
INSTRUCTOR	Dr. Prerna Nadathur (prerna.nadathur@phil.hhu.de)
OFFICE	24.53.00.87
CLASS SCHEDULE	Thursday 16.30-18.00
CLASS LOCATION	24.21.U1.21 (Z50)
COURSE WEBSITE	pnadathur.github.io/causation-winter19.html All course materials will be posted on the website.

DESCRIPTION

In communicating our knowledge of causal relationships between events in the world, language represents our primary encoding. The structure and expression of causation in language is therefore of interest to linguists, philosophers, and cognitive scientists seeking to understand how causal information is represented in cognition. This course surveys a range of literature on the semantics and grammatical structure of causation, examining both the expression of causation in a cross-linguistic perspective, as well as theoretical approaches to modeling different types of causal connections. Topics include causative verbs and morphology, agentive and non-agentive causation, causal event structure, and causal models in the study of counterfactual conditionals and lexical semantic representation.

COURSE AIMS

This course is intended for students of linguistics, or the philosophy of language, who have some background in semantics and pragmatics. It aims to familiarize them with the literature on causation in semantics and grammar, introduce them to active areas of research, and provide them with the tools to investigate and ask questions about causation in a semantic framework. The course is structured around reading and discussion. It is assumed that attendees have completed the assigned reading prior to class. Please see below for policies regarding credit points and the Abschlussprüfung.

POLICIES

- (i) **Readings.** Readings should be completed before the class for which they are assigned. All readings can be downloaded from the course webpage. To access the reading list, you will need the course password: **lukeminen**.
- (ii) **Assignments.** You are asked to complete short weekly reading responses (1–2 pages). You should pick one of the assigned readings and provide a short summary, and then focus on a particular claim or idea it introduces: you might either present some reasons to be critical of the claim, suggest a way of further investigating this claim, or contrast it with other ideas in the relevant literature. You might also discuss some questions raised by the paper or article.
Reading responses should be submitted by email or on paper in class or in the department office (24.53.00.86). Responses are due by beginning of the class for which the reading was assigned. Late responses will not be accepted. Note that if you submit them by midday

on the previous day (Wednesday), it may be possible for me to incorporate your questions into the lecture/discussion, so you are encouraged to consider submitting your responses early.

- (iii) **Participation.** To receive credit points (Kreditpunkten, Beteiligungsnachweis) for participation, you must complete 10 reading responses throughout the course. (Note that this means there are three weeks in which you need not submit a response: it is entirely up to you to choose which weeks you do not complete responses.)
- (iv) **Final exam/Abschlussprüfung.** In order to qualify for the AP, you must complete a final paper (8–12 pages). You can apply for the AP using the appropriate forms for your course of study, available in the linguistics department office (24.53.00.86). The final paper should contain an original contribution, which may be descriptive, empirical, or theoretical. You should submit a short proposal for your paper topic to me at latest by the final lecture (30.01.2020).
- (v) **Language.** Lectures and any supplementary materials will be in English. You are strongly encouraged to complete the reading responses in English: you will NOT be penalised for grammatical mistakes. If you would strongly prefer to complete your responses in German, please let me know in advance so that I can make arrangements for you to receive feedback. If you intend to apply for the AP and wish to write your final paper in German, please let me know by 19 December.
- (vi) **Academic integrity.** Academic dishonesty and plagiarism are strictly prohibited. You are welcome to use the library, textbooks, journal articles, and other resources, but you *must* cite any sources that you use. Quoted material in particular must be attributed, including page numbers where possible. You are welcome to discuss the readings with other students, but you must write up your responses independently, in your own words. You may NOT work with other students on the final exam.
- (vii) **Electronic devices.** As a courtesy to other students, please do not use cell phones during class. You may use a laptop to take notes.

COURSE PLAN (subject to revision)

1. Introduction and course overview	10.10.2019
2. Formal basics, lexical decomposition <i>Reading:</i> Dowty 1979 (excerpts); Fodor 1970; McCawley 1976, 1978	17.10.2019 <i>Response due</i>
3. Typology of causative constructions <i>Reading:</i> Comrie 1989 (Ch. 8); Shibatani 1976; Bhatt 2003	24.10.2019 <i>Response due</i>
4. The causative alternation <i>Reading:</i> Levin 2015; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1994, 2005 <i>Optional:</i> Chierchia 2004; Erteschik-Shir 1979, Pinon 2001	31.10.2019 <i>Response due</i>
5. Lexical and periphrastic causatives; parameters <i>Reading:</i> Shibatani 1976; Wierzbicka 1998	07.11.2019 <i>Response due</i>

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 6. Direct and indirect causation | 14.11.2019 |
| <i>Reading:</i> Wolff 2007; Martin 2018; Martin & Schäfer 2014;
Neeleman & van de Koot 2012 | <i>Response due</i> |
| 7. Internal and external causation | 21.11.2019 |
| <i>Reading:</i> McKoon & MacFarland 2000; Wright 2002;
Koontz-Garboden 2008; Rappaport Hovav 2019 | <i>Response due</i> |
| 8. Agentive causation | 28.11.2019 |
| <i>Reading:</i> DeLancey 1984, Van Valin & Wilkins 1996; Kittilä 2005;
Beavers & Zubair 2013
<i>Optional:</i> Folli & Harley 2004; Martin & Schäfer 2012 | <i>Response due</i> |
| 9. Causal event structure and aspectual class | 05.12.2019 |
| <i>Reading:</i> Demirdache & Martin 2016; Lyutikova & Tatevosov 2014;
Tatevosov & Ivanov 2009; Martin & Schäfer 2012 | <i>Response due</i> |
| 10. Alternative approaches, causal pluralism | 12.12.2019 |
| <i>Reading:</i> Lewis 1973; Kvart 2001; Hobbs 2003; Copley & Wolff 2014
<i>Optional:</i> Lewis 2000; Mackie 1965; Thomason 2014; Woodward 2003 | <i>Response due</i> |
| 11. Structural equation models and uses | 19.12.2019 |
| <i>Reading:</i> Sloman 2005; Croft 1991; Lauer & Nadathur 2019 | <i>Response due</i> |
| 12. Counterfactual conditionals and dispositions | 09.01.2020 |
| <i>Reading:</i> Schulz 2011; Briggs 2012; Ciardelli et al 2017;
Schulz & van Rooij 2019 | <i>Response due</i> |
| 13. Force dynamics, frustratives | 16.01.2019 |
| <i>Reading:</i> Wolff 2003, 2014; Sloman et al 2009;
Copley & Harley 2014; Kroeger 2017 | <i>Response due</i> |
| 14. Causal models and lexical semantics | 23.01.2020 |
| <i>Reading:</i> Baglini & Francez 2016; Nadathur 2019 (Ch. 3);
Alonso-Ovalle & Hsieh 2017; Castroviejo & Oltra-Massuet 2018;
Hara 2017 | <i>Response due</i> |
| 15. Review, project discussions | 30.01.2020 |
| | <i>Topic proposals due (last day)</i> |

-
- [1] Alonso-Ovalle, L. & H. Hsieh. 2017. Causes and expectations: on the interpretation of the Tagalog ability/involuntary action form. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 27, D. Burgdorf, J. Collard, S. Maspong, & B. Stefánsdóttir (eds): 75–94.
 - [2] Baglini, R. & I. Francez. 2016. The implications of managing. *Journal of Semantics*, 33: 541–560.
 - [3] Beavers, J. & C. Zubair. 2013. Anticausatives in Sinhala: involitivity and causer suppression. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31: 1–46.
 - [4] Bhatt, R. 2003. Handout on causativization. March 2003.
 - [5] Briggs, R. 2012. Interventionist counterfactuals. *Philosophical Studies* 160: 139–166.
 - [6] Castroviejo, E. & I. Oltra-Massuet. 2018. Generic and action-dependent abilities in Spanish ‘be capable.’ *Glossa*.
 - [7] Chierchia, G. 2004. A semantics for unaccusatives and its syntactic consequences. In A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, & M. Everaert (eds.), *The Unaccusativity Puzzle*, 22–59. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - [8] Ciardelli, I., L. Zhang, & L. Champollion. 2017. Two switches in the theory of counterfactuals. *Linguistics and Philosophy*.
 - [9] Comrie, B. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 - [10] Copley, B. & H. Harley (2014). Eliminating causative entailments with the force-theoretic framework: the case of the Tohono O’odham frustrative *cem*. In *Causation in Grammatical Structures*, B. Copley & F. Martin (eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - [11] Copley, B., & P. Wolff. 2014. Theories of causation should inform linguistic theories and vice versa. In B. Copley & F. Martin (eds.), *Causation in Grammatical Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - [12] Croft, W. 1991. *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 - [13] Danlos, L. 2001. Event coreference in causal discourses. *The Language of Word Meaning*, 216–242.
 - [14] DeLancey, S. 1984. Notes on agentivity and causation. *Studies in Language* 8, 181–213.
 - [15] Demirdache, H. & F. Martin. 2016. Agent control over non-culminating accomplishments. In *Verb Clauses and Aspect*, E. Barraón López (ed). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
 - [16] Dowty, D. 1979. *Word meaning and Montague grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
 - [17] Erteschik-Shir, N. 1979. Discourse constraints on dative movement. In T. Givón (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*, 441–467. New York: Academic Press.
 - [18] Fodor, J. 1970. Three reasons for not deriving “kill” from “cause to die.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 1: 429–438.
 - [19] Folli, R. & H. Harley. 2004. Consuming results in Italian and English. In P. Kempchinsky and R. Slabakova (eds.), *Aspectual Inquiries*, 95–210. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
 - [20] Hara, Y. 2017. Causality and evidentiality. In *Proceedings of the 21st Amsterdam Colloquium*, A. Cremers, T. van Gessel, & F. Roelofsen (eds).
 - [21] Hobbs, J. 2003. Causality and modality: the case of ‘would.’ *Journal of Semantics* 20.

- [22] Kaufmann, S. 2013. Causal premise semantics. *Cognitive Science*, 37: 1136–1170.
- [23] Kittilä, S. 2005. Remarks on involuntary agent constructions. *Word* 56.
- [24] Koontz-Garboden, A. 2008. Anticausativization. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27. 77–138.
- [25] Kroeger, P. 2017. Frustration, culmination, and inertia in Kimaragang grammar. Ms.
- [26] Kvart, I. 2001. The counterfactual analysis of cause. *Synthese* 127, 389–427.
- [27] Lauer, S. & P. Nadathur. 2019. Causal necessity, causal sufficiency, and the implications of causative verbs. Accepted, pending minor revisions.
- [28] Lewis, D. 1973. Causation. *The Journal of Philosophy* 70, 556–567.
- [29] Lewis, D. 2000. Causation as influence. *The Journal of Philosophy* 97, 182–197.
- [30] Levin, B. 2015. Semantics and pragmatics of argument alternations. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 1, 63–83.
- [31] Levin, B. & M. Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [32] Lundquist, B., M. Corley, M. Tungseth, A. Sorace & G. Ramchand. 2016. Anticausatives are semantically reflexive in Norwegian, but not in English. *Glossa* 1: 1-30.
- [33] Lyutikova, E. & S. Tatevosov. 2014. Causativization and event structure. In *Causation in Grammatical Structures*, B. Copley & F. Martin (eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [34] Mackie, J. 1965. Causes and conditions. Reprinted in *Causation*, E. Sosa & M. Tooley (eds.), 1993. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [35] Martin, F. 2018. Time in probabilistic causation: direct vs. indirect uses of lexical causative verbs. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 22.
- [36] Martin, F. & F. Schäfer. 2012. On the argument structure of verbs with bi- and mono-eventive uses. In *Proceedings of the Northeast Linguistics Society*.
- [37] Martin, F. & F. Schäfer. 2014. Causation at the syntax-semantics interface. In *Causation in Grammatical Structures*, B. Copley & F. Martin (eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [38] McCawley, J. 1976. Remarks on what can cause what. In *The Grammar of Causative Constructions*, M. Shibatani (ed). New York: Academic Press.
- [39] McCawley, J. 1978. Conversational implicature and the lexicon. In P. Cole (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 9: Pragmatics*, 245–258. New York: Routledge.
- [40] McIntyre, A. 2005. The semantic and syntactic decomposition of *get*. *Journal of Semantics* 22: 401–438.
- [41] McKoon, G. & T. MacFarland. 2000. Externally and internally caused change of state verbs. *Language* 76, 833–858.
- [42] Neeleman, A. & H. van de Koot. 2012. The linguistic expression of causation. In *The Theta System: Argument Structure at the Interface*, M. Everaert, T. Sioni, & M. Marelj (eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [43] Piñón, C. 2001. A finer look at the causative-inchoative alternation. In *Proceedings of the 11th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference*, 346–364.
- [44] Pykkänen, L. 1999. Causation and external arguments. In *Papers from the UPenn/MIT Roundtable on the Lexicon*, L. Pykkänen, A. van Hout, & H. Harley (eds), Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- [45] Rappaport Hovav, M. 2019. Deconstructing the internal/external causation distinction. Ms, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

- [46] Schulz, K. 2011. If you’d wiggled A, then B would’ve changed. *Synthese* 179: 239–251.
- [47] Schulz, K. & R. van Rooij. 2019. Natural kinds and dispositions: a causal analysis. *Synthese*.
- [48] Shibatani, M. 1976. The grammar of causative constructions: a conspectus. In *The Grammar of Causative Constructions*, M. Shibatani (ed). New York: Academic Press.
- [49] Sloman, S. 2005. *Causal models*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [50] Sloman, S., A. Barbey & J. Hotaling. 2009. A causal model theory of the meaning of *cause*, *enable*, and *prevent*. *Cognitive Science* 33: 21–50.
- [51] Tatevosov, S. & M. Ivanov. 2009. Event structure of non-culminating accomplishments. In *Cross-linguistic Semantics of Tense, Aspect, and Modality*, L. Hogeweg (ed). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [52] Thomason, R. 2014. Formal semantics for causal constructions. In B. Copley & F. Martin, (eds.), *Causation in Grammatical Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [53] Van Valin, R. & D. Wilkins. 1996. The case for “effector.” In M. Shibatani & S. Thompson (eds.), *Grammatical Constructions*, 289–322. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [54] Wierzbicka, A. 1998. The semantics of English causative constructions in a universal-typological perspective. In *The New Psychology of Language*, M. Tomasello (ed). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [55] Wolff, P. 2003. Direct causation in the linguistic encoding and individuation of causal events. *Cognition* 88, 1–48.
- [56] Wolff, P. 2007. Representing causation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 136: 82–111.
- [57] Wolff, P. 2014. Causal pluralism and force dynamics. In B. Copley & F. Martin (eds.), *Causation in Grammatical Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [58] Woodward, J. 2003. *Making things happen: a theory of causal explanation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [59] Wright, S. 2002. Transitivity and change of state verbs. In *Proceedings of the 28th Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 339–350.