṭar-ji=se   paṛʰ-**va**-ya
       I=Erg boy.Obl=Acc teacher-Resp=Inst study-Caus-Perf.M.3.Sg
       'I had the boy taught by the teacher.'   (Urdu)

- As shown in Table (26), most verbs can take both causative morphemes.

- The forms marked with a '?' are either ones which have been reported in the literature, but which informants find questionable, or which have been reported as both good and bad within the same piece of writing, indicating variability in judgement.

- There are lexical gaps. The reason for these gaps is not clear.

  - Phonological? (can one find a systematic phonological characterization)
  - Speaker variation?
  - Accidental historical development?

- For instance, Old Indo-Aryan could standardly causativize 'come' and 'go', Modern Urdu/Hindi have no direct causative forms for these verbs. Why?

(26)

Intransitive	Causative		Transitive	Causat
Stem form	-a-	-va-	Stem form	-a-
ban 'be made'	ban-a	ban-va	kaṭ 'cut'	kaṭ-a
ʋṭʰ 'rise'	ʋṭʰ-a	ʋṭʰ-va	xarid 'buy'	—	x
beṭʰ 'sit'	bɪṭʰ-a	bɪṭʰ-va	kar 'do'	kar-a
haṭ 'move away'	haṭ-a	haṭ-va	pakṛ 'catch'	pakṛ-a	p
har 'lose'	har-a	—	mil 'meet'	mil-a	
so 'sleep'	sul-a	sʋl-va	bec 'sell'	bɪk-a	
			(bɪk 'be sold')		
jal 'be aflame'	jal-a	jal-va	mar 'hit/kill'	mar-a	
			(mar 'die')		
has 'laugh'	has-a	has-va (??)	le 'take'	—	li-
bʰig 'get wet'	bʰigo 'soak'		naha 'bathe'	nahl-a	n
ḍub 'go under'	ḍubo 'drown'		dʰo 'wash'	dʰul-a	d
Verbs of Motion	**Causative**		**Ditransitive**	**Causat**
Stem form	-a-	-va-	Stem form	-a-
ja/ga 'go'	—	—	de 'give'	dil-a	dil
a 'come'	—	—			
cal 'walk/stir'	cal-a 'drive'				
bʰag 'run'	bʰag-a	bʰag-a			
caṛʰ 'climb'	caṛʰ-a	caṛʰ-va			
doṛ 'run'	doṛ-a	doṛ-va			
Verbs of Perception	**Causative**				
Stem form	-a-	-va-			
dekʰ	dɪkʰ-a	dɪkʰ-va (??)			
ḍar 'fear'	ḍar-a	—			
Sound Verbs	**Causative**				
Stem form	-a-	-va-			
sʋn 'hear'	sʋn-a	sʋn-va			
Ingestives	**Causative**				
Stem form	-a-	-va-			
kʰa 'eat'	kʰil-a	kʰil-va			
pi 'drink	pil-a	pil-va			
Special Ingestives	**Causative**				
Stem form	-a-	-va-			
cakʰ 'taste'	cakʰ-a (??)	cakʰ-va			
paṛʰ 'read'	paṛʰ-a	paṛʰ-va			
likʰ 'write'	likʰ-a	likʰ-va			
ga 'sing'	—	ga-va			

6.2   Deo 2002 — The Role of the Root

Deo (2002) notes that which causative form gets selected when also seems to depend on the original underlying root.

Hindi Verb Roots

- Hindi verbs are primarily monomorphemic (see (26)).

- Verbs which are not monomorphemic are generally the product of lexicalization:

(27) a.

Preverb	+	Verb	$\longrightarrow$	Verb
ud		val	$\longrightarrow$	ʊbɑl
up		turn		boil

b.

Noun	+	Verb	$\longrightarrow$	Verb
kaṛak		kṛ		kaṛak
thunder		do		thunder

Causativization of Lexicalized Roots

- Former Particle/Preverb Verbs are causativized via root "strenghthening".

(28)

Sanskrit	Modern Base Verb	Causative
ut chal	ucʰal 'bounce'	ucʰ**al**
ut tar	ʊtɑr 'descend'	ʊt**ar**
ud val	ʊbɑl 'boil'	ʊb**al**
vi ghaṭ	bɪgɑṛ 'spoil'	bɪga**ṛ**

(Adpated from Deo 2002)

- Former N+V complex predicates are causativized via "strenghthening" the former root 'do'. This has the synchronic effect of causative *-a-* affixation.

(29)

Sanskrit	Prākrit	Modern Base Verb	Causative
karda kṛ	kaṛakkai	kaṛak 'thunder'	kaṛak-**a**
jhal kṛ	jhallakai	jʰɑlak 'shine'	jʰalak-**a**
jhan kṛ	jhanakkai	jʰanak 'ring'	jʰanak-**a**
dhaṭ kṛ	dhaṛakkei	dʰaṛak 'beat'	dʰaṛak-**a**
daha kṛ	dahakkei	dɑhak 'burn'	dɑhak-**a**

(Adapted from Deo 2002)

Speculative Note: The evidence from N-V lexicalizations might help to make the ingestive class (see table (26)) less odd.

6.3   Historical Scenario

Recall that Masica posited the development of *-va-* from a double causative formation. Due to the available historical evidence, this position must be considered untenable.

Saksena (1982:101) predicts that

- *-a-* will eventually be reanalyzed/lexicalized as a transitivizing suffix

- *-va-* will be left as the only productive causative suffix

7   Alternative Analysis and Conclusion

7.1   Transitivization vs. Causation

- The "strengthening" of the root has entered the language as a transitivizing strate

mɑr 'die'	mar 'hit/kill'
bɪk 'be sold'	bec 'sell'
ʊbɑl 'be boil'	ʊbal 'boil'
ʊtɑr 'descend'	ʊtar 'get down'

- Transitivization differs from causativization:

  - **The semantics differ:**
    1. Simply adding an agent (causer) leaves one in the same core event predicati
    2. Adding an agent (causer) to an event that already specifies an agent lea one with two event predications (a complex event=a complex predicate).

  - **Supporting evidence:** causative morphemes are always added to the n transitivized root

7.2   Layers or Parameters of Causativization

There is only one "layer" of causativization (not two), as is typologically standard.

- The two synchronic causative morphemes *-a-* and *-va-* are continuations of a transp ent allomorphy at an earlier stage of the language.

- The transparency has been lost, so that there are now two separate morphemes.

- Given that a distinction between indirect and direct causation is an old part of language, a likely scenario is that the two morphemes are indeed being identified w direct vs. indirect causation, as proposed by Saksena (1980, 1982).

- However, this identification is not hard and fast, leading to speaker variability.

There is no need for an assumption of parametric variation across causation (cf. Alsina and Joshi 1991, Alsina 1996).

(30) a.   phik-itsa   'cause' < ag pt   'cook'< ag pt >>   (OBJECT CAUSEE)
           cook-CAUS

      b.   phik-itsa   'cause' < ag pt   'cook'< ag pt >>   (OBLIQUE CAUSEE)
           cook-CAUS

One only needs to posit one form of argument structure merger (Butt 1998) if one takes into account separately established semantic factors such as object "affectedness" (e.g., Krifka 1992, de Hoop 1992, Ramchand 1997) and a notion of "control" (cf. Kaufmann 2001).

(31)   'cause' < ag th   'pred'< ag . . . >>

References

Alsina, Alex. 1996. *The Role of Argument Structure in Grammar: Evidence from Romance.* Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.

Alsina, Alex and Smita Joshi. 1991. Parameters in Causative Constructions. *Papers from the 27th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 1–15.

Böhtlingk, Otto. 1839–1840. *Pāṇini's Grammatik.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Republished in 1998.

Butt, Miriam. 1998. Constraining Argument Merger Through Aspect. In E. Hinrichs, A. Kathol and T. Nakazawa (eds.) *Complex Predicates in Nonderivational Syntax.* Academic Press.

Butt, Miriam. 1993. Object Specificity and Agreement in Hindi/Urdu. In *Papers from the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicgo Linguistic Society*, 80–103.

Butt, Miriam and Tracy Holloway King. 2002a. The Status of Case. In *Clause Structure in South Asian Languages*, ed. Veneeta Dayal and Anoop Mahajan. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. In press.

Butt, Miriam and Tracy Holloway King. 2002b. Case Systems: Beyond Structural Distinctions. In *New Perspectives on Case Theories*, ed. Ellen Brandner and Heike Zinsmeister. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications. In press.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar. 1926. *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Literature, Volume II.* Calcutta: D. Mehra, Rupa & Co. 1975 edition.

Deo, Ashwini. 2002. A Diachronic Perspective on Complex Predicates in Indo-Aryan. Talk at the Workshop *Complex Predicates, Particles and Subevents*, Konstanz, September.

Hock, Hans. 1981. Sanskrit Causative Syntax: A Diachronic Study. *Studies in the Linguis[tic] Sciences* 11(2):9–33.

Hoernle, R.A.F. 1879. A Collection of Hindi Roots with Remarks on their Derivation a[nd] Classification. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of West Bengal.*

de Hoop, Helen 1992. *Case Configuration and Noun Phrase Interpretation.* PhD the[sis], University of Groningen, The Netherlands.

Jamison, Stephanie. 1976. Functional Ambiguity and Syntactic Change: The Sanskrit [?] cusative. In *Papers from the Parassesion on Diachronic Syntax, Chicago Linguis[tic] Society*, 126–135.

Kachru, Yamuna. 1980. *Aspects of Hindi Syntax.* Delhi: Manohar Publications.

Kaufmann, Ingrid. 2001. *Medium: Eine Studie zur Verbsemantik.* Habilitationsschr[ift], Heinrich-Heine Universität Düsseldorf.

Katre, Sumitra M. 1987. *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Republish[ed] in 1989.

Krifka, Manfred 1992. Thematic relations as links between nominal reference and tempo[ral] constitution. In I. Sag and A. Szabolcsi (Eds.), *Lexical Matters*, 29–53. Stanford, C[A]: CSLI Publications.

Masica, Colin. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan Languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Pr[ess].

Mohanan, Tara. 1988. Causatives in Malayalam. Ms., Stanford University.

Pischel, Richard. 1900. *A Grammar of the Prākrit Languages.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsida[ss]. Republished in 1999, translated by Subhadra Jhā.

Ramchand, Gillian 1997. *Aspect and Predication: The Semantics of Argument Structu[re].* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Saksena, Anuradha. 1980. The Affected Agent. *Language* 56(4):813–826.

Saksena, Anuradha. 1982. *Topics in the Analysis of Causatives with an Account of Hi[ndi] Paradigms.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Speijer, J. S. 1886. *Sanskrit Syntax.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas. Republished 1973.

Thieme, Paul. 1927. *Das Plusquamperfektum im Veda.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupre[cht].

Woolner, Alfred. 1917. *Introduction to Prakrit.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Republished [in] 1996.